

TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

July 6, 2026 Regular Meeting

The Saddle Brook Zoning Board of Adjustment will hold a regular meeting 7:00 p.m. on Monday July 6, 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. Tokosh, Ms. Nobile, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Francin, Mr. Latona, Mr. Schmelz, Mr. Duffy – Present.

Mr. Gjorgievski is absent.

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

5. NEW BUSINESS

A.) 230 Market Street, LLC, 226-230 Market Street, Block 514, Lot 1

The Applicant proposes to convert the existing mechanic shop to a convenience store that does not conform to the zoning ordinance for the Township of Saddle Brook as it exists today. **The proposed convenience store would be an expansion of a pre-existing, nonconforming use.**

Craig Bossong is the attorney for this application and he comes forward. They appeared at the previous meeting and was adjourned and carried to this meeting for the applicant to make some changes resulting from comments made by the Board and their professionals.

Mr. Bossong – We were here before the Board last month and we took the comments the Board and professionals made and redesigned the project. We eliminated the second story to eliminate the office. We’re not changing the building at all the footprint the walls or anything. We are taking the mechanic shop out of the building and converting the mechanic shop into the convenience store. With removal of the office space and the second story the parking will now comply. We need 7 parking spaces there’s 7 parking spaces being proposed. The ADA space which was undersized is now compliant for a van so that works. There is the size of the parking spaces that is being requested as well as the call up that it’s an expansion of a nonconforming use. We have the engineer back to testify and go through the changes that were made on the plans and then we have an updated rendering to present to the Board which we will mark at that point in time.

Mr. Bossong calls up the engineer. He was previously sworn in and qualified at the prior meeting.

Mr. Bossong – Can you walk the Board through the changes from the last meeting on the plans and we’re referring to sheet C101.00 that were revised and submitted to the Board I believe two weeks ago.

Mr. Reda – The last revision it was dated June 15, 2026 and basically we removed the second story that was originally proposed in the first submittal and the parking spaces are in compliance and modified the required ADA parking requirement for vans based on the engineering comments.

Mr. Bossong – There was a question on the refuse and recycling area. Can you please explain what you did there.

Mr. Reda – We had an existing it was like 3 feet by 6 feet it's on wheels moveable.

Mr. Bossong – You confirmed with the client that that's how the existing garbage pickup happens and dumpsters wheeled out the garbage truck comes on lifts it up dumps it and then leaves and the same will happen with the recycling?

Mr. Reda - Yes I did.

Mr. Bossong – So there's no conflict with the parking spaces being proposed.

Mr. Reda – No.

Mr. Bossong – I do notice on the plan there's some revisions I guess it was just an oversight it does mention office space still. That needs to be removed from the plans.

Mr. Reda – Yes.

Mr. Bossong – Where it says two story that will be revised.

Mr. Reda – It's existing one story. There's no change to the existing footprint of the building.

Mr. Bossong – We have a rendering we'll put up on the easel I think we're up to A6. Can you walk the Board through exhibit A6 the rendering and show the interior of the building as it's designed?

Mr. Reda – It shows the existing building with the proposed modification to continue like storefront and to the right and the left side of the entrance of the proposed convenience store. The sign we propose to be like 35 square feet with another small sign with the logo of the future business. The proposed exterior was fiber cement finished panels.

Mr. Bossong – The rendering that was done at the time did not adequately reflect what the actual floor plan is does this give a more representative example of what the interior floor plan will be?

Mr. Reda – Yes it shows the coffee station to the right and then the shelves which it could be four of them and with aisles and to the left there is a walk in box with seven doors and a service counter in the back side of the store.

Mr. Bossong – That's where the cash registers and checkout would be?

Mr. Reda – Yes.

Mr. Bossong – Nothing further for the engineer.

Mr. Duffy – Why did the total floor area increase 200 square feet?

Mr. Reda – It wasn't increased.

Mr. Duffy – You originally had 2110.8 now.

Mr. Cialone – Your zoning chart shows an increase in total floor area of 200 square feet from existing to proposed.

Mr. Reda – There is no increase in the square footage of the existing building.

Mr. Bossong – So that should be amended to reflect the same.

Mr. Reda – Yes.

Mr. Duffy – It should have read.

Mr. Reda – 2110.8 square feet.

Mr. Paparozzi – On the plan it shows the dumpsters for the recycling and the garbage but I don't see where you have it enclosed. By code it has to be enclosed.

Mr. Reda – I have showed a fence with gates.

Mr. Paparozzi – I didn't see it on the plans.

Mr. Reda – It is on the plans it says existing fence / gate. It is also shown on the architectural plans.

Mr. Bossong – You can see it more clearly on sheet A102 of the architecturals.

Mr. Paparozzi – Okay and the second thing is and I'll also refer to the attorney the logo next to the wall sign. The wall sign was okay I guess the logo that's being put there would create a variance because you're only allowed one wall sign of the logo is considered a wall sign.

Mr. Cialone – I would consider it a sign. If they're separate like that I think that's two signs.

Mr. Paparozzi – I didn't realize what it was. If they're going to keep the logo then that's a fourth variance.

Mr. Reda – We can enclose it and add the five square feet and keep it as one sign and eliminate the second sign.

Mr. Paparozzi – Okay so if you get rid of that second sign you just need to revise the plans to show that I guess.

Mr. Cialone – The plan shows only one sign his rendering is showing two.

Mr. Paparozzi – When the engineer testified he said the second sign.

They will revise the plans and the rendering to show only one sign.

Ms. Murray – Where are the fill lines will it interfere with parking? I'm looking to see where they are on the drawing and I don't see them. Where would you come in with a tanker and would it block some of the parking?

Mr. Reda – They deliver in the morning before they are open so it doesn't interfere.

Ms. Murray – Sometimes they don't so I was looking to see will the gas truck block any parking.

Mr. Bossong points out where the fill lines are.

Ms. Murray – Is the turning radius going to be sufficient?

Mr. Reda - Yes.

Ms. Murray – Is there any ground testing that's needed to be done?

Mr. Reda – It's required.

Ms. Nobile – Can you just talk to the lighting of the property what's existing and what's changing on the exterior?

Mr. Reda – There will be two 120 watt fixtures facing down.

Mr. Bossong – Is there any lighting on the building now?

Mr. Reda - Yes there is.

Mr. Bossong – They'll just be these two lights that will be updated on the building there's no other lights being changed on the site.

Ms. Nobile – There's an existing light fixture closer to the street is that being removed?

Mr. Reda – Yes.

Mr. Bossong – Are you talking about on Market Street on the left hand side?

Ms. Nobile – Yes C100.

Mr. Bossong – That's remaining.

Ms. Nobile – Okay. There's no intention of putting any lighting on the Harrop side.

Mr. Reda – No.

Mr. Paparozzi – Just one follow up. The gas station and the convenience store are going to be two separate entities but you only have one office.

Mr. Reda – We have a small kiosk between the pumps.

Mr. Paparozzi – Okay it's not shown.

Mr. Reda – It's in the top panels.

Mr. Paparozzi – Maybe you should highlight that a little.

Mr. Duffy – What are the hours of operation?

Mr. Reda – 6 am to 10:30.

Mr. Duffy – Is that the current gas station operating time now?

Mr. Reda - Yes.

Mr. Cialone – My notes showed 6 to 10 from last time.

Mr. Duffy – So which is it the store is going to close at 10 and the gas is going to stay another half hour?

Mr. Reda – Yes.

Mr. Duffy – Okay.

Ms. Murray – There are no changes to the gas station. Everything is going to remain the way it is.

Mr. Reda – Yes.

Ms. Murray – Thank you.

There are no more questions for the engineer.

Mr. Duffy asks for a motion to open to the public.

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

Mr. Duffy – Having heard none.

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

Mr. Bossong asks if there are any questions for the architect.

There are no questions for the architect or any other questions in general.

Mr. Duffy makes a motion to approve the application with the following provisions.

A complete updated revised set of plans that reflect all the comments. The sign needs to be one sign. The comments on 100 and 101. The total floor area.

Mr. Cialone – Show one story and remove the office. The square footage and also compliance with Neglia's report of May 14, 2026.

Mr. Burbano seconds the motion.

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

**B.) Saddle Brook SG West, LLC, 275-323 North Midland Avenue,
Blocks 1201 & 1202, Lot 1 & 2 and Block 1202, Lots 30-32, 32.01, 33-35**

The Applicant proposes to remove and replace four (4) existing billboards within the subject property with new foundations, monopoles, and structures of the same size and within the same locations that do 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.

Matthew Gilson is the attorney for this application and comes forward.

Mr. Gilson – We're here for an application at Zuckerberg's Industrial Park. My client purchased the property a number of years ago. They made a number of improvements and to continue with that theme there are 4 outdated billboards on site and we are looking tonight to replace them bring them up to date with the current standards of how billboards are constructed. We're not proposing larger billboards. We're not proposing illuminated billboards. We're looking to take structures that have become old and antiquated and replace them with new industry standard. I will have one witness for you tonight Mr. Josh Sewald from Dynamic Engineering. He'll testify as both our engineer and professional planner and unless the Board has anything else I would like to call him as a witness at this time. Mr. Chairman would it be the Board's pleasure that I break up the witnesses testimony into engineering and planning or would you like to just have him go through everything on direct?

Mr. Duffy – It's the same person?

Mr. Gilson – Yes.

Mr. Duffy – Just do it all and this way we can move quickly on opening the meeting to the public.

Mr. Cialone swears in Josh Sewald he gives his credentials as well and is accepted as a witness by the Board.

Mr. Gilson – Could you please give the Board an overview of the existing site conditions in our proposal?

Mr. Sewald – On the Board before you if you want to mark it as exhibit A1 or we can reference it as an aerial map. It is today's date prepared by my firm. It's an aerial map exhibit and on top of it we have a bunch of lines on there.

Mr. Cialone – We'll mark it as A1 dated July 6, 2026.

Mr. Sewald – I'll briefly go through this just so that the Board's familiarized with the property although I think you're all very familiar with it. This property is outlined in a bold yellow line that's on the screen approximately the 200 foot property owners list is the dotted yellow line around it. All the light blue lines that are your different zone lines that come directly off your zoning map in your Master Plan and then you'll see a purple line that separates your Township from the Elmwood Park Borough that's located to the west. To the north of our 8.15 acre property we have more commercial and industrial uses within the CH2 zone. To the south of us is Molnar Drive and the Garden State Parkway. To the east of us is Midland Avenue that's our long frontage we have on our property where all four of those existing billboards are today. Beyond that is the rest of the Zuckerberg Industrial Park and to the west again is the railroad line as well as the municipal boundary line with Elmwood Park. The property as you can see is uniquely shaped it's long and narrow. It is part of the overall industrial park of the Zuckerberg Industrial Park. Lot 1 specifically is tractor trailer storage. You can see that's on the north side of the exhibit. Lot 2 has 4 separate warehouses all located within lot 2. Again tonight's focus is purely on 4 separate billboards located along the frontage of Midland Avenue. Based on historical aerials and all the mapping and records that my firm could find these billboards date back to at least the early 1970's. We could tell with some of the existing lattice structural steel that's out there supporting them that they've been there for quite some time. Then we can quickly move on to what our next exhibit will be. This will be our rendering just to show

where we'll be replacing the new ones and what we'll be focused on for the rest of the evening. We can mark this as exhibit A2. This is entitled overall site plan rendering July 6, 2026 prepared by Dynamic Engineering. This is the same orientation as exhibit A1 zoomed in so everybody can see it. The same aerial map that you saw in A1 the same yellow line that you'd see around the property line. You'll see on the right side of the exhibit we have 3 pictures of where those 4 existing billboards are located. Also the zoning notes and the signage chart directly out of our civil drawings that we measured. Again the important part that my colleague mentioned in his opening we're not modifying the actual billboard. We're not enlarging it. The same square footage that's out there today will be hopefully with the approval of this Board. It is a static billboard meaning that you actually have to change the material on it between advertisements. It's not becoming a digital LED board. There's not going to be lights or flashing signs. What we're looking to do as the applicant as you heard in the opening is continue to modernize some various site improvements that you have throughout the overall Zuckerberg Industrial Park. This is one of them. So the 4 billboards that are out there today I'm sure you've driven past it you'll see that double pole lattice style structure steel. What they're looking to do is provide a modern monopole that you would normally see as you've driven throughout northern New Jersey. Overall again same square footage, same height. There's no intensification or substantial modification to the actual advertisement area. So all intents and purposes should the Board vote favorably after construction the only thing you're going to see different is that there's going to be one pole at the bottom instead of two poles with a foundation. Just to go through some numbers billboard number one which is located at the southernmost property line that's about 24 feet by 10 feet in size and a maximum height of 31 feet. Billboards two and three located in the middle of the property they are next to each other. Same thing double sided and 24 feet by 10 feet so same as billboard number one also at a maximum height of 31 feet. Lastly is billboard number four that is located at the northern most side. Same thing 24 by 10 feet and that is a little bit taller at a maximum height of 35 feet. So from an engineering standpoint we had the opportunity to jump in take a look at the first round of review letters from your Board engineer Neglia Associates and give them some additional information they requested. That's why there's a packet of plans, an itemized response and some other things associated with what a typical site plan would have. Now we're not disturbing over 5000 square feet so we don't have to go to the County planning Board, we don't have to go to the local soil conservation district really we have to come here before your Board talk about a use variance when I put my planner's hat in a little bit. From an engineering standpoint that's what we're looking to do. We're not touching the warehouses, access points, parking lot facilities, grading, drainage, lighting, landscaping all that fun stuff you guys usually hear. All we're looking to do is modernize and replace in kind those 4 billboards that we have out there today.

Mr. Gilson – You had a chance to review the latest Neglia report dated June 4, 2026?

Mr. Sewald – I have.

Mr. Gilson – The applicant has no issue with complying with the technical requirements as laid out in that letter?

Mr. Sewald – No a majority of the comments you'll see in dark bold of items that I think vastly have been addressed. If there's any remaining comments we're happy to address them as conditions of approval and I think a lot of it will be through direct testimony tonight and any ancillary questions the Board may have.

Mr. Gilson – That's it for engineering we could go on to planning now. Could you please describe the variance relief that is sought by the applicant tonight and provide the justification for same?

Mr. Sewald – As the project planner we took a look at the existing conditions of the property, survey, what the applicant is looking to do. We took a look at your zoning map ordinance, your Master Plan and the reexamination of your Master Plan back in June of 2014. Overall in my professional opinion this falls within what we call a D2 variance. So yes it is a use variance which is why we're here before you this evening at the ZBA. However we're making the assumption that it is a preexisting and legal nonconforming structure. Why, based on all the paperwork that we've received from your municipality we don't see any violations associated with those billboards which tells me they're allowed to be there. So when we talk about what is a D2 we must balance out the positive and the negative criteria. We must demonstrate special reasons. We must talk about the promotion of general welfare and finally what we're

looking to do is make sure the negative criteria this is the most important part that there will not be any substantial detriment to the public good and we will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan. Let's go through a little bit of that. I believe that we advance 3 special purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law purpose A, G and M. M being the most important in my opinion because at the very end of section M it talks about to the more efficient use of land. This industrial park has been in your community for decades. Everyone is aware of it they've driven on Midland Avenue for a very long time they're used to these 4 billboards that are out there today. If we were up here talking about taller, more square footage, additional billboards or even making them a digital component of it we would be talking about possibly intensification of it. That's not what we're here for tonight. We're simply looking to replace the structure which a lot of times is associated with a building permit application. When you just want to fix something that could be broken or just is in need of repair. We're here tonight because billboards are not specifically permitted so because we're touching it we must talk about this D2 variance overall because we advanced one of the special reasons and then we showed that there's no detriment to the Zone Plan or the Master Plan I believe that we can with the Board's support approve a D2 use variance associated with this. If there was a question or comment about whether it's a D1 or D2 I'm available to discuss that but in our opinion and review of the application the site and the records from your municipality we believe that it falls within more of the D2 criteria.

Mr. Cialone – Let me ask you a question.

Mr. Sewald – Please.

Mr. Cialone – It's not a permitted use as you stated.

Mr. Sewald – Correct.

Mr. Cialone – You're technically ripping them down and destroying them so they no longer exist. So really my opinion it's a D1 variance it's a use variance now because I don't think it matters if the destruction is intentional or unintentional whether it's fire or you take it down. I think by taking it down and even though you're putting up exactly the same thing I think you're triggering a D1 use variance.

Mr. Gilson – We're happy to provide that.

Mr. Cialone – I'd appreciate if you could provide that.

Mr. Sewald – Certainly can and that's why we're prepared to have that discussion depending on the Board's interpretation. So when you to a D1 all the testimony I just said still stands. However when you talk about a D1 when we go to the positive criteria the first balancing test in addition to the special reasons we must talk about particular suitability and when you talk about a D1 use variance that's the most important part for the Board in my opinion to consider. So the negative criteria is exactly the same. Is there any substantial detriment to the public good? Are we going to substantially impair the intent and purpose of the Zone Plan? The balance test the positive criteria must outweigh that negative. It doesn't mean there's not any detriments in the negative it just means that the positive must outweigh that negative and beyond the special reasons which I'm going to stick with A, G, and M. M being the more efficient use of land we must talk about particular suitability. This property has been developed for many years as an industrial park. This property has included these 4 billboards for decades and will provide advertising not just for local businesses but the nearby businesses in the area. In my opinion this site is specifically suitable. You are not near any residential. You are on a highly traveled roadway within an industrial park. What we want to worry about when it comes to billboards are we negatively impacting a sensitive use. Is it a school, is it a hospital, are there residents and that's not what we have. To the west of us is a railroad, to the south of us is a road and the Garden State Parkway, to the east of us is a road and the rest of our industrial park and then to the north of us is more uses within our zone that have already been there for quite some time as well. So in my opinion the positive criteria is the property and the municipality get 4 modernized billboards that have been there for quite some time. The negative component is do these 4 billboards belong on this site and we believe that yes they do because they've been there for a long time and they are particularly suitable for not just this property and that's the balance test for the positive but also is it suitable for the character of the neighborhood. I would argue that it is based on the use and the area that's been developed here for quite some time.

Mr. Gilson – Just to address Mr. Paparozzi's report you mentioned the signs are not illuminated.

Mr. Sewald – They are not what we call a digital illuminated sign they are static. However there are a couple of lights that shine up so that you can see the sign at night. However they're not illuminated that we would run a lighting plan that you would normally see because that's lights that illuminate the ground with a foot-candle illumination. Those two lights per facade will be still there in the post development condition should the Board vote favorably and to illuminate the sign. So there is lighting but it's not what you would traditionally see with a digital sign. It's not moving it's not LED and there's no downward facing lights that would be spilling off onto other properties.

Mr. Gilson – The applicant would agree to conform with the ordinance that any imaging on billboard 1 is not red or green because it's within 200 feet of a traffic light.

Mr. Sewald – Correct and that's a great ordinance that comes right out of if you were going to go to a digital sign or a moving sign. This is going to be static there will be no red or green lights located on these billboards.

Mr. Gilson – All lighting will conform with the ordinance for outdoor lighting.

Mr. Sewald – Absolutely.

Mr. Gilson – Mr. Chairman the applicant will be happy to stipulate to a six month look back once the new billboards are installed for your professionals to review the lighting as in place.

Mr. Duffy – Noted.

Mr. Gilson – I have no further questions for this witness.

Mr. Paparozzi – Just a few things. The billboard is going to remain there's no change in the sign or there is a change in the sign?

Mr. Sewald – The advertisements change depending who they sell the space to but the size of it's identical.

Mr. Paparozzi – Is it revolving is one advertisement up for 15 seconds and it slides to another one?

Mr. Sewald – Not digital at all it's static so that you actually have to come and put it on.

Mr. Paparozzi – The changing is manual.

Mr. Sewald – That's correct.

Mr. Paparozzi – I also have two other variances or three variances because I agree with Mr. Cialone on the D1 because it is coming down and by putting it back up you're creating two front variances and a side variance. The side variance was supposedly 25 feet. There's no number on there for the sign that's existing but it looks like it's less than five feet when I made my inspections. Those three variances along with the use are what you're applying for. That is all I have Chairman.

Ms. Nobile – I just want to confirm these signs are just for advertisement because the location 3 is a Zuckerberg advertisement specifically for the property. Is that no longer going to be is that going to be for it's going to change for whoever rents it? What were the intentions for it are all the signs going to be for public rental?

Mr. Sewald – The purpose is to do offsite signage. I think if they had a down a month or so they'd put up their own signage but no the intention for billboard is to rent the space.

Ms. Nobile – Location 3 is for a Zuckerberg advertisement.

Mr. Cialone – I had that question too is that picture you're showing of location 3 is that wrong? Because that's clearly not a billboard.

Ms. Nobile – It's a sign for the park.

Mr. Cialone – The site plan shows 4 on one side but your pictures so the double side by side ones you have them shown just as location 2.

Mr. Sewald – Yes.

Mr. Cialone – But on your site plan I think you marked them as 2 and 3.

Mr. Sewald – There's billboard 1 is Ms. Nobile's question of where it says Zuckerberg's. That's at the southernmost right on Molnar Drive right by the Garden State Parkway.

Mr. Cialone – No I believe she's looking at location 3.

Ms. Nobile – I'm looking 3 of 5 on your set of drawings.

Mr. Sewald – That's the survey it was not prepared by my firm and I apologize for that. If you look at the exhibit before you A2 what we did was to address Neglia's comments Dynamic prepared a civil set and did an itemized response but just to through them so I make sure I answer all your questions.

Ms. Murray – Her question is for the sign on the other side of the property it's on the opposite side.
 Mr. Paparozzi – East side of Midland Avenue.
 Mr. Sewald – Each one of these billboards are double sided.
 Ms. Murray – No what I'm saying is you have the long narrow piece of property which has 4 billboards on it correct. The one that says Zuckerberg's is on the other side of Midland Avenue.
 Mr. Paparozzi – It's on the east side of Midland.
 Mr. Cialone – That's not included.
 Mr. Sewald – That's not on this application. Everything we're presenting and representing tonight is on lots 1 and 2 on the west side.
 Mr. Cialone – And that's 4 on that side.
 Mr. Sewald – Correct.
 Ms. Nobile – Okay.
 Mr. Sewald – And each one of those 4 are double sided.
 Mr. Cialone – Right.
 Mr. Duffy – Does anyone else have any questions?
 Ms. Murray – I'm glad to see they're not digital.
 Mr. Sewald – They're not digital.
 There are no further questions.
 Mr. Duffy asks for a motion to open to the public.
 Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Tokosh to open to the public. All in favor – YES.
 Mr. Duffy – Having heard none.
 Ms. Murray makes a motion seconded by Mr. Tokosh to close to the public. All in favor – YES.
 There are no further questions from the Board.
 Ms. Murray makes a motion to approve the application with the stipulations that Mr. Cialone will help with.
 Mr. Cialone – The applicant will comply with Neglia's report dated December 9, 2025 revised to June 4, 2026. Billboard 1 will not contain any red or green lights. The billboard lighting will conform to the Township's outdoor lighting ordinances and there will be a six month lookback so that the Board Professionals can review the lighting and could be revised if needed to comply with applicable ordinances and laws. Then of course our standard conditions. Is there anything else?
 Ms. Murray – No that's what I have.
 Mr. Duffy seconds the motion.
 Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Tokosh, Ms. Nobile, Mr. Burbano, Mr. Francin, Mr. Duffy – YES.

6. RESOLUTIONS

A.) Approval Ready Spaces Management, LLC, 575 North Midland Avenue, Block 1701, Lot 1.02

Mr. Duffy makes a motion seconded by Ms. Murray to approve the resolution.
 Roll call - Ms. Murray, Mr. Mazzer, Mr. Tokosh, Ms. Nobile, Mr. Francin, Mr. Duffy – YES.

7. MINUTES

Meeting of June 1, 2026 Regular Meeting

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

8. COMMUNICATIONS

Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, 12/09/25 (275,279,280,285,291,321,323 N. Midland Avenue)

Anthony Kurus to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, Revised 6/04/26 (275,279,280,285,291,321,323 N. Midland Avenue)

Gary Paparozzi to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, 6/15/26 (275,279,280,285,291,321,323 N. Midland Avenue)

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

9. VOUCHERS

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 6/10/26, Carmen Sta Maria, 145 Market St., Block 609, Lot 9 \$370.50

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 6/10/26, Saddle Brook SG West, LLC, 275-323 North Midland Avenue, Block 1201, Lot 1 \$615.00

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 6/10/26, Artur Myrto, 315 Seventh Street, Block 115, Lot 5 \$697.00

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 6/10/26, 230 Market St., LLC, 226 Market St., Block 514, Lot 1 \$1,517.00

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 6/10/26, Wilfred & Rita Itondo, 28 Danna Way, Block 1816, Lot 8 \$150.00

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 6/10/26, Anthony Scaturro, 494 Steinway Rd., Block 702, Lot 9 \$150.00

Neglia Engineering Assoc., 6/10/26, Leone, 522 Saddle River Rd., Block 1309, Lot 6.01 \$410.00

Birchwale Pellino & Cialone, LLC, 6/25/26, Ready Spaces, 575 N. Midland Ave., Blk 1701, Lot 1.02 \$1,815.00

Paparozzi Associates Inc., 6/11/26, Ready Spaces, 575 N. Midland Ave., Blk 1701, Lot 1.02 \$150.00

Paparozzi Associates Inc., 6/11/26, Carmen Sta Maria, 145 Market St., Block 609, Lot 9 \$75.00

Paparozzi Associates Inc., 6/11/26, 230 Market St., LLC, 226 Market St., Block 514, Lot 1 \$563.00

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

Mr. Duffy – Having seen none.

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

11. ADJOURN

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

Meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank Barrale