

TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

December 1, 2025 Regular Meeting

The Saddle Brook Zoning Board of Adjustment will hold a regular meeting 7:00 p.m. on Monday December 1, 2025 at **(Saddle Brook Municipal Complex, 55 Mayhill Street)**

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 7:09 pm.

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT: adequate notice of this meeting has been sent to all members of the Zoning Board and to all legal newspapers in Accordance with all the Provisions of the "Open Meetings Act", Chapter 231, P.L. 1975.

4. ROLL CALL

Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Mr. Latona, Mr. Duffy – Present.

Mr. Burbano arrived at 7:23, Ms. Nobile arrived at 8:05

Mr. Francin, Mr. Manzo and Mr. Gjorgievski are absent.

Mr. Cialone the Board Attorney, Mr. Kurus the Board Engineer and Mr. Paparozzi the Board Planner are also in attendance.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A.) Gino Latona, 22 Weller Terrace, Block 1813, Lot 9

The Applicant proposes a front porch, side and rear additions and add-a-level that does not conform to the zoning ordinance for the Township of Saddle Brook as it exists today.

Mr. Cialone confirms that the notice is in order and they may proceed.

Mr. Cialone swears in Gino Latona he gives his address as 22 Weller Terrace.

Mr. Latona – Currently have a small cape. Me my wife and daughter have outgrown it and we are looking to add some more living space and storage throughout the home. In order to do so we are looking to add an eight foot rear addition which would open up the first floor. A three foot eleven side addition which would align the garage with the rear of the home and allow us to be able to pull a car into the garage and be able to open up the doors. Then all the bedrooms will be moved upstairs. There's going to be an add-a-level throughout the top of the home and current front foyer will be the new front open porch. The property has four preexisting nonconforming conditions which are minimum lot frontage, minimum front yard, minimum single yard and minimum combined side yard and we're seeking variances.

Mr. Duffy – Is your architect going to be giving testimony this evening?

Mr. Latona – I would swear him in just in case.

Mr. Duffy – He needs to be sworn in and qualified.

Mr. Cialone swears in Stanley J. Kufel, Jr. he gives his address as 337 Demarest Avenue in Oradell, New Jersey. He gives his qualifications and the Board accepts him as a witness.

Mr. Kurus – The only question we had was with respect to the impervious coverage. I think your plan underestimated it. Do you have the increase in impervious existing versus what's proposed?

Mr. Kufel – We went from 2030 to 2900 on total maximum coverage of the property.

Mr. Kurus – I guess the existing patio is there and the two story addition is going to be over the patio right?

Mr. Kufel – Correct.

Mr. Kurus – Then an extension to the driveway to get another parking space.

Mr. Kufel – Yes.

Mr. Latona – It's mainly the driveway and the side walkway.

Mr. Duffy – So there's a discrepancy on that number that we have to fix?

Mr. Kurus – I think it might be a little less than what was in the Zoning Officer's report.

Mr. Latona – I think the original report was calling it a patio expansion but the patio is existing and 226 whatever point whatever feet is being taken up for the rear addition.

Mr. Kurus – It's under so they don't need a variance for it.

Mr. Duffy – Okay.

Mr. Kurus – With the less impervious it wouldn't be a requirement for drainage that would be the difference.

Mr. Paparozzi – The single side yard and the combined side yard are new variances not preexisting because of the additions so those are the new variances that are being requested. On the porch you have P/P porch what is P/P?

Mr. Kufel – Proposed porch extension. There's an existing cover now but we're proposing an extension of the existing porch line.

Mr. Paparozzi – Where does the porch come out is it only one story?

Mr. Kufel – Yes.

Mr. Paparozzi – What is the distance off the house my plan is small it looks like 3.7 feet I just want to verify that.

Mr. Kufel – That's correct.

Mr. Paparozzi – You also show a height of 27.5 but yet the survey doesn't have any Topo.

Mr. Kufel – No we don't have a Topo.

Mr. Paparozzi – How did you do it without a Topo from the survey?

Mr. Kufel – I did it by measurement myself.

Mr. Paparozzi – You're not licensed to do that but if the Board wants to accept that it's close.

Mr. Kufel – We also could offer an as built.

Mr. Paparozzi – If that's the case and the Board decides to go that way I would ask for an as built after the framing so if it is over either he comes back to the Board or he could maybe reduce the pitch on the roof but that should be a condition if the application is approved that an as built survey with topography by a surveyor be provided.

Mr. Kufel – We're going to be below the allowed anyway. We're going to make sure of that.

Mr. Paparozzi – You're only half a foot.

Mr. Kufel – I understand.

Mr. Paparozzi – If you're showing a half a foot quite honestly that's close enough to ask for a height.

Mr. Kufel – I can get an engineer to do that.

Mr. Paparozzi – Surveyor not an engineer he's not licensed either.

Mr. Kufel – Oh we can do that. If the Board wishes we'll provide an as built when the framing is up as the ridge line gets placed.

Mr. Duffy – By a licensed surveyor.

Mr. Kufel – Yeah.

Mr. Duffy – Do any Board members have any questions?

Mr. Latona – I have a question for one of the variances. The front yard setback it's saying 25 feet. I'm going to have 25 feet to the actual house it's going to be 26.1 and then it's going to be 22.4 to the open front porch. So wouldn't that mean that variance is not needed because you need a minimum of 25 to the front yard and there's going to be 26.1.

Mr. Paparozzi – That's correct I said you need a variance for side yard and combined side yard nothing to do with the front.

Mr. Latona – Okay.

Mr. Duffy – Anybody have any questions? Can I have a motion to open the meeting to the public?

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to open to the public. All in favor – YES.

Mr. Duffy – Having heard none.

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to close to the public. All in favor – YES.

Mr. Schilp makes a motion to approve the application providing they get the as built survey by a licensed surveyor during the framing in regard to the height.

Mr. Duffy – Do we have to make an adjustment here on anything?

Mr. Paparozzi – Mr. Ambrogio had 4 that were preexisting 2 are new because of the addition.

Mr. Duffy – Single yard and the combined side yard because they're new.

Mr. Kufel – That's correct.

Mr. Duffy – There's a motion on the floor.

Ms. Murray seconds the motion.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Mr. Duffy – YES.

Mr. Latona sits in for Ms. Nobile and Mr. Burbano arrives at 7:23 pm.

B.) Wladyslaw Gusciora, 475 Hobson Avenue, Block 702, Lot 22

The Applicant proposes to convert a single family dwelling to a two family dwelling that does not conform to the zoning ordinance for the Township of Saddle Brook as it exists today.

Mr. Cialone confirms that the notice is in order and that they may proceed.

Mr. Cialone swears in Wladyslaw Gusciora and he gives his address as 475 Hobson Avenue.

Mr. Duffy – Just walk the Board through your plan and what you're looking to do.

Mr. Gusciora – I've been a resident for 22 years in the same house. It's a single family home my daughter is getting older and moving out so it's just going to be my wife and I. We want to convert it from a one family to a two family to help us to stay in the Town to keep the taxes paid and hopefully retire here. That's basically what we're doing. We're not making the building any bigger it's staying the same size. We're not increasing any coverage it's just converting the first floor that is right now a big family room to a one bedroom for my wife and myself.

Mr. Duffy – I'm going to open it up to the Board to ask questions.

Ms. Murray – How do you get to the second floor?

Mr. Gusciora – It's a split level so when you walk in you actually walk in between the two floors. Once you walk into the foyer there's stairs going downstairs and stairs going upstairs. If you look at that there's a little wall right at that foyer then there's a side entrance that's already existing to the first floor and that's what we will use to our apartment. Like I said we are not increasing any size of the homes.

Ms. Murray – No it's just without the second floor picture I wanted to know how you were getting to the other side. I see the down and that's the part behind the garage so you'll have the downstairs and the basement.

Mr. Gusciora – Yep.

Ms. Murray – So you'll have the basement and the first floor and the garage and the apartment will be on the second floor.

Mr. Gusciora – The renter will be living there and we live downstairs the two of us.

Mr. Burbano – How many other two families are on the street?

Mr. Gusciora – Most of the block is two family. I think there are only like 4 one families and the rest are two family.

Mr. Burbano – Okay thank you.

Mr. Tokosh – What is the total height of the building?

Mr. Gusciora – It's a two story right now. I know we're definitely under the height but it's a two story existing and we're not going up or nothing on it. If you like we could get that measured but never thought about it because it's existing.

Mr. Burbano – They're proposing 28 feet there's no change.

Mr. Paparozzi – First on Mr. Ambrogio's letter of denial we have an RB zone and a two family RB zone the code requires 7000 square feet not 6500 so that variance is from 6000 to 7000. The street frontage for RB for two family is 70 feet not 65 so that variance goes from 50 to 70. Additionally I have one page

on the architect plans I don't know the number of bedrooms to calculate parking requirement so I can't tell you about that but the garage is for one family there's no separation of wall in the garage to split. So if there's two cars in the garage the only two cars in the driveway can belong to the same family if you understand what I'm saying. But I don't know how many parking spaces are required because I don't have a full set of architect plans for the entire house.

Mr. Gusciora – We have a two car garage and we have three spaces in front of the garage. Right now we park three cars in front of the garage.

Mr. Duffy – The question is how many bedrooms are in the house.

Mr. Gusciora – Upstairs we have three bedrooms. This would be the fourth bedroom in the house.

Mr. Paparozzi – So the tenant would have one space.

Mr. Gusciora – Yes.

Mr. Burbano – Do you have a kitchen upstairs right now?

Mr. Gusciora – Yes.

Mr. Burbano – Is this a new kitchen in the back?

Mr. Gusciora – Yes this would be a new kitchen there's a back porch that we would convert to a kitchen.

Mr. Burbano – There's no full set of plans so it's hard to understand what the existing condition is.

Mr. Gusciora – Yeah because we're not doing nothing upstairs so I guess he didn't draw anything in.

Mr. Burbano – Normally it would show some sort of building or new in that area it just looks like it's existing.

Mr. Gusciora – It's an enclosed porch it's been all season close so we're just converting that to a kitchen. That is one story it's the same story in the back.

Mr. Schilp – It's very confusing on what you talked about on entry into the house. There's a front set of stairs and there's a side set of stairs. Are both sets of stairs going into both apartments?

Mr. Gusciora – Right now both of them are accessible it's a single family house.

Mr. Schilp – When you're done making the modification which one goes to which area and is there going to be any passage way that they could get through a doorway or anything like that?

Mr. Gusciora – Right now what we're proposing is to close off the stairs coming in from the front. Closing up that stairs so that would eliminate any entrance to the bottom floor except for the side entrance. So the second floor would not have access to the first floor.

Mr. Schilp – The front stairs are going to go where?

Mr. Gusciora – Upstairs.

Mr. Schilp – Only upstairs?

Mr. Gusciora – Only to the second floor.

Mr. Schilp – There won't be any access from?

Mr. Gusciora – No.

Mr. Schilp – The side entrance will only go.

Mr. Gusciora – Only to the first floor and give me access to the basement.

Mr. Schilp – I mean like Mr. Burbano said I'd love to see something on the drawing I'd love to see what's on the second floor and there is nothing.

Mr. Burbano – It almost looks like he put the wall in the wrong spot. So it looks like he blocked off the stairs.

Ms. Murray – No it's a baby split like this.

Mr. Gusciora – It's a split level.

Ms. Murray – When you walk in the front door where it says up and he's blocking the down so it's like a half and a half. The two stairs are next to each other and one goes up and one goes down and he's locking the down one. So you can only go up the half of a level to that floor.

Mr. Gusciora – To the second floor yes.

Ms. Murray – Would it be helpful with an elevation yes.

Mr. Schilp – Without seeing everything that you want I have a hard time trying to prove something that I can't see. That's my concern.

Mr. Gusciora – What are we looking at I apologize.

Mr. Schilp – You gave us one sheet and all it had on it is the first floor. There's nothing about the second floor and the diagrams that you have for the stairs going up and down it shows doorways and it looks like you can go from anywhere to anywhere. I know what you're saying to me but I don't see that on the plans and without any plans for the second floor that's even worse.

Mr. Duffy – I'm going to propose something to you. I think if you listen to some of the concerns that a couple of Board members have it would be my suggestion that you ask for an adjournment and supply the plans the full set.

Mr. Gusciora – With the existing.

Mr. Duffy – Right so they have a better understanding it will serve your application better. This way you don't have to worry about run the risk of losing out on the application. I'm not guaranteeing you either way I don't do that.

Mr. Gusciora – I understand.

Mr. Duffy – If you don't do that and you were denied you would have to considerably change things in order to do this again.

Mr. Gusciora – Understood.

Mr. Duffy – My suggestion is that you request an adjournment from the Board. What is a little in your favor is this is December first and we're not coming back again until January 12th so it should give you ample time to get that together and get it to the secretary ten days prior to that.

Mr. Gusciora asks for an adjournment without further notice to the January 12, 2026 meeting.

Mr. Duffy asks the Board for a motion.

Mr. Schilp makes a motion seconded by Ms. Murray to adjourn the application without notice to the January 12, 2026 meeting without further notice.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Latona, Mr. Duffy – YES.

C.) Mark & Kari Fritsch, 175 Hayes Drive, Block 1714, Lot 1

The Applicant proposes a mother/daughter, front porch and 2nd floor addition that does not conform to the zoning ordinance for the Township of Saddle Brook as it exists today.

Mr. Cialone confirms that the notice is in order and they may proceed.

Joseph Conte is the attorney for this application he comes forward with the applicant Mark Fritsch and their architect Alexis Lugo.

Mr. Cialone swears in Mark Fritsch he gives his address as 175 Hayes Drive.

Mr. Conte – They currently have a property that has four bedrooms and one and a half baths. They're looking to expand upon the existing footprint essentially having a five bedroom with four and a half bathrooms. There are a few variances that are required. Again they are not expanding on the footprint but because of the addition there's approximately four variances that are being triggered here so we're asking for variance relief for those variances. I'd like to just put Mark on initially and ask a few questions to explain to the Board the purpose and the need for the addition.

Mr. Fritsch – I've been a lifelong resident of Saddle Brook for 40 years. My wife is pregnant with or third child. We have 4 bedrooms currently the rooms are tiny so we're expecting the third one so we need some more space upstairs. My mother in law is living in Lodi she is 75 and we want her to come live with us. She's had two knee surgeries so just to make life easier for her we're asking to build a bedroom upstairs and a living room downstairs. We're going to knock down the existing garage that's going to be one living room and then a bedroom upstairs with a bathroom. We're not going past the footprint we're just going straight up and I think one of the variances is the front porch which I think is five feet and the driveway is another variance.

Mr. Conte – So essentially your family is expanding you need additional room for your family. You have three children and you're going to have your mother in law live with you. Does the Board have any questions for Mr. Fritsch?

Mr. Duffy – So this isn't really a mother daughter because there's no kitchen involved with this.

Mr. Fritsch – No.

Mr. Duffy – Originally I think there was I remember hearing or seeing something about that.

Mr. Conte – The initial plan had proposed like a wet bar just like a sink or a kitchenette that's been removed.

Mr. Duffy – The actual footprint you're just knocking the garage down but the structure is going to be put back there.

Mr. Fritsch – Yes.

Mr. Duffy – Do any Board members have any questions?

Ms. Murray – The office downstairs on the first floor has a closet which is then considered a bedroom because it has a closet.

Mr. Conte – We could remove that. If the Board is favorable to the application we could remove that closet in the office on the first floor.

Mr. Schilp – I'm looking at the proposed second floor plan. The bedroom that's up there and it says laundry room are you going to be able to walk from?

Mr. Conte – Yes there's currently a mud room and it's going to be a walkway between the two bedrooms.

Mr. Schilp – The stairway would go down to the living room downstairs. Just to clarify that looks good.

Mr. Paparozzi – I'm just not clear on the driveway that's going to remain. The garage is going to be gone but I don't know the footprint of the garage is going to stay and is the driveway going to stay?

Mr. Fritsch – The driveway is going to stay.

Mr. Paparozzi – I don't really see it on the architect's plan but the existing driveway on the survey is going to remain?

Mr. Fritsch – Yes.

Mr. Paparozzi – If that's the case Chairman the 5 bedroom house would require 4 parking spaces for RSIS and if that driveway is remaining you can fit 4 cars.

Mr. Fritsch – You can fit 4 cars.

Mr. Paparozzi – I know but it's marked as a variance and quite honestly then it's not. Five bedroom house RSIS requires 4 parking spaces. You have 36 feet 18 and 18 is 36 you got over 20 feet from the property line to the end of the concrete so that's 4 spaces. So that variance would be eliminated for parking. On Mr. Ambrogio's letter of denial the architect's plan is really not clear on that driveway and also on the front porch I don't know where the 19 came from but we'll assume that it's 19.

Mr. Duffy – The architect is here this evening.

Mr. Conte – That's correct I can have him testify and answer that.

Mr. Duffy – Why don't we do that.

Alexis Lugo the architect comes forward and is sworn in by Mr. Cialone. He gives his credentials and is accepted as a witness.

Mr. Lugo – The front porch we were extending out 5 feet past the existing footprint. So the existing footprint front yard setback is 26.05 feet so we will be at 21.05 to the porch. That's marked on sheet A1.1.

Mr. Paparozzi – If it's coming out 5 feet and you have 26 you have 21 you're only required 20 then it's not a variance as well. I think there are 2 variances not 4 but I could be mistaken.

Mr. Duffy – There's 2 preexisting and then you're saying that if the driveway that you talked about remains that covers the 4 spaces so that variance is no longer needed correct?

Mr. Paparozzi – Correct.

Mr. Duffy – The front porch can you review that again one more time.

Mr. Paparozzi – The front porch requires 20 foot setback. The one corner of the house to Hayes is 26.05 the second corner which is not marked on the survey is approximately 25.2. If you come out to 5 feet you're still over 20 feet the requirement is 20 feet so those two variances would be eliminated.

Mr. Conte – We noticed for those variances but I agree with you. I wasn't sure if there was an overhang or where that was but after testimony from the architect it does seem that we still have the 20 feet from the front line.

Mr. Burbano – I think they were doing it based on whether it was going to be a two family.

Mr. Paparozzi – Two family is not permitted in the zone then you would need a use variance as well but I don't know if that's what the application is.

Mr. Duffy – No the application is not for that because it was taken away.

Mr. Burbano – You're doing a separate entrance with a portico to make it look like a two family from the front and everything in the house is a two family including that little back cutout that has the plumbing right above. It's a completely separate structure.

Mr. Duffy – It doesn't have a kitchen so it doesn't become an apartment.

Mr. Paparozzi – That could be in a condition but if I'm looking at A1.1 on your architect sheet.

Mr. Burbano – I know what it looks like now it looks like an addition.

Mr. Paparozzi – The addition only has a powder room it doesn't have a full bathroom.

Mr. Burbano – On the second floor.

Mr. Paparozzi – Yeah. Well on the first floor the second floor plan.

Mr. Burbano – The second floor plan has a full bathroom.

Mr. Paparozzi – Yeah that has a full bathroom.

Mr. Burbano – You got a full complete second set of stairs going up to the bedroom. So you got the bedroom upstairs, family bathroom downstairs and then you have a carve out for where a kitchen can go where the plumbing is all above.

Mr. Paparozzi – You're right so a condition in the resolution if approved would have to be there would not be a kitchen and not converted.

Mr. Cialone – No additional kitchen.

Mr. Paparozzi – I would also state that it shouldn't be a two family because for a kitchen all you need is an outlet. You have an electric stove you got a kitchen. I would also state that like Mr. Burbano said condition that it doesn't become a two family anytime without coming back in front of this Board. That would be my suggestion.

Mr. Conte – The applicant would have no problem agreeing to that. The whole purpose here is their family is growing. They're going to have a lot of kids in that house mother in law in the house. So they really have no intention of but I understand what you're saying too.

Mr. Burbano – I'm completely understanding of that you sell the house in the future you've got a complete separate entrance, complete separate structure and you have a carve out for a kitchen on the first floor as part of that extended family room. It would be very easy for somebody to sneak an apartment in there. I don't have any problems with what they're doing to be transparent but having it look like a two family from the front is where I have the issue because you have all single family houses on that block. This house looks like a two family from the outside too as opposed to if there was a side entrance where it's unseen. If you drive past that house it looks like a two family just missing a second mailbox right. The front of the house is where that second portico is isn't it?

Mr. Lugo – If I may there's already an entrance there.

Mr. Burbano – Because it's a sun porch right.

Mr. Lugo – It's a connector right now to the garage on AD1.0.

Mr. Conte – We can definitely if the Board looks favorable upon it we could definitely put something in the resolution so that in the future if it does get sold obviously that resolution does become a public record.

Mr. Burbano – The Building Inspector would flag it when they go for the CO.

Mr. Conte – Right.

Mr. Burbano – I'm just trying to be like Saddle Brook I wouldn't want a two family looking house in a one family residential because then everybody is going to come and ask to do it. So there would have to be something in the resolution for me to say that it's not going to become and if it is that there's heavy fines or something.

Mr. Duffy – We could put in the resolution that no additional kitchen would go in and that in the event the property is sold then we could stipulate if they were to put a second kitchen in they would have to come back to the Board for approval for use as a two family since they're not in a two family zone.

Mr. Burbano – You're saying it's a sunporch does it look like a sunporch with the door or is it a physical man door the existing house as it stands now.

Mr. Lugo – It's covered.

Mr. Burbano – So the only thing changing is you're adding a portico in front of it.

Mr. Lugo – That's it. It has a door with two windows.

Mr. Conte – Mr. Chairman do you want me to just have him put on the record the two variances that we need?

Mr. Duffy – Oh yeah we have to put them on the record.

Mr. Conte – Mr. Lugo can you go over the two variances that I believe are still pending here?

Mr. Lugo – On the right side facing the house the existing is already over the side yard setbacks and the same goes with the rear yard setbacks. The existing house is nonconforming.

Mr. Duffy – No other questions. Can I have a motion to open the meeting to the public?

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to open to the public. All in favor – YES.

Mr. Duffy – Having heard none.

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to close to the public. All in favor – YES.

Mr. Paparozzi – Mr. Chairman although the same footprint exists and it's preexisting the addition of the second floor creates the variances. So it's not preexisting those two variances those are new variances.

Mr. Duffy – Okay thank you. Just so the Board knows those two nonconforming on the zoning letter of denial are actually new variances and the parking requirement is no longer needed and the open front porch is no longer needed.

Mr. Mazzer makes a motion to approve what Mr. Duffy stated.

Mr. Duffy – We have a motion on the floor to approve the application. There will be no additional kitchen to be constructed. In the event the property is sold and the new owners if they want to put another kitchen in they have to come to the Board because at that point it will be a two family house.

Mr. Schilp seconds the motion.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Latona, Mr. Duffy – YES.

D.) Greater Bergen Realtors, 405-433 North Midland Avenue, Block 1401, Lot 12

The Applicant requests a reconsideration of a prior approval granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment at the October 6, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Duffy – What we have here is a reconsideration that was based initially on the change of hours if I'm correct.

Brian Chewcaskie is the attorney for the applicant and comes forward.

Mr. Chewcaskie – That's correct Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Duffy – Just one question we had to have this noticed correct.

Mr. Cialone confirms the notice is in order and they may proceed.

Mr. Chewcaskie – We were before the Board on October 6th the Board granted an approval subject to various conditions to provide 100 parking spaces or what I would call nonrelated parking spaces for Greater Bergen Board of Realtors. After appearing on the 6th I personally visited the site the following weekend and determined that there were more parking being utilized on an overnight basis than was characterized during the course of the proceedings. I thereafter did some research. Digital Room Printers has 50 spaces. Digital Room Printers appeared before the Planning Board in 2021 and obtained an approval which was conditioned upon getting additional parking spaces for its employees. They installed a compactor. That compactor was approved but as a result of the installation of that compactor they lost parking. During that research and I should have known better because I represented Digital Rooms at that time in 2021 we did provide one of the parking agreements with Greater Bergen Board of Realtors dated October 21, 2021 with regard to 35 parking spaces. Testimony before the Planning Board was that Digital Room Printers operates for three shifts. We verified with the operator Hank Grandherst that those three shifts utilize the parking. So we had a restriction on the hours of parking I believe 7 to 9 but as indicated in my correspondence to Mr. Cialone on October 28th there are three shifts. During those three shifts the first shift is the maximum, the second shift diminished and the third shift is limited probably up to about 10 spaces but those spaces are being utilized. So that was request number one. Request number two is after the filing of the application there was a modification to one of the lease documents for the auto storage. That modification provided an additional 10 spaces as needed. So we are requesting the Board this evening to reconsider the conditions that were imposed. First to address Digital Room's and second to address the additional parking for the auto storage. So what was approved was 100 spaces

with limitations on Digital Room's use and also there were only 40 spaces identified for the auto facility where there are now 50. What we've also provided was redacted lease or license agreements. For the Board's purposes all we did was redact the consideration being made for those license agreements. So I did request Mr. Cialone to not adopt the resolution so that the Board could hopefully reconsider the request and modify as I've stated. I have Mr. Ledesma here sitting to my right who testified who can verify everything that I've said if you want him sworn in to do so.

Mr. Duffy – Two approaches we have to take. The first is to either approve or deny the request for a reconsideration. Since we already had the vote the question to put to the Board is will we grant the motion to reconsider our previous approval on the basis of testimony. That is in relation to the time change in the parking where we have previously approved 7 am to 9 pm this would open it up to 24 hours that we would take that time constraint away.

Mr. Cialone – That was special condition B in the resolution. I know we didn't adopt the resolution but it was drafted. So at that time there were 40 spaces that were leased by AW Auto or that was the testimony and those were going to have overnight parking. The remaining 60 spaces we put a condition that they can only be used between 7 am and 9 pm and I believe Mr. Chewcaskie you're asking for that to be lifted for all 60 or just the 50 for Digital?

Mr. Chewcaskie – Only the 50 for Digital Rooms.

Mr. Duffy – The other item would be amending the application because the application stated for 40 spaces for the A&W Auto and now it's an increase of 10.

Mr. Cialone – So we would be going from a total of 100 spaces to 110 spaces.

Mr. Duffy – So the question to the Board before we go any further we would need a motion to accept the reconsideration of our original approval. What that does is it opens us back up to we can ask questions again we can amend even our own conditions and you can change your vote. It's almost as if we reset the clock. That's one avenue or you can deny the request for reconsideration and then the application moves forward as it stood at our October 6th meeting.

Mr. Schilp makes a motion that we reconsider the application and just as a comment I went up to Digital Printing and asked them myself.

Mr. Duffy – Can we hold that till after let's establish that and that will be entered into the discussion on this.

Mr. Mazzer seconds the motion to reconsider.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Mr. Duffy – YES.

Ms. Nobile, Mr. Burbano – NO.

Mr. Duffy – We just needed a simple majority for that motion correct.

Mr. Cialone – Correct.

Mr. Duffy – Now we can move forward on let's take the first reconsideration. So the consideration that we will talk about is the change in time. Mr. Schilp can you finish what you were going to say?

Mr. Schilp – I talked to the people at Digital. There are 16 employees on the night shift and there's about 30 and it depends sometimes it goes up and down on the afternoon shift. I didn't ask about days because how many on days but a significant number on days. They would have to have overnight parking for the 16 that they have because there wouldn't be enough spots.

Mr. Burbano – How many are they asking for?

Mr. Duffy – For 50 which we approved originally.

Mr. Schilp – Not for overnight.

Mr. Duffy – No we did 7 to 9 actually in our discussions we didn't have any determination exactly was the third shift a continual thing was it sporadic. So we decided we would go with 7 to 9 but they run three shifts continuously Monday through Friday occasionally on the weekends but that's workload dictated and it's a reduction in spaces used on second and third shift. The obvious is the 50 and I'm sure there's a little bit of overlap.

Mr. Burbano – I understand that but if we approve this we're not approving only them we're approving anybody that they want to rent it to when those people move out for overnight.

Mr. Duffy – No we stipulated let's clarify that. The 50 spaces for Digital Room would be the only ones we would allow to extend the timeframe and we did stipulate that any change in tenants that were renting

the Township had to be notified of who they were because we did say we wanted businesses in Town. We did look at this and say in the resolution they would get 50 7 to 9 and if Digital Room went out and somebody else came in the Township has to be notified that's a whole new process.

Mr. Burbano – Yeah but it wasn't for overnight.

Mr. Duffy – No the reconsideration is the overnight on so the other spaces the beauty school and the other 6 and 4 those are still subject to the 7 to 9 they don't change.

Mr. Burbano – They're just looking to change it for the overnight for that one tenant and that one tenant only.

Mr. Duffy – Exactly.

Mr. Burbano – So when that one tenant leaves the zoning still stays the same for any new tenant that might come in right.

Mr. Duffy – That's a good question.

Mr. Burbano – You can't change the zoning law and have it revert back once it's changed it's changed.

Mr. Cialone – This is a condition so it depends on how you want to structure it. If you want to just allow the overnight for Digital Room and then it reverts back to 7 to 9 Digital Room's no longer leasing those spaces we can do that there's a condition of approval.

Mr. Burbano – I didn't realize zoning laws could go back to what they were.

Mr. Cialone – It's a condition.

Mr. Burbano – In essence it's reverting back to the old zoning then.

Mr. Schilp – The old zoning is none.

Mr. Burbano – No I'm saying what we just approved. So let's say we approved it and we do a condition that it's only them you're reverting it back to.

Mr. Duffy – That means that the tenant that would go in that space would be entitled to 50 spaces to rent from Greater Bergen and their time constraint would be 7 to 9. If they needed to address that they have to come back.

Mr. Burbano – The zoning is for the 50 parking spaces the condition is just for them for the overnight.

Mr. Duffy – Yes.

Mr. Cialone – You can leave the 7 to 9 on the 60 spaces but then cut out a provision that allows Digital Room to use it for overnight and only Digital Room to use their spaces for overnight parking. Something to that effect you could do it that way too.

Mr. Chewcaskie – Mr. Chairman if I may because this got convoluted with my appearances before the Planning Board that identified the parking. I have no objection to that condition. The intention is that Digital Room operates three shifts those three shifts as indicated and confirmed by Mr. Schilp is that the numbers go down.

Mr. Burbano – I understand you know what it is the messiness of this is that they've been using it for years without the zoning and you let 16 overnight and now you have people coming in and out you can just use 100 it's the same thing as going from a one family to a two family after the fact. There's no policing it like carving out that overnight that's why we did till 9:00 to try to limit that from happening.

Mr. Duffy – We can because we're now doing a reconsideration we can add additional stipulations to it. I thought about this and said okay so how do we know who's in there all day and all night. In the original approval the spaces would be marked approval by the engineer. I thought about this and I said that only separates the spaces it doesn't necessarily have any way of tracking. We could say that the landlord would have to issue parking permits to the people who are using the parking spaces or they would require and I'm speaking out loud so if you have a suggestion as I'm going along I'll be happy to entertain it.

Mr. Chewcaskie – We have no objection to hang tags or something because I'm sure Digital Room can print them.

Mr. Duffy – Something so we know these people are in here and that's it. A&W Auto all of their cars would have to put something in the windshield and not the placard that they put on the license plate. This would provide the opportunity for any resident in Town that wanted to do it could walk in the back and take a look and make a complaint. We could give teeth to this. I understand what you're saying it has gone on for a long time. My fear is that if we don't address this stuff now and we let it go it's going to get worse and they're going to do it again anyway but if we put the proper stipulations in now we have some teeth

that there's recourse. You can go to the Zoning Official and say they're in violation and then he's got to act and site them. I know this mess has gone on for a while now it's in our lap so we have an opportunity to clean it up. We already approved one thing and if we leave it that way who's to say it doesn't grow from 40 to 50 over here and 50 to 60 over there. At least if we set it up in a way that we can push them into a corner where they have to monitor. Then it's on the landlord's responsibility to make sure that he does it's his property he's got to maintain it so they're the ones getting the fine not the people that are using it. We get an advocate out of the deal. That's just my opinion.

Mr. Schilp – Maybe.

Mr. Duffy – Everything is subject to maybe but if we don't do anything we don't get anything and because we have this reconsideration we now have an opportunity to tighten up our own decision from the last time if the Board so chooses. The Board is within their rights to on the reconsideration to say no. I believe in this reconsideration we have an opportunity to really tighten this up. My fear is if we don't do it it's going to get worse there's going to be abuses and the Town is not going to have any recourse. They will but in all actuality if you don't give them something to work with how is it going to happen. This is where we're at on the reconsideration just on the time change. Does anybody else have any thoughts?

Mr. Schilp – I'd like to know if we can restrict the number of overnight now we're just strictly talking about Digital right?

Mr. Duffy – Yes.

Mr. Schilp – if there could be something in there that they're not allowed any more than the 16 guys on the shift and so many guys on the afternoon are there that you would put it down that the maximum number of cars you can have there at any one time is 25. This way here there was a shift change for an hour and a half hour overlap then the other one might come in.

Mr. Burbano – We need to have more placards out there than the only one.

Mr. Duffy – I think the nature of their business might be where this shift they got to have 40 guys because they got a big thing going and then the next time it goes down to 27 so now we're trying to anticipate his business and we don't know enough about it. If we say you get 60 spots you issue 60 placards or the method that we can talk to the engineer and make sure it's done the way we're looking. We have 60 placards from one sixty there's no 61 you don't have guys you only have 50 cars at max. How they overlap is going to be there little dance not ours. The request for the reconsideration is on the parking spaces dedicated to Digital Room, LLC, to where their time would be 24 hours. They don't have a restriction on because they run three shifts. To approve it I would say that we add all of them at this point or the amendment part? So Digital Room and since this is the time constraint this also takes into consideration Cosmo Beauty and Stephan Williams. For those two the time will stay 7 to 9.

Mr. Cialone – To be clear if Digital Room is no longer a tenant those 50 spaces go to 7 to 9 they revert to 7 to 9 restriction.

Mr. Duffy – Their additional requirement is that a permit placard is issued so that anybody that works for Digital Room they get their placards their permitted to park in their spaces. Stephan Williams gets his four they're permitted to park. This way we know who they are and the Beauty Academy has their six. That is what's up for reconsideration. That would require a motion to accept or deny.

Mr. Schilp – I'll make a motion that we accept the stipulations that you just discussed.

Mr. Duffy – So we have a motion to accept the reconsideration on the parking times and with the stipulation that they're going to issue a placard or a permit that is visible from outside the vehicle.

Mr. Paparozzi – And the additional 10.

Mr. Cialone – No.

Mr. Duffy – That's an amendment we're going to do that next.

Mr. Mazzer – Is this something you're going to hang on the mirror or something?

Mr. Duffy – Yeah they can hang it on the mirror they can leave it on the dashboard. As long as it's visible from the outside of the vehicle.

Mr. Schilp – They all have to be put in the same area.

Mr. Duffy – I agree with that.

Mr. Schilp – You want to put it on a back window on a side window but everybody gets it in the same spot.

Mr. Duffy – So it's got to be visible which means pick a spot everybody gets the same spot however they want to do it.

Ms. Murray seconds the motion.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Ms. Nobile, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Duffy – YES.

Mr. Duffy – That takes care of the request for reconsideration. The second part of this now is the amendment which is the increase from 40 spaces to 50 for A&W Auto. Do you have any comments?

Mr. Chewcaskie – The only comment I would have is that in order for clarity I wanted to make sure that everything was correct from the October meeting. When we looked at that after we filed the application there was an amendment to that license agreement that provided for an additional 10 as needed spaces. So we'll leave it for the Board to determine whether to permit those additional 10 spaces or not.

Mr. Duffy – It's a simple amendment we can leave it at the original 40 or increase it to 50.

Mr. Schilp – I only live a couple of blocks from there I pass that place several times a week and I have never in the past 6 months seen less than 54 cars in that lot. The last couple of meetings we had it was stated by the presenter here that oh I check the lot to make sure that there is only these required number here and the required number is 40. There has been over 50 cars there every time. Now we're going to go to 50 or is requesting 50 and I can see the 50 going to 60. He sat there and swore that I checked the lot. If you checked the lot and say that there's only 40 cars there when or is it just the one time I go past that there's 54 cars there. You can find out there's other people on the Board who have gone there also and there's always been over 50 cars so somebody is pulling my chain.

Mr. Burbano – Is the auto company that is looking to lease the space a business within Saddle Brook?

Mr. Schilp – No it's Elmwood Park.

Mr. Burbano – I was inclined to approve the other because they're a business in Town that we're trying to support.

Mr. Duffy – Those are businesses in Town I don't know the affiliation with A&W Auto in Saddle Brook with the exception that they park behind Greater Bergen Realty.

Mr. Schilp – This has been going on for a couple of years. The part that I police there is no policing back there they do whatever they want anytime.

Ms. Murray – My concern is the documents I've got in front of me too. You've got the parking space license agreement that was signed off on 2/8/24 and then the addendum for the additional 10 to get 10 more it's not dated so I'm trying to figure out because it says dated August 1, 2024 so if this addendum was valid the same time you came in with the first agreement why weren't they together the first time asking for the 50 because that means you didn't file all the agreements when you didn't have the totals correct. If your totals aren't correct and you don't know what you're leasing because you don't have all your papers together and in order how do you expect us to understand what you're actually asking for. Your dates are a little odd here. I find it hard to accept and these documents should have been here.

Mr. Chewcaskie – We don't disagree we just wanted to make sure all the information was accurate. I'm not going to make excuses I just want to say we wanted to correct it so that it was fully before the Board and as I did the same as Board members have done going over there and count it. If somebody's looking we want to make sure it's correct.

Ms. Murray – Okay thank you.

Mr. Duffy – Any other questions? Whether it's 40 or 50 part of the problem is it's gone on for some time and we need to put a stop to it. We can still require the same permits we said for the other spaces as a requirement for A&W regardless of 40 or 50 it doesn't matter. Whatever the number is we approved 40 already this is a request to amend to 50. So we can put a couple more springs to it and we can certainly deny the amendment and leave it at the original 40. Regardless of whether the agreements with the landlord and the tenants were 40 or 50 it really doesn't matter because they weren't in a position to make the agreement in the first place. We want to make sure that we keep the vehicles except for Mr. Ledesma wants to make sure that the spots are available in the front and right around the outside of the building for when he does their training classes. He doesn't want to fill the whole place up and our intent is to control this.

Ms. Murray – What's the condition of the vehicles they're bringing in are they drivable?

Mr. Duffy – Oh yeah they're actually for sale.

Ms. Murray – It's from a car lot that doesn't have enough space on it for the car lot.

Mr. Duffy – We did stipulate that there is no viewing of those vehicles on the property. It's not a used car lot the only thing they do is it's an overflow parking for them.

Ms. Murray – They would have the same ability that Digital would to make sure that there's only a certain amount of placards that are issued to them in a different color or style or something else so that they would be distinguishable from the others and you would know that that's their spots.

Mr. Duffy – Color is probably your best.

Ms. Murray – I would think that if this was something we would approve they would be issued that many and they can't park a vehicle of any sort without a placard hanging in it.

Mr. Schilp – They're doing it right now.

Ms. Murray – I understand that.

Mr. Schilp – They have been since the first time they came here.

Mr. Tokosh – What if we give the 50 blue to put on the dashboard and anything that doesn't have our identification you give them a ticket.

Mr. Cialone – We don't have the ability to do that.

Mr. Duffy – The Council would have to put an ordinance together for this. He would be in violation of the zoning variance so Mr. Ambrogio can give them a violation.

Mr. Ledesma – For clarification we're a training association not a brokerage house.

Mr. Duffy – There wouldn't be a ticket like the police wouldn't do it the Zoning Officer would do it and every day they're over they would get a fine. That's the extent of the teeth we could give them.

Mr. Burbano – With all these provisions we would hire a full time person to enforce it.

Mr. Duffy – This is what's in front of us.

Ms. Murray – To address Mr. Schilp's valid comments. Right now they don't have any way to say whose cars are whose. Technically speaking we don't know which ones belong to if somebody is parking in spots that they're allotted. At this point A&W is the one that we have to have identified.

Mr. Duffy – Has to have placards we'd have to add that in regardless if we go 40 or 50 they get placards. Then it becomes Digital Room's problem that they're not parking where they said they would park. As long as we can keep them to a certain number. You see how this type of issue causes such angst and it's because there are rules to follow and people have this tendency to not follow rules anymore. We just don't think they apply to anybody we just go about and do whatever the heck we want to do and we come back to a situation like oops I got caught now I'll ask for permission. That didn't work well with my mother it doesn't work well today anymore either. I can promise you this regardless of what number comes out 40 or 50 it's going to get watched and watched closely. If there's no further discussion I'm going to open it up to the public.

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to open to the public. All in favor – YES.

Mr. Duffy – Having heard none.

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to close to the public. All in favor – YES.

Mr. Duffy – The question to the Board regardless of whether it's 40 or 50 we are putting in placards the same as we discussed with the other three tenants that will have to be put in. Someway to differentiate which tenant is which and I leave it to the Board.

Mr. Schilp – I'd also like if it gets approved they have to mark the spots that's going to say A&W.

Mr. Burbano – It was color coded because if they change tenants.

Mr. Duffy – We did have that and that's not changing and it had to be approved by the engineer. We did do that already the only thing we are going to change is the number. The question to the Board is do we have a motion to confirm the change from 100 spaces to 110 which would give the additional 10 to A&W or stay with the previous count which was 100.

Mr. Burbano – Are you segregating it to 40 for this 20 for this?

Mr. Duffy – That's already segregated and we've approved a total of 100 spaces that's original.

Mr. Burbano – Your approval would be for 110 but the additional spaces for that specific tenant and not any other one.

Mr. Cialone – Correct. If you saw Mr. Chewcaskie's letter from October 28th he specifically Cosmo 6 spaces, On Your Way Stephan Williams 4 spaces, Digital Room 50, A&W Auto 50.

Mr. Burbano – Okay.

Mr. Schilp makes a motion that it stays at the 40 number total 100 with 40 going to A&W.

Ms. Murray seconds the motion.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Ms. Nobile, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Duffy – YES.

Mr. Duffy – The reconsideration is accepted regarding the time waived. We have the placards however you decide them. There was in the prior approval about marking out the spaces and it is the 40 spaces we're not going to add the other 10.

E.) Carmen Sta Maria, 145 Market Street, Block 609, Lot 9

The Applicant proposes a mixed use structure consisting of a restaurant on the first floor and apartments on the second and third floors that do not conform to the zoning ordinance for the Township of Saddle Brook as it exists today.

Mr. Cialone confirms that their notice is in order and they may proceed.

Joseph Mecca is the attorney for this application and he comes forward.

Mr. Mecca – I'm going to start out with our engineer but I do want a little bit of housekeeping. There's one additional variance that is not on the zoning schedule. Although the height of the building conforms the height of the building is 32 feet where 35 is the maximum allowed it is three stories not two and a half stories. With that I'm going to ask that Mr. Donly be sworn in and qualified.

Mr. Cialone swears in Michael Donly the engineer for this project. He gives his qualifications and is accepted by the Board.

Mr. Mecca – If you don't mind if you could just go over first the existing conditions of the site.

Mr. Donly – We're dealing with a previously developed site located on the north side of Market Street lot 9 block 609. It's in the B1 primary business district. The lot abuts a B1 district at both sides and we have RA district to the rear of the site. This lot is 75 feet wide by 100 feet deep with an area of 7500 square feet. So it is a bit undersized for what's required. A hundred feet is the required width and 10,000 square feet is the required area. What exists is a two and a half story framed dwelling with a front porch which wraps around the right side. It's an irregular shaped building it's 28.8 feet wide and 39.4 feet deep. It's most recent use was as part of the florist shop next door on lot 8 to the west. It was used mostly as a design center for weddings as we were informed. Originally the house we believe was for a single family residential. There's a kitchen on the first floor the upper two floors are residential. There's a free standing carport at the left rear corner of the site. There's a shed at the right rear corner. Two other sheds are located along the right property line. Most of the site is currently developed with macadam and concrete surfacing except for a small portion of the right side yard and the front yard is green space. Along the rear property line a decorative block wall exists along with a chain link fence partially. The chain link fence also exists along a portion of the right property line in the front yard. There was previously a pole mounted business sign in the front yard next to the front property line and next to the edge of the driveway. That has since been taken down but you can still see the evidence of it. Site access from Market Street is provided by an 11 foot wide driveway apron and a flush curb adjacent to the left property line. No previous line striping was observed. There is currently parking in the front yard, the rear yard and the left side yard. Electric service is currently provided by overhead wires and an electric meter at the left side of the building. Public water and gas services are routed through the front cellar meters are in the cellar. A public sewer is utilized with a tie in at Market Street.

Mr. Mecca – If you could go through the variances we are requesting and then we can do the site plan.

Mr. Donly – We have as mentioned an existing nonconformance with regard to lot area. Ten thousand square feet is required we have seventy five hundred square feet. Lot width a hundred feet is required we have a seventy five foot lot. So those are existing nonconformances. There is an existing nonconforming front yard of 23.5 feet to the covered front porch 25 feet is required. We are proposing 25 feet so no variances. The side yard setback is required at 15 feet 11.78 feet exists. The right side we're also proposing or requesting a variance for the right side with a 10 foot setback. The side yard setback for both is limited to 30 feet we have 46.28 feet existing. I need to make a correction to what's on the plan. We're proposing 51.33 feet combined side yard. There's no variance required.

Mr. Mecca – We're actually increasing the total side yard setback.

Mr. Donly – That's correct. With regard to the rear yard setback 25 feet is required 36.69 feet exists 25 feet is proposed no variance. The maximum building height as discussed 35 feet is required with a maximum two and a half stories 32 feet exists with two and a half stories 32 feet is proposed but with three stories. So a variance is requested for number of stories. The maximum lot coverage of 50% is required 80.8% exists and 77.5% is proposed. That's also a correction to what's shown on the site plan. So a variance is required.

Mr. Mecca – We're reducing the nonconforming as it relates to this.

Mr. Donly – That's correct. The minimum floor area ratio 0.5% is required 0.27 exists 0.47 is proposed so no variance is required. The number of parking spaces. I think we're going to go into that more deeply but we're not seeking a variance for the number of parking spaces. Parking spaces in front yard zero are allowed currently when you enter the site there is parking in the front yard. We're estimating three cars and what's being proposed we're also proposing three cars parking in the front yard so a variance is requested. The ADA accessible spaces one is required as mentioned there's no current striping. We are proposing one ADA space no variance. Landscape buffer the side yards it's not required because we abut B1 zoning district on both sides. Existing it's not applicable proposed is not applicable for the side yards. For the rear yard 10 feet is required 1.2 feet exists to the free standing canopy and 2 feet is proposed to a refuse area. So we are requesting a variance for the landscape buffer in the rear yard.

Mr. Mecca – The signage will comply as well.

Mr. Donly – Yeah the maximum number of signs allowed is one. One sign existed and we're proposing one so no variance is required.

Mr. Mecca – What's being proposed is a restaurant I call it fast casual type of a restaurant. We'll hear testimony as to the clientele and then two separate residential units 2 bedroom 1 bath units above on the second and third floor correct.

Mr. Donly – Correct.

Mr. Mecca – If we could just go through the site plan and how you configured the site with the aisle width.

Mr. Paparozzi – Mr. Donly can you give us the last revision date on the site plan?

Mr. Donly – August 20, 2025.

Mr. Mecca – Let's go through it I know that a restaurant is proposed at the ground level just go through the details of the site layout.

Mr. Donly – Previously we were trying to work with the existing building and trying to fit the parking around the building. We appreciate the Board Engineer's comments.

Mr. Mecca says to go to site plan C102.

Mr. Donly – We're proposing a new building 23.66 feet wide by 50 feet deep. It's three stories 32 feet height. We're proposing a restaurant at the ground level. There's an entry door located at the front of the building. There's a dining area at the front section of the restaurant so that makes sense. A door is also proposed at the rear of the building for the kitchen. Two residential units are proposed above each with two bedrooms. One unit at each of the two upper floors approximately 1000 square feet per unit. The access to the residential units is also at the rear of the building. There's an entry door if you look at the back of the building the entry doors are noted with a solid hatched triangle those indicate the doors. The building is proposed with an internal full height stair. No elevator is proposed. The building is going to be fully sprinklered. The first floor has been set at a height of seven inches above the finished grade of the parking area. This makes access much easier than what we had with the existing building where you had to walk up five steps. In that case we had ramps that had to go up to get patrons into the restaurant. That's been eliminated so now we have a much easier access from the parking area. A full cellar is proposed. There's a door at the left side of the building for access to cellar or utility meter reading and such also some storage. They'll be some testimony about that from the applicant. A mechanical room is proposed along with meters in the cellar. The utilities are proposed to be underground going forward. There's an outdoor dining area that's proposed at the front of the building that's going to match the building width of 23 feet. So part of that raised let's call it a patio will be used for the entry. There's going to be a ramp that's part of that for ADA access and then there will be a step. There's a concrete curb on the left edge of that patio so people walking from their cars will step up to that 6 inch step up to the

restaurant. Three air conditioning compressor units are proposed in the rear yard. There's going to be a kitchen exhaust duct at the right side of the building extending up above the eave and the architect will provide further testimony on that exhaust. The sign we're proposing is 75 feet is required as a maximum we're proposing a 32 square foot sign that's proposed to be wall mounted above the front glazing of the restaurant and illuminated with goose neck lights above it.

Mr. Mecca – That'll be shown on the architectural plans.

Mr. Donly – Yeah we have it on sheet C106 and just to make a correction currently the sign is shown as Mama Fina but it's going to be Mama Fina's. We're proposing a 32 square foot sign. The font is similar to a commercial script text in black color. I believe it's going to be a white background but I think you'll hear more testimony about the colors of the building from the architect. The font size will be 16 inches high. The overall sign dimensions are 20.5 inches high by 19 feet long and as I mentioned there will be gooseneck lights above for illumination. The hour of operation of those lights will suit the restaurant hours. The restaurant hours will be provided by the applicant.

Mr. Mecca – Let's go through the parking and the circulation for the site and address the comments from Neglia.

Mr. Donly – The previous plan that we had submitted showed stacked parking. We really had to make a tremendous effort to try to fit the parking on the site but with this application we have a new building to work with. We're setting the building ten feet from the right property line and that enabled us to get a much better parking layout where we have 9 spaces provided including one ADA space all along the left side. So when cars pull into the lot they'll make a left into those spaces. The parking stalls we did receive a review comment that 180 square feet is required. Five of our nine parking spaces numbers four, five, six, seven and eight are in fact 10 feet by 18 feet and meet the 180 square foot requirement. Only three of the nine parking spaces numbers one, two and nine are 9 feet wide by 18 feet.

Mr. Mecca – Nine by eighteen is that standard size based on RSIS?

Mr. Donly – RSIS requires a minimum 9 by 18 space so the 10 by 18 is really a Township requirement.

Mr. Paparozzi – It's also a commercial requirement RSIS is residential. You have a commercial entity.

Mr. Donly – In this case it's mixed use.

Mr. Paparozzi – Yeah well you have to conform to the commercial.

Mr. Donly – ADA space number 3 is 11 feet by 18 feet to allow a van to drop off people so that plus the required 5 feet by 18 foot striped loading area is provided. Then just some justification on the 9 foot widths that we're showing. We're trying to maintain a landscaped area to the rear of space number 9. That landscaped area makes it easier to pull a car into space 9 or to back out of space 9. So we are trying to keep that landscaped area in place. That's at the left rear corner of the site. The 9 foot wide spaces are also located at locations where the aisle width is 24 feet. We have two areas where we have a 24 foot aisle. When you pull into the site and towards the rear of the aisle is 24 feet wide. It's only along the building where it narrows a little bit. We have 22.83 feet adjacent to the building. So the areas where we have the 24 foot width that's where the 9 foot wide spaces are. A waiver is being requested for the more restrictive RSIS requirement for 3 of the 9 spaces. With regard to the parking calculations 3 spaces are required for the residential 1.5 spaces for each two bedroom unit. We have two units so that's 3 spaces for residential. The restaurant based on gross area one space per 200 square feet of gross area is required. So that would round up to 6 spaces based on area. If we look at the restaurant parking requirement based on seating we have 18 seats times 1 space per 3 seats is also 6 spaces. So we're providing 6 spaces for the restaurant based on that number of spaces for the restaurant we're allowed 18 seats. We're currently showing 12 seats on the architectural drawings. So we're proposing 6 seats outside of the new dining area.

Mr. Mecca – Obviously, they're seasonal.

Mr. Donly – Yes. That's part of the idea of having the basement access along the left side of the building so that umbrellas and tables could be brought inside in the winter.

Mr. Mecca – You'll hear further testimony from the applicant but with regard to the tenant parking we're going to designate those spaces for the tenants correct.

Mr. Donly – Yeah it makes sense to designate spaces 7, 8, and 9 those are closest to the rear of the building as residents only.

Mr. Mecca – One of the other things you'll hear from the applicant is that since she'd be owner operating and also be in charge of the tenants above the lease confirmed that they'll only be the one or two spaces as part of the lease agreement with any tenant. So she'll be able to enforce that I know you just heard about enforcing of the parking but by way of a lease agreement saying you get this unit but you get either one or two depending on which unit you have. Then the other issue would be if there's guests. Part of that would be the lease would also specify that the guest can park but only after business hours after 8 you'll hear testimony that it closes at 8 pm so that there's no conflict with a guest coming in during the day. That'll be part of a lease agreement she has with her tenants and we can make that a stipulation.

Mr. Donly – So just to go over site access and circulation. We did receive informal review and acceptance from Eric Timsak planner at the Bergen County Planning Board for the current design. Previously we had actually been asked to do a circular design and this new design is preferred over that previous one. So we have informal acceptance we still have to make the application to the Bergen County Planning Board. Currently we're proposing a 24 foot wide driveway and a 34 foot wide curb cut at Market Street. This received preliminary approval.

Mr. Mecca – You received an email from Mr. Timsak with that specified on a drawing correct.

Mr. Donly – We did we went back and forth with some sketches and received the okay knowing that we still had to file the application to the County.

Mr. Paparozzi – Mr. Donly your two way aisle on your revised plan says 22.83 not 24.

Mr. Donly – That's next to the building it constricts a little bit next to the building. So it's 24 feet wide where you pull in. If you look near the driveway apron there's a dimension called out.

Mr. Paparozzi – Right but by spaces 3, 4, 5 you have 22.83 it's not 24 feet throughout.

Mr. Donly – Those spaces we made 10 feet wide to make it easier to pull into those spaces. We did provide a turning maneuver plan to show that that's very doable.

Mr. Paparozzi – Okay but it's a variance or a waiver.

Mr. Mecca – It's a waiver and you'll see there's turning templates that are provided.

Mr. Duffy asks that these questions be directed through the Chair.

Mr. Duffy – The driveway is considered 24 feet wide or 22.83 feet wide?

Mr. Paparozzi – 22.83.

Mr. Donly – The minimum width of this driveway is 22.83.

Mr. Duffy – So that's the actual width of the driveway.

Mr. Donly – There are portions of the driveway that are 24 feet wide. It constricts at the building 14 inches.

Mr. Duffy – So saying its 24 feet at the entrance actually isn't entirely true because it constricts so you have to go with what the constriction is actually what your entire driveway is.

Mr. Donly – It constricts but it does not constrict at the entrance it constricts at the building which is 25 feet back from the front property line.

Mr. Duffy – I understand what you're saying. I'm not agreeing that it's 24 feet I'm saying because your narrowest part is one that's the whole thing. That's how you have to look at it.

Mr. Donly – Yeah there's a variance for that portion of the driveway no question about it.

Mr. Duffy – Okay.

Mr. Donly – I would suggest it's more of a design waiver. We have a planner that will testify as to the ability to maneuver. Market Street is a County road there's presently no plan by the County to widen the roadway in front of lot 9 but an easement line is noted on the plans. It's set 2 feet west of the front property line. That was a requirement of the County to show that on the plan. The lot 10 to the east that area was widened in front of the nursery school. We're showing a little bit of that on our site plan. That's not proposed to be extended in front of lot 9.

Mr. Mecca – As far as refuse turning template and turning template for passenger vehicles have also been provided let's go over that.

Mr. Donly – Just one more item with regard to the aisle width. The Fire Department requires an 18 foot width as I understand it and we are exceeding that with our 22.83 foot aisle width. So there'll be no parking striping proposed along the left side of the building.

Mr. Mecca – And that's on the site plan?

Mr. Donly – It's on the site plan. The way that the driveway is currently laid out the driveway is located generally in the middle of the lot so that vehicles entering will turn left into the parking spaces. Customers will then walk from their cars to the restaurant. They'll step up six inches as mentioned on the raised patio in the front and then wheelchair access is provided via a ramp at the toe of the patio to the front of the patio. The existing sidewalk and the right of way will be replaced but it's going to remain at the same continuous height no ramps at the driveway. That was a County request that we satisfied. They wanted a continuous height sidewalk to replace what's there. So residents and employees will park and walk to the entry doors at the rear of the building and then with regard to delivery trucks we looked at FedEx trucks, UPS trucks, Amazon trucks those are the largest trucks anticipated to this site. Food and beverage delivery is proposed with vans and the applicant will provide testimony to that. Delivery trucks will drive straight back to unload to the rear kitchen door or to the left door to the cellar. A 10 by 35 foot loading zone is noted on the site plan alongside the building. Delivery hours are to be scheduled prior to opening the restaurant so customer spaces will be available to allow the turnaround that's noted on the maneuvering plan which is sheet C109. We show how the truck enters the site and how it backs up. That aisle whether it's 24 feet or 22.83 feet is not enough for a delivery truck to make a turnaround. They need a space so what we're proposing is that the delivery schedules the way things are now on line with FedEx and Amazon you can actually set the delivery times and we're proposing that deliveries be scheduled for the morning when the parking spaces for the restaurant are available so the truck can back up.

Mr. Mecca – What are we looking at now identify it for the Board.

Mr. Donly – This is sheet C109 it shows the maneuvering of 2 vehicles a passenger vehicle and also a delivery truck. As mentioned the delivery truck is only the FedEx type truck UPS type truck. Refuse is proposed with a Hino 195 truck which is not as large as FedEx or UPS truck. It's similar to what junk removal companies use. There's different companies that use more of a stake side type of a body and it's a much smaller truck that is maneuverable on this site. We're not proposing to use dumpsters we're proposing to use 95 gallon cans that will be stored behind a fenced refuse area.

Mr. Mecca – When you say cans we're talking about plastic.

Mr. Donly – Plastic 95 gallon cans so they don't need to be picked up mechanically they can be emptied into that truck. We provided a calculation on our site plan which is C102 to show how we arrived at the refuse and recycling volumes. The calculation shows that the 8 foot by 10 foot refuse area and the truck size as mentioned is acceptable if we have twice weekly pickup. Which that is what the applicant is currently producing from another similar restaurant that they have in Hackensack that is producing a certain amount of garbage and recycling and that's what our calculation is based on. That truck would just pull in. It could even pull into a parking space if one is available but it could just pull in and it would be at a time of day when the parking spaces for the restaurant are available for him to backup.

Mr. Mecca – There will be no backing out onto Market Street everything would be turn around.

Mr. Donly – That's correct. I know there was some talk of stipulating that in a contract with the refuse company. So that's something that could be done if that assuaged your concerns.

Mr. Mecca – As you know there's a hill as you come up that hill sight distance coming from east to west is somewhat limited. You don't want people backing out of that driveway.

Mr. Donly – Just to finish the maneuvering we are showing how a passenger car can maneuver on site. That's the NJDOT they call it P for passenger vehicle it's similar to a Chevy Suburban which is a very large vehicle. The Cadillac Escalade is smaller than the Chevy Suburban so even with the largest possible vehicles anticipated our 22.83 width is acceptable for making maneuvers into the parking spaces and for backing out and leaving the site. The same is true for the van accessible vehicles that come in. Also the only drawback is the largest truck the delivery trucks and I think if we can schedule those in the morning that problem will go away. Alternately they could park on Market Street in front of the nursery school at certain times of the day those spaces are available as well and I imagine that a lot of drivers would just do that then try to even access the site. That's what I've seen. We can provide it we can make the turnarounds. With regard to traffic control we're providing a stop sign and a painted stop bar at the egress point. A no left turn sign is proposed for vehicles exiting the site just for safety. We did provide sight distances on our site plan. That's going to be C102. I'd like to enter this as an exhibit. We have 13 copies of an aerial photograph from Google Maps.

The exhibit is marked A1.

The exhibit is already in the packet that was provided so it is not marked.

Mr. Donly – This map is marked up with the site distances that my office calculated. It's based on how far you can see from a point at the driveway for a driver exiting the site to the west for cars traveling eastbound. We have 709 feet you see that on the left of our site. On the right we have assuming cars parked in that County road widening at lot 10 which is to the right of our lot we can see behind those cars pretty far 320 feet. As you're exiting the site you can see 320 feet to see if cars are approaching and decide if you're going to exit the site. The cars get to a certain point and you can't see through the cars that are parked on the street. This is the situation that we have to deal with. In some case a driver leaving the site might not see a car until it's 120 feet in front. This is an improvement to what exists. Right now the driveway is all the way to the left property line and the hill slopes down in that direction so cars exiting the site are worse off right now than they are under this plan and this plan it does provide 320 feet of sight distance. The bushes in the front will have to remain trimmed to maintain that sight distance. Based on the 30 mile per hour speed limit in both directions these sight distances are acceptable per code. So for that reason because in some cases we might be limited to the 120 feet we made the decision to limit the left turn parking out of the site. If you think about it a car exiting the site the driver would be in a vulnerable position possibly to cars traveling west bound. As the engineer signing the plans I'm more comfortable limiting that left turn.

Mr. Mecca – There's currently no storm water improvements or drainage improvements other than sheeting over the asphalt is that correct?

Mr. Donly – That's correct. Currently I'm going to go back to sheet C101 which is the existing plan. Currently water surface flows from right to left so from east to west and also from north to south. So some of the water from our lot 9 is flowing onto the adjacent lot 10 to the west. So what we're proposing to do is to reduce that amount of runoff. We're not stopping the runoff we're really not changing the pattern of the flow but we're reducing the amount. We're actually reducing the impervious coverage for this project 246 square feet less than what exists is proposed. So we're creating more green space but with the 10 foot right yard setback there was a concern as to how to get the storm water runoff out of that area so area drains are proposed. We're proposing I believe 2 or 3 area drains on the right side. Go to C103 the grading and utility plan. We're proposing 2 area drains in the right side yard because we only have a 10 foot side yard we want to collect that water. We're piping it and we're running that to seepage pit number 1 and that also collects water from the two front roof leaders. There were some comments received regarding the open cover it will be changed on the plan to a closed cover on seepage pit number 1. Seepage pit number 3 is in the left rear corner. If you look at the grading plan you'll see three dark circles it's the rearmost dark circle in space number 7. So that will be a 500 gallon seepage pit that will collect runoff from the rear roof leaders. Then we're also proposing a seepage pit number 3 I'm sorry seepage pit number 2 is for the sump pump discharge. So the sump pump discharge seepage pit number 2 is the only seepage pit to have a grate. So that would allow possible overflow. It's hard to quantify the amount of discharge from a sump pump system. We have not done geotechnical test pits, borings and such.

Mr. Mecca – If there's a requirement that you change the storm water plan based upon that you'll agree to do that.

Mr. Donly – Yes so we did receive some review comments and we're willing to respond accordingly to satisfy the comments received. The volume of storm water that falls on the rear yard the left side the front yard as mentioned it will be reduced but there will still be some runoff to allot to the left. Currently there is an existing asphalt curb along the left property line which conducts water to the front yard. So we're looking to follow that same pattern. We're going to replace that asphalt curb with a concrete curb along the left property line. It will run from the left rear corner to a point that's aligned with the front of the building next door. We're just replacing an asphalt curb with a concrete curb and that will conduct water to the front. Again we're reducing the runoff so that will be an improved condition for the neighbor. There was a comment received regarding the pipe blanks and inverts we will comply with what's been requested. We will add notes as requested regarding preventing adverse runoff impacts and repairing any damage to adjacent properties.

Mr. Mecca – We talked about ADA compliance with regard to the parking and the entry and exiting from the building.

Mr. Donly – We're dropping the first floor as mentioned it's going to be one step up from the parking area but the grades on site are all within ADA requirements of one on twelve. The maximum proposed grade on the site is 6.5%, 8.3% is allowed. This site meets the grading requirements for ADA access whether that person is accessing the site from the sidewalk or from the van accessible space so that's a big improvement. Also the van accessible space number 3 is located near the entry to the restaurant. We tried to keep space number 3 close to that ramp that leads to the restaurant. I didn't mention it but spaces 1 and 2 we're proposing signage that reads take out only. A lot of the business and the applicant will testify is based on takeout service rather than in house dining.

Mr. Mecca – I think we covered the comments that were given.

Mr. Donly – Yeah we're up to 3.17.

Mr. Mecca – Okay so 3.17 is the storm water impact adding a note confirming the applicant's responsibility preventing adverse runoff impacts and repairing any damage to adjacent properties.

Mr. Donly – That's correct. I'm going to mention some item numbers they refer to the review letter received from the Board Engineer.

Mr. Mecca – The last revision date on that is September 26, 2025.

Mr. Donly – So items 3.18 to 3.19 we will and we've already mentioned that we will obtain Bergen County Soil Conservation District approval and submit documentation regarding the correspondence and approvals from Bergen County that is ahead of us. With regard to construction and site protection notes items 3.20 to 3.24 we will add the plan notes requested regarding protection of neighboring property improvements, reconstruction, site stabilization we will comply. Item 3.25 ADA compliance we already spoke of. Item 3.26 add floor area ratio calculations. We're currently showing the FAR equals 0.47 in the bulk table. We will add the calculation as requested. Item 3.27 with regard to utility coordination applicant to confirm coordination with all utility providers for new services. We agree to that. Applicant to ensure all new utilities are located underground. So currently only the electric is overhead that will be located underground as mentioned the meter will be in the new cellar. Item 3.28 regarding the sanitary sewer information we have it shown on our existing plan C101 where that existing pipe comes out of the cellar. There's a small circle drawn in the cellar just in the middle of the front wall. That's the approximate location of the existing sanitary line. We checked with the Township DPW, Building Department there are no records on file. What we're proposing to do is to field verify where that pipe goes and then the condition would be checked prior to reuse. It would be temporarily capped prior to construction. We do show a detail for this on C103. I don't know that we need to look at the sanitary lateral detail but there is a detail on C103 that shows where the pipe gets capped and we will add a note about verifying condition. Item 3.29 offsite work and approvals some disturbance is anticipated to the neighboring property to the west. As mentioned there's an asphalt curb along that property line so likely we're going to disturb in some manner the neighbor's property to the left. So we're going to I believe we're going to be speaking to the adjoining neighbor.

Mr. Mecca – I stopped by there but didn't get a chance to speak to the owner but absolutely will speak to the neighbor which is the florist to our west.

Mr. Donly – The goal is to work with the neighbor and satisfy any disturbance that's caused to their property. We're already adding a note to that effect. Item 3.31 testimony regarding the hours and frequency for the proposed loading area. So we're proposing as mentioned twice weekly pickup of refuse and recycling. We're going to schedule that prior to 10 am opening of the restaurant.

Mr. Mecca – Actually 8 am to 8 pm is what she put down.

Mr. Donly – We'll hear testimony about the hours of operation. I think it was mentioned that customers might not come in until 10. We'll provide additional testimony with regard to the opening schedule but the refuse and recycling is proposed prior to opening. Also delivery of restaurant supplies are to be conducted by commercial vans which can utilize the parking spaces available prior to opening. As mentioned the delivery trucks are going to require some spaces to maneuver on site if they come on site. Item 3.32 I don't believe we've contacted the Saddle Brook Fire and Police Departments yet regarding site access. As mentioned we are providing the 18 foot width minimum aisle for them to get a truck on site if they

wanted to. Item 3.33 sidewalk and access route confirm sidewalk and driveway apron designs provide 4 foot width and 2 foot maximum cross slope. So we have added a note 17 on our site plan which is sheet C103. Note 17 states that the County inspector is to be notified during construction sheet C102 item 17 we added a note as requested by the County that the County will come out inspect the walks and apron during construction. They will be on top of this I was told.

Mr. Mecca – Next is lighting.

Mr. Donly – We do have a lighting plan C108. It's a photogrammetric grid that shows the lighting intensity throughout the site based on the lighting that's proposed. So we're proposing 6 total wall mounted LED fixtures and we're providing lighting in accordance with the Township code 206-69.

Mr. Duffy – Did you verify that new lighting code for Saddle Brook?

Mr. Donly – Yes. I did look at the new code I saw that recent ordinance and followed that. Three exterior grade wall mounted LED cylindrical shaped lights are proposed at the front of the restaurant. They have a brushed aluminum or painted chassis as mentioned they're cylindrical. Most of the light that they produce is downward but they have a white acrylic diffuser at the face of the fixture. These lights are set approximately five feet above the new walking surface. They have a height of 36 inches by 6 inches wide and they are 4 inches deep so they project off the building 4 inches. These are 28 watt fixtures which provide sufficient intensity to the walkway and for the outdoor dining area per ANSI recommendations which we do note the ANSI recommendations on our plan. 2.2 to 4.7 foot candles are provided 1 to 4 foot candles are required for walking surfaces. So we're meeting that requirement at the front walkway, the patio area and the ramps. Then regarding spillover at the edge of Market Street we have light levels of no more than 0.1 foot candles so almost no spillover to the street. Then on the left side of the building and the rear of the building we have let me start with the left side. We have two wall mounted LED fixtures and one at the rear wall. They're proposed as wall pack units. They're set at a height of 10 feet above the parking surface so they don't get hit by a delivery van or truck. They're exterior grade they're rectangular shaped they're 15.5 inches wide they're 4.76 inches high and they project 11.5 inches from the walls. They are down lights they have a clear acrylic cover at the underside. These are 47 watt fixtures they provide sufficient intensity to the walking surfaces around the building. 0.1 foot candles to 6.5 foot candles are provided 1 foot candle to 4 foot candles are required by ANSI. At the left and right property lines the light levels are 0.2 foot candles maximum. At the rear line they're 0.4 foot candles maximum but these values don't consider the fact that we're installing a six foot high fence along the portion of the left and rear property lines. Along the right property line the adjoining neighbor to the east has already replaced their fence with a six foot high vinyl solid fence along most of that right property line. So we're keeping the light levels down but we also have a six foot fence to prevent spillover along the left property line and rear. So the fixtures and heights provided provide adequate lighting intensity while minimizing spillover in compliance with the code.

Mr. Duffy – Mr. Mecca looking at the time and I know from Mr. Donly's testimony there's going to be a number of questions from the Board itself not to mention that I'm seeing people that are probably.

Mr. Mecca – They're with us I think the only people are the two ladies in back there that are neighbors.

Mr. Duffy – Okay. They still have an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Mecca – So we need to come back.

Mr. Duffy – Yes you do.

Mr. Duffy explains that there are a lot of questions that he has and that they need to request an adjournment.

Mr. Cialone – We would just ask a request for adjournment without notice and a tolling of the time.

Mr. Mecca – I would ask that it be carried to the next meeting which I think is January 12th and we waive the 120 days for the Board to act and without notice.

Mr. Duffy – So we have a request for an adjournment to our next meeting tentatively January 12th with no further notice and waiving the tolling of time.

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to approve the request for an adjournment.

All in favor – YES.

Mr. Duffy – This application is approved for an adjournment if you are here for this it'll be on January 12, 2026 at 7 pm. It won't be in the newspaper.

6. RESOLUTIONS

- A.) Approval Christopher Stanton, 141 Cambridge Avenue, Block 1506, Lot 31
- B.) Approval Saddle Brook BOE, 540 Saddle River Road, Block 1308, Lot 2
- C.) Approval Saddle Brook BOE, 225 Market Street, Block 506, Lot 1

Mr. Schilp makes a motion seconded by Ms. Murray to approve the resolutions.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Tokosh, Ms. Nobile, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Duffy – YES.

7. MINUTES

Meeting of November 3, 2025 Regular Meeting

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to read and file. All in favor – YES.

8. COMMUNICATIONS

Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, 11/03/25 (22 Weller Terrace)
Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, 10/22/25 (475 Hobson Avenue)
Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, 11/05/25 (175 Hayes Drive)
Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, 8/27/24 (145 Market Street)
Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, Revised 9/23/25 (145 Market Street)
Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, Revised 9/26/25 (145 Market Street)

Mr. Schilp makes a motion seconded by Ms. Murray to read and file. All in favor – YES.

9. VOUCHERS

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 11/05/25, GBAR, 405-433 N. Midland Ave., Block 1401, Lot 12 \$345.00
Neglia Engineering Assoc., 11/05/25, 390 Realty, LLC, 390 Floral Lane, Block 1402, Lot 1 \$345.00
Neglia Engineering Assoc., 11/05/25, Best Budz, 253 Route 46, Block 120, Lot 5 \$1152.50
Neglia Engineering Assoc., 11/05/25, Gusciora, 475 Hobson Avenue, Block 702, Lot 22 \$205.00
Birchwale Pellino & Cialone, LLC, 11/19/25, Stanton, 141 Cambridge Ave., Block 1506, Lot 31 \$250.00

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to pay if the funds are available. All in favor – YES.

10. OPEN AND CLOSE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Schilp makes a motion seconded by Ms. Murray to open to the public. All in favor – YES.

Mr. Duffy – Having seen none.

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to close to the public. All in favor – YES.

11. ADJOURN

Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Schilp to adjourn. All in favor – YES.

Meeting adjourned at 10:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Barrale