

TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
May 4, 2026 Regular Meeting

The Saddle Brook Zoning Board of Adjustment will hold a regular meeting 7:00 p.m. on Monday May 4, 2026 at **(Saddle Brook Municipal Complex, 55 Mayhill Street)**

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

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. Burbano, Mr. Francin, Mr. Schmelz, Mr. Duffy – Present.
Mr. Tokosh, Ms. Nobile, Mr. Latona, and Mr. Gjorgievski are absent.
Mr. Cialone the Board Attorney Mr. Kurus the Board Engineer and Mr. Paporozzi the Board Planner are also in attendance.
Mr. Francin sits in for Mr. Tokosh and Mr. Schmelz sits in for Ms. Nobile.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A.) 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.

(Applicant was initially heard at the December 1, 2025 meeting and was carried without further notice to the January 12, 2026 meeting and then carried again to the March 2, 2026 meeting without further notice required and then again to the April 6, 2026 meeting without further notice required and then once more to the May 4, 2026 meeting).

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

Mr. Mecca – We do have another iteration of our plans to present this evening. I have our engineer Mr. Donly. The plans have been submitted to the engineer and to the planner. We would like the Board to also consider the prior iterations but this is a sort of an adaptation based upon the comments we heard from the last meeting. With your indulgence I’ll have Mr. Donly.

Mr. Cialone swears in Michael Donly he gives his business address as 769 Chestnut Street in New Milford. His license is still in good standing and he is accepted as a witness.

Mr. Donly – The layout of the building as far as the footprint is the same as the previous plan that was submitted. It’s fifty feet deep by 23 feet 8 inches wide. A variance is still requested for the 10 foot setback at the right side yard where 15 feet is required. A front walk was added from the sidewalk in the right of way perpendicular to the building and it connects to the front patio area. A second door was added to the front. We’re showing doors with a solid hatched triangle. There is a small triangle two in the front now where there was one previously and Mr. Severino will discuss that change to the building. The building height is now proposed at 32 feet 4 inches which is approximately 4 inches higher than what exists but within the 35 feet allowed. Two stories are proposed with this plan. Mr. Severino will explain that. A variance is still requested for lot coverage due to the fact that we added space number 10 and we added the walk in the front yard. So we’re adding a little bit of coverage with this proposal.

Mr. Duffy – What's the calculations on that?

Mr. Donly – We have an existing lot coverage of 80.8% and we have a proposed coverage of 81.0%.

Mr. Mecca – What does that come to in terms of square footage?

Mr. Donly – So in terms of square footage we have an existing lot coverage of 6061 square feet and we are proposing an additional 15 square feet 6076 is proposed it's a de minimis increase.

Mr. Mecca – Go through the parking calculation circulation plan.

Mr. Donly – As we provided testimony at the previous meeting we are proposing 10 spaces now. We added space number 10 to the rear of the building. We're complying with the ADA requirements. Space 3 remains as the ADA space. Spaces 1 and 2 are now 10 feet wide. The only spaces that are still only 9 feet wide are spaces 8 and 9. All the spaces are complying except for 8 and 9 because we're trying to leave a little bit of landscaping in that left rear corner which also helps a car exiting space 9 to back up.

Mr. Mecca – The 9 by 18 is a fairly common standard although it's not the standard in Saddle Brook.

Mr. Donly – Correct 9 by 18 is typically required by the Residential Site Improvement Standards but I know that Saddle Brook has a specific requirement for 10 by 18 or 180 square feet. It could be a different dimension. So a waiver is still requested for the 9 foot spaces for spaces 8 and 9. At the Board's request we looked into an EV charging station. Based on a review of the code it's only necessary where there's 5 or more residential units proposed or where there are 25 or more spaces for a commercial use. So we don't trigger the requirement for this project for either of those criteria. The other change to this plan is we removed signage and then we received quite a few comments from the Board. We were proposing 2 takeout only signs. Not traffic signs just parking signs that were to be mounted on the fence where applicable or pole mounted. We basically eliminated those signs for takeout only and residents only. I think we're open to the Board's comments about that but it seemed to simplify the application just to take those signs off. Those are really the layout changes. I know we provided testimony to the refuse area behind space 10 in our previous attendance here. So that is reflected on this updated plan.

Mr. Mecca – They'll be separation between recycling and regular trash.

Mr. Donly – We do have a fence that divides that refuse area into refuse and recycling.

Mr. Mecca – We did provide a template.

Mr. Donly – We provided an exhibit that shows some plantings between where the refuse is stored and the rear fence.

Mr. Mecca – Also the garbage and the type of truck that will be used for the garbage.

Mr. Donly – We provided testimony that a specific Hino 195 type of truck would be used for this property which can maneuver on the site and has the capability to provide twice weekly pickup with the volume generated. Those are the changes with regard to the site plan. I know that there are other changes we've already committed to make throughout the rest of the plans. For example the storm water management system. That will need to be updated so the balance of the plans will need to reflect comments received and testimony provided already as far as the response to the engineering comments received. So essentially the drainage and storm water we'll recalculate it. We have a little bit more coverage than we had previously. Before we were losing coverage but we were still providing a storm water system in the form of a detention system.

Mr. Mecca – Nothing exists now for storm water management.

Mr. Donly – No all the water flows off the site currently. So we'll be making a big improvement to the drainage and then as far as the site lighting we've already submitted a plan for site lighting really that doesn't change. We have the same building size we have the same light fixtures and locations. We have the refuse area in the back has a six foot fence. We had a refuse area previously with a six foot fence so really the lighting doesn't change significantly as far as the intensity on the property.

Mr. Mecca – As far as drainage calculations they'll be provided as a condition that the system we're proposing will support the drainage.

Mr. Donly – It will and we actually provided the calculations right on the plans so those will get updated with the next submittal. Then the landscaping plan we didn't submit a revised landscaping plan. It's not going to change all that much. The front walk is going to remove some areas we could have planted in but I think we can work around that and make it nice. The refuse area we're going to add some plants inside the refuse area as requested by the Board to screen the garbage and such. The landscape plan

it's not a lot of green space on the site and I think that we're going to plant it in a way that makes sense. We already provided a landscape plan we're going to continue with a similar layout and aesthetic.

Mr. Mecca – Any questions for Mr. Donly?

Mr. Kurus – The turnaround you're using the ADA spot to turn and get in and out with the trash vehicle.

Mr. Donly – We could take a look if you like.

Mr. Donly puts sheet C109 on the easel.

Mr. Donly – This provides a diagram for both the passenger car and the delivery truck.

Mr. Paparozzi – Sheet C110 you're looking for.

Mr. Donly – It's also on 110. So sheet C110 shows the maneuvering for the ADA van and for the refuse truck.

Mr. Kurus – The testimony is that that would be scheduled so that it wouldn't be impeded by the spot it has sufficient room to come in and out.

Mr. Donly – Correct.

Mr. Mecca – That was the testimony it would be scheduled during off hours so there would be no conflict.

Mr. Kurus – Have you gotten any response from the County yet on your application?

Mr. Donly – We were holding off from an application to the County until we.

Mr. Mecca – They did review it though.

Mr. Donly – We received preliminary review from the County Planner Eric Timsak yeah.

Mr. Kurus – No substantive comments from them to date?

Mr. Donly – There was some back and forth with the current layout as is presented. We went through several iterations with them to come up with this layout scheme and we received informal approval subject to the Zoning Board review.

Mr. Paparozzi – Did they make any comments on left turn and right turn only?

Mr. Donly – Not yet.

Mr. Mecca – It would be subject to their review. It's a County road.

Mr. Paparozzi – I just did a rough on the new plan Floor Area Ratio. Now I think it dropped because you went to 2 and ½ stories. Do you have that number? I want to see if I have the right number.

Mr. Donly – It's 0.39 based on the gross area.

Mr. Paparozzi – .5 is the maximum required so there is no more D variance on the application

Mr. Mecca – If I may I wish that was true but it's a mixed use building so there's still a D variance.

Mr. Paparozzi – I said for Floor Area Ratio. I'll go over them since you have them listed. I have the side setback as one variance, the maximum lot coverage as a second variance. We eliminated the height, we eliminated the Floor Area Ratio, we eliminated the parking. Parking spaces that are 10 by 18 so there's a small variance for that. Twenty four foot is required for a two way aisle you have 22.83. No front yard parking is permitted and you're proposing front yard parking and the landscape buffer is supposed to be 10 feet and the buffer that you proposed is less than 10 feet. So those are the variances I have 6 and the mixed use.

Mr. Duffy – Do you concur with that?

Mr. Mecca – Yes.

Mr. Cialone – I just want to make sure I have it right. Minimum side yard, maximum lot coverage, landscape buffer, parking space size, 3 parking spaces in the front yard.

Mr. Paparozzi – No parking in the front yard and 24 foot aisle and they have 22.83.

Mr. Cialone – Technically even though it's preexisting what about the minimum lot size and lot frontage since it's a new building.

Mr. Paparozzi – Yeah it's existing.

Mr. Cialone – Right but if the Board approves it I think we should grant them for preexisting only because it's new construction.

Mr. Paparozzi – Preexisting is 10,000 square feet to 7,500 and 100 foot minimum frontage to 75. Those are the preexisting.

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

There are no questions from the Board.

Mr. Duffy – 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. Mecca – I'll call Mr. Severino our architect.

Mr. Cialone swears in William Severino and he gives his business address as 104 Summit Circle Little Ferry, New Jersey. His qualifications are still accepted.

Mr. Severino – In response to the comments from the last meeting we took another pass at the configuration of the building and the number of floors number of apartments. The basement and first floor remain as before. As we go up to the second floor now at the top of the stairs we have a door that would lead to the front apartment and a door that would lead to the rear apartment. They are basically a mirror image one to the front one to the rear. The lower level of the units has a living room, a kitchen, a half bath and a stacked washer dryer. It now has stairs that go up to a sleeping platform. The sleeping platform on the upper level has a bathroom and the sleeping mezzanine. Because the mezzanine and the whole area is less than half the size of the floor below it's a mezzanine and not a floor. So as not being a floor this is a two story building with a mezzanine.

Mr. Papparozzi – Two and a half.

Mr. Severino – I'll do two and a half and that's where we are. In elevation you can see one to the front one to the rear so that they mirror each other. In elevation you can see we have the two story space in the front for the living room. That two story space is accentuated by the larger windows to the front which gives presence to the building. The doors give balance at the front as well and going around the side we have the little pop ups for the bathroom for the stair so we can get some light and air into those areas. Which is why the side dormers are as they are. Going over to the other side and rear elevations similar large window to the back to emphasize that two story space that we provided for the living and once again the side elevation towards the drive aisle has the pop up dormer for the stair actually this side is just the bathrooms and the side elevation otherwise pretty much stays as it had been.

Mr. Mecca – When you're done I'd like to show a comparison with the first iteration versus this.

Mr. Severino – Certainly. We have on the cover sheet a comparison between how the existing building sites and how the proposed building sites. Basically we tried to get the same angle from the same spot show the same image and you can see it really is not too much different in massing from the existing heights and sizes. That's what we have.

Mr. Mecca – With the Board's indulgence I'd like to put up the first what we initially proposed.

Mr. Severino puts up the original image along with the current iteration.

Mr. Mecca – That was a three story with two bedrooms on each level is that right?

Mr. Severino – Yes the initial proposal two bedrooms on the second two bedrooms on the third. Single bathroom on the second single bathroom on the third similar amenities of living room, dining room, kitchen and laundry in both units.

Mr. Kurus – You basically eliminated the height variance.

Mr. Mecca – We did.

Mr. Kurus – I'm saying he's not requesting a variance for height anymore.

Mr. Mecca – For stories right because the height is.

Mr. Papparozzi – You're allowed two and a half.

Mr. Mecca – I'm saying we eliminated for stories.

Mr. Cialone – They always had the height they didn't have the stories.

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

There are no questions.

Mr. Duffy – This is all sprinklered right?

Mr. Mecca – Yes.

Mr. Duffy – Has any thought been put into emergency access or escape from that loft in the event of fire?

Mr. Severino – The short answer is yes.

Mr. Duffy – Good now just explain the short answer.

Mr. Severino – What I had intended with this if we provide egress windows on those sides from the bathrooms from the top of the stair it would give someone the availability to go to the egress window and

if the fireman's there with the ladder out they go. If the fireman needs to get in through the side window in they go and especially at the restrooms you can come in through the big casement window and step on the toilet and get down to the floor. It's probably just as easy as going into a bedroom. So that's kind of what we thought as a way to get in so that you're not just at the 42 inch high wall waiting for someone to come through the front.

Mr. Duffy – Okay.

Mr. Severino – And it's all sprinklered.

Mr. Duffy – The 42 inch high half wall is solid.

Mr. Severino – Yes. For furniture, for privacy, for use.

Mr. Duffy – Okay anyone else? 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 – I'm opening for this witness and the entire application. Having heard none.

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

Mr. Duffy makes a motion with the variances let's list them and the conditions.

Mr. Mecca – or the record we do need 5 affirmative votes for the mixed use.

Mr. Duffy – Yes we do.

Mr. Cialone – We have a use variance for the mixed use because there's residential mixed commercial and the residential is not permitted, we have minimum side yard setback one side of 10 feet is proposed where 15 is required. Maximum lot coverage of 81% is proposed where 50% is required. Maximum landscape buffer in the rear of 3 feet where 10 feet is required. We have 2 parking spaces that are 162 square feet where 180 is required. Then we have 3 parking spaces in the front yard which is not permitted. Then we have a drive aisle width of 22.83 feet where 24 feet is required. Then we have the 2 preexisting conditions lot size of 7,500 square feet where 10,000 is required and minimum lot frontage of 75 feet where 100 feet is required. Then on top of the variances is also a site plan approval. Terms of conditions I'm going to run through what I have from prior meetings. In terms of the parking spaces initially they had some designated for the tenants and some for the restaurant and guests of the tenant would be permitted to park in the restaurant's parking spaces after hours. I don't think that matters anymore since they're no longer designating spaces.

Mr. Duffy – No that ratio changed.

Mr. Cialone – Right so we don't need that condition. The applicant shall consult with the adjoining neighbors concerning the trimming of trees. The applicant has already installed a physical divider between the recycling and refuse containers. The applicant's going to maintain the Japanese Maple Tree in the front yard so it does not obstruct the line of site of vehicles exiting the property. We have the applicant installing arborvitae trees between the area for the refuse and recycling containers and the rear fence so as to screen that area better from the adjoining properties. Then compliance with Neglia's review letter. They're also going to recalculate drainage and the landscaping plan I saw or I guess the remainder of the site plan including landscaping plan hadn't been revised showing that additional parking space and the front walkway. I don't know if the Board would like that updated.

Mr. Duffy – Yes update that.

Mr. Cialone – Okay. Those are the conditions I had.

Mr. Schilp – The distance between the garbage and the back 6 foot fence is minimal and I think if you put arborvitae back there they aren't going to last more than a season. Off the top of my head it's only about two feet.

Mr. Duffy – Three feet.

Mr. Schilp – I have them at my house and they're about two and a half feet so there's no. I really don't think that if you put arborvitae back there they're very expensive and I don't think they're going to last a season. Just put grass back there and mow it.

Mr. Mecca – We have a fence and a wall so there's privacy.

Mr. Schilp – There's a six foot high fence you're going to need arborvitae that are eight and ten feet.

Mr. Duffy – You can the arborvitae out.

Mr. Schilp – Thank you.

Mr. Duffy – Okay I'm satisfied with my motion.

Mr. Schilp seconds the motion.

Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Schilp, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Francin, Mr. Schmelz, Mr. Duffy – YES.

6. RESOLUTIONS

NONE

7. MINUTES

Meeting of April 6, 2026 Regular Meeting

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

8. COMMUNICATIONS

NONE

9. VOUCHERS

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 4/13/26, Puccio IV, LLC, 487 Market St., Block 705, Lot 29 \$247.00

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 4/13/26, Ready Spaces, 575 N. Midland Ave., Blk 1701, Lot 1.02 \$247.00

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 4/13/26, Carmen Sta Maria, 145 Market St., Block 609, Lot 9 \$123.50

Birchwale Pellino & Cialone, LLC, 4/21/26, First Quarter 2026 Retainer \$875.00

Birchwale Pellino & Cialone, LLC, 4/22/26, Carmen Sta Maria, 145 Market St., Blk 609, Lot 9 \$825.00

Return of Unused Escrow, Qawiya, 82 Midland Avenue, Block 401, Lot 2.01 \$1392.96

Return of Unused Escrow, Carlo Sagri, 158 Schepis Avenue, Block 1715, Lot 25 \$26.55

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

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.

11. ADJOURN

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank Barrale