

MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CITY OF CLIFTON
June 19, 2024
7:00 P.M. REGULAR MEETING

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

AVRAHAM EISENMAN (2A)
DAVID BRAID (1A)
ALESSIA ERAMO
MAUREEN O’CONNOR
SCOTT SOCHON
MICHAEL MOLNER
GEORGE FOUKAS
VICE CHAIRMAN SCORZIELLO
CHAIRMAN ZECCHINO

ALSO PRESENT:

Nicholas Graviano, P.P., Board Planner
Anthony Kurus, P.E., Board Engineer
Liana Bolcato, Asst. Zoning Officer
Jessica Sweet, Esq., Counsel/Secretary

Chairman Zecchino called the Meeting to Order at 7:03 p.m.; he led the entire assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. Pursuant to the “Open Public Meeting Law” public notice of the Board’s 2024 regular meeting schedule was published in the Herald News on December 24, 2023. All notice requirements were satisfied. Chairman Zecchino announced the time, place, and form of notice as well as advising all applications that formal action may be taken on the matters set forth on the Agenda. Said opening statement is incorporated herein by reference and made a part hereof.

CONTINUED HEARINGS

1. AMEER SIGNS, 1240 Main Ave., Block 11.16, Lot 2; Zone: BC

The applicant is proposing signage in the Main Ave Overlay District which requires the following variances; proposing face lit signage where not permitted, and proposed sign is greater than two feet in height.

Chairman Zecchino announced that the application of Ameer Signs will be carried due to a notice defect; it will be rescheduled to July 17, 2024, and the applicant will re-notice.

2. GEELAND, LLC 811-813 Rt 46, Block 34.03, Lots 75 and 77 – R-A2
Continued from 2/7/24 (all eligible except Eisenman) and 5/1/24 (all eligible except Braid)

Attorney Michael Sullivan entered his appearance on the record, and identified the property which is the subject of the application and the relief sought. Mr. Sullivan also summarized the prior testimony provided at the February 7 and May 1 hearings by the project engineer, and identified the revisions to the plans that were submitted on Date, 2024.

William McGeever, Architect; Andrew Viscio, PE, Traffic engineer, both of whom were previously sworn.

Mr. McGeever provided his qualifications, which were accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. McGeever identified the materials he reviewed in preparation for his testimony this evening. He then described the proposed building as a three-story building, fully sprinklered and meeting all code requirements. It will contain approximately 31,000 square feet. The ground floor will contain two interior loading bays. Offices will be on the first floor. There will be elevators for customer use. Storage facilities will be located on the 1st floor, 2nd floor, and 3rd floor. Hours of operation will be 6 am to 10 pm. Office hours will be 8 am to 6 pm weekdays; 9 am to 3 pm on Saturdays. There will be a security camera running at all times. It will require 2-3 employees. Mr. McGeever then described the interior building layout. Floors will be 10'6"; ground floor will be 12'. They will be using state-of-the-art technology for security purposes.

Mr. McGeever described the proposed signage. It will be on the west, north, and east side. No signage will be on the south side facing the farm and residents. each sign is 100 SF or smaller. Operator has not decided on the color or lettering. Addressing the freestanding pole-mounted sign, Mr. McGeever stated they are willing to work with the Board planner on aesthetics, but no final design has been determined; consistent with the recommendations of Mr. Graviano's report.

Mr. McGeever then provided a handout, consisting of three sheets, depicting the building renderings, which was marked as exhibit A-5. Mr. McGeever testified that the first page depicts the proposed front/west façade showing the building view facing Route 46. The office area is at the front. He described the building façade. The second page depicts the northeast corner of the building from the broad street intersection. Only three stories of the building will be visible from the west and northeast facades. The third page depicts the south façade view from the dead end of Martindale Road and shows the trees that will remain. Colors selected are earth-toned so as to blend into the surrounding trees. Lighting is minimal, all down-facing lights that will maintain all lighting on the property. No spillage to the farm or adjacent property.

Mr. McGeever stated that there will be 845 units inside the building ranging from 4 x 5 to 10' x 30' in size. There will be minimal travel inside the building for customers as the signage will provide express instructions to reach their units. Mr. McGeever addressed the comments of Mr. Graviano's report and agreed to comply.

Chair asked why the building is three stories. Mr. McGeever responded that the self-storage facility industry standard is 100,000 square feet; they needed the three stories to meet this square footage. Chair raised questions about the need for the D6 height variance; this is a single-family home zone where the limit is 2 stories; Chair stated further that if the 2-story height was met the impacts to the residences would be minimized. Mr. McGeever noted that the commercial zones allow three stories, or 35-40 feet. Chair raised questioned if there is a hardship need for the height variance. Mr. Sullivan stated that the zone permits conditional uses such as schools and houses of worship that are permitted to have a height of 3 stories/35' and allowable coverage of 35%. Mr. Sullivan also stated that the Planner will address the height variance criteria but was not able to be here tonight. Chair stated that schools and houses of worship are inherently beneficial uses.

Commissioner Eramo asked how the renderings will change in the winter when the trees lose their foliage and noted that it would be helpful to see another rendering view for the fall/winter.

Commissioner Eisenman asked what is the ramp to the left in the first sheet of A-5; Mr. McGeever stated it is the ramp to 46; Mr. Sullivan said the traffic engineer will address questions regarding the ramp.

Mr. Graviano suggested that the façade be dressed up a bit more. Mr. Sullivan reiterated that the applicant is happy to work with the Planner to improve the façade. Mr. Graviano asked that the applicant supply additional renderings, with the detail requested by Cmr. Eramo, prior to the next hearing.

Vice Chair Scorziello confirmed that the facility would have 800+ units; what would it have if they reduced the height. Mr. McGeever said he did not have that information now. Vice Chair Scorziello asked Mr. McGeever to provide that calculation.

Interested parties:

- Matthew O'Donnell, 75 Karen Drive, previously sworn: asked about the height, referencing A-200.00 in the submitted architectural plans, depicting the south elevation view from the farm. Mr. O'Donnell asked about how the height measurement of 44' shown on the plan was calculated; Mr. McGeever stated that the zoning ordinance calculates the building height as an average taken from all four sides of the building. Mr. O'Donnell asked what the height measurement from the roll up door shown on the plans. Mr. McGeever stated it was 44.5' at this exact location.
- Jennifer Papa, 171 Grove St., Clifton: addressed the negative criteria of the use variance and asked Mr. McGeever how he accounted for the impacts to the neighbors in preparing his design. Mr. McGeever responded that he tried to make the building blend in as much as possible to the surrounding landscape. Ms. Papa asked if they considered making this a one-story building similar to other self-storage facilities she has seen; witness said no. Ms. Papa asked about the impervious coverage; is there a way to make the building smaller. Mr. McGeever said they are not considering changing the building footprint at this point.
- Oleksander Pulaski: asked why no one had mentioned her property on lot 39 and said A-5 is misleading and she is upset. She stated that her property faces the view shown

- on the third page of A-5; and her house is very close to this location. She complained that the storage facility will face her house and the tower will face her bedroom. Until the trees grow, her bedroom will have a clear view of the building. Mr. McGeever said her property is at least 75' from the building. Ms. Pulaski expressed skepticism about the tree coverage and stated this project will make her feel like she is in prison.
- Jody Magee, 28 Standish Drive, Clifton: asked if the architect could address any benefits that the building will have to the neighborhood. Mr. McGeever said that it would be a transitional use between the residential homes and Route 46; it will be an improvement to the site which is overgrown, and additional new trees will be planted to improve the site. She stated that what the residents and farm workers see now is open space/a wall of green. Mr. McGeever said that the building materials will blend in with the greenery.
 - Jasmine Moriano, 137 Grove Street, Clifton; asked about the building materials; she noted that the wooded area is substantially cooler than the surrounding area, and asked if the building materials will increase the heat generated on the site. Mr. McGeever said that the building materials are light-colored and will not increase the heat generated or increase the temperature. About the trees- Moriano confirmed that the renderings show the trees at 3-5 years of growth; how tall will they be at planting? Mr. Sullivan said the trees were addressed at the last hearing and identified on the landscape plan, available to the public.
 - Lisa Ciccone, 68 Martindale Road, asked about the existing wildlife habitat. She asked who would enforce the 5-minute idling rule; Mr. McGeever stated that there are interior loading bays, so he believes that people will turn off their engines to avoid carbon monoxide poisoning. Mr. McGeever noted that the building will also be equipped with a ventilation system. Ms. Ciccone scoffed at this and stated that the ventilation system will vent to the environment. Addressing sheet 2 of Exh. A-5, she asked if they are improving the landscaping on street opposite the building. She asked if the applicant is going to be putting trees on the opposite side of Broad Street, she claimed this is a false sense of beautification. She asked a question about the tree height, Mr. Sullivan clarified that the landscaping plan shows the height at planting and growth.
 - Doris Rascher, 678 Broad Street: Asked another question about the trees and provided visual aids showing the 4" tree caliper and 4' height. How close will the loading docks of the building be to the rear of the property at Broad Street? Mr. McGeever stated it will be 140 feet from edge of the building, not including the landscaped buffer. Ms. Rascher asked for further details on the landscape buffer. Mr. McGeever stated that they will be 15'-18' on day one planting but not many fully mature trees will be maintained. The loading bays will be 14' tall.
 - Anne Schnackenberg: asked about how the design works towards the public good; what have you done to make this design better? Mr. Sullivan stated that the question has been asked and answered. How does this design show that the use will not impair the master plan or zoning ordinance; this is a question for the planner. As to height, she asked how far the shadow from the design will be cast to the farm property. Mr. McGeever stated that between the farm and the building there is a row of plantings, with at least 24' of drive aisle, it's more than 40 feet in width. Is there a required buffer area for a commercial building to residential use; yes, 16' is required; they are

proposing 75'. How many units- it will be 834 units. The rendering vegetation appears to be very lush; is this a photoshopped photo? How did you come up with that? It's 3-5 years; this is a prediction as to what it will look like.

- Vera Lazar, 22 Spencer Ave: height seems very high. How much taller is the building than the surrounding houses; Mr. McGeever said he does not have that. Lighting will be downward facing LED lights along the perimeter of the building. Any illuminated signage will be on the north, west, and east sides, not the south facing the farm or residents. The security lighting will be on all night. Signage will be off at night. Have you thought of using vines around the building to make it blend into the surrounding vegetation more? Any other plantings considered to further obscure the building. Mr. McGeever stated that they relocated the building to keep as great a buffer as possible from the farm.

At 8:15 p.m., with no additional members of the public seeking to question Mr. McGeever, Chairman Zecchino advised the Applicant that they were out of time and the Board would have to move on to the other scheduled hearings; and announced that the hearing on this application would continue on July 17, 2024, with no further notice to be provided.

**3. DURANGO SISTERS LLC, 363 Lakeview Ave., Block 1.27, Lot 9, Zone: B-C
Continued from June 5, 2024; all Commissioners eligible to vote.**

Glenn Peterson, Esq., entered his appearance on behalf of the applicant, and stated that he will be presenting the testimony of witness William J. Martin, RA, PP, whose qualifications were accepted by the Board. Mr. Peterson handed out a four-page exhibit, marked as A-3, showing (1) Google street view of the existing restaurant; rendering of the proposed building modifications; photos of all four sides of the existing building; and an aerial view of the neighborhood.

Mr. Martin stated that he designed the architectural plans submitted in support of the application and described the plans. He described the proposed changes to the existing restaurant, an expanded food preparation area that will replace a number of the old bar seats, so seating is being reduced. In terms of intensity of use, the proposed is somewhat less than what was previously operational there, within 2-3 years ago. Mr. Martin summarized the items he reviewed in preparation for his testimony.

Property is a corner lot containing 6700 SF, located just south of the Paterson City line between the Parkway and Route 46. 3,236 SF building located on the site; was a former bar/restaurant in operation for 46 years. Mr. Martin described the existing site improvements, a rear parking lot, driveway. Addressing the proposed floor plan, Mr. Martin described the basement/crawl space improvements. Mr. Martin then addressed the proposed exterior improvements: a new roof that will be smaller, as the existing mansard roof extends beyond the property line and is not aesthetically pleasing.

Zoning is B-C along Lakeview Ave; borders the R2A zone in the rear. The BC neighborhood allows restaurants as a conditional use; the existing restaurant is a permitted conditional use, which will be continued. The existing building will be improved. The added improvements that the applicant is making require the Board's approval.

Variance criteria:

1. Mr. Martin then summarized the specific variances requested and the standards for approval:
 - a. D3 Conditional use variance existing bar/restaurant to new restaurant/bar.
Proposing a total of 114 seats in the existing 3,236 SF restaurant + 10 employees, requiring a total of 53 parking spaces, where 3 spaces are proposed. Restaurants are a conditional use in the B-C district, provided the parking is met, and provided that the restaurant provides a 10' wide landscaped strip to any adjoining residential lot line (RB-1 zone to the east/rear; neither requirement is met by this application.
 - i. Deviation from the standards must be supported by evidence that the purposes of the MLUL are met but the burden of the positive criteria is less than that of a D1.
 - ii. Use was previously operated for 43 years with the same parking deficiency.
 - iii. 10' landscaping strip required but the site does not have sufficient space for that given the location of the lawfully existing structure.
 - b. C variances:
 - i. Minimum parking/loading area setback to lot lines;
 - ii. Minimum area of interior parking lot landscaping;
 - iii. Front yard building setback – 5' required; 0' existing/proposed.
 - iv. Side yard building setback – 5' required; 0' existing/proposed.
 - v. Current lawful existing structure does not allow these requirements to be met.
2. Mr. Martin then addressed the Positive Criteria for approval of the variance relief sought, as follows:
 - a. Desirable visual environment promoted: existing building had limited windows but this concept is to engage the neighborhood and bring the outside in, this will have a positive impact on the neighborhood.
 - b. BC zone is for business uses that serve the surrounding residential neighborhood; in his opinion this is good planning to put a restaurant in this space to serve the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Martin described the surrounding uses, including a beauty salon across the street that has the 10 parking spaces that the employees will be using (lease previously provided as Exhibit A-2) after 5 pm. The surrounding neighborhood is a mix of service/commercial uses.
 - c. Addressing the Master Plan, Mr. Martin testified that this proposal meets several objectives of the master plan:
 - i. Continue to plan uses to provide jobs and expand the tax base.
 - ii. Goal 6- encourages the use/rehabilitation of older commercial structures.
 - iii. Goal 13- seeks to improve and advance community appearance through desirable civic design.
 - d. In light of what is being proposed, the purposes of the MLUL are met to allow the applicant to continue the use.

3. Mr. Martin then addressed the Negative Criteria for approval of the variance relief sought, as follows:
 - a. Project as proposed will have a positive impact on the neighbors, no negative effects aesthetically.
 - b. Drainage will be addressed through improvements, so no negative impacts.
 - c. Will likely improve surrounding property values, with the improvements and the reuse of this vacant building.
 - d. No substantial or excessive noise to be generated.
 - e. No significant change in traffic activity, or substantial detriment as the traffic generated by the prior bar/restaurant was greater; the proposed use is less intense as the interior seating area/capacity will be reduced due to the interior expansion.

Commissioner Foukas stated that the rendering is attractive, and the improvements look good, but why are you here? Mr. Martin stated that this is because of the use of the basement, they will use the basement for unpacking/loading/restaurant storage. They are also modifying the building to remove a section of the roofline which will increase the overall volume, so this is something of an expansion, not that it will allow for additional seating but for mechanical improvements. Vice Chair Scorziello observed that the plan is great, it looks nice, but there are signs that were not included. Mr. Martin confirmed that the signs will remain.

Mr. Kurus identified a number of items in his report; the applicant confirmed that the engineer will address those items. Mr. Graviano stated that he agreed with the applicant's testimony regarding planning. Parking variance is a D3 conditional use standard. Mr. Graviano asked for the stucco material to extend to all four sides of the building; Mr. Martin stated that they would extend it to the sides of the building and agreed to break it up as requested by Mr. Graviano, he would design a pattern that would break up the wall facing the residential neighbors.

At the conclusion of the testimony, Commissioner Foukas made a motion to approve, subject to the stipulations that the Applicant comply with the recommendations contained in the reports of the Board's professionals, and subject to the shared parking agreement marked as Exhibit A-2. Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chairman Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino. The motion passes, the application is approved.

NEW HEARINGS

1. YEHOSHUA ALLSWANG, 464 South Parkway, Block 58.01, Lot 6; Zone:RA1

The applicant is proposing a new two-story addition to the single-family home which requires the following variances; side yard setback proposed at 6.5' where 10' required; rear yard setback proposed at 18.3' where 35' required, combined side yard setback proposed at 14.25' where 24' required and driveway in front of proposed addition not serving a garage.

Fruma Leiderman, 464 South Parkway, appeared with Mr. Allswang in support of the application. Mr. Allswang stated that they purchased this home a year ago, it was abandoned;

they have 7 children, a large, blended family. The existing home is not large enough for their family. They want to build an addition to the rear that will be in the location of the previously existing garage; there was a big garage in the rear that will be taken down. This will be an improvement over existing conditions.

At the conclusion of the testimony, Vice Chairman Scorziello made a motion to approve. Commissioner Sochon seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Molner, Foukas, who noted that the proposed addition is in keeping with the character of the existing neighborhood, Vice Chairman Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino. The motion passes, the application is approved.

2. CARLOS LANGE, 473 Highland Ave., Block 21.04, Lot 5, Zone: RB2

The applicant was previously denied by the Board 4/5/2023 and is coming back with an amended plan requesting to keep already built two car garage requiring the following variances, garage located at 2' from the rear property line where 5' is required, and 440 sq. ft garage exceeds the maximum permitted in the zone.

Glenn Peterson, Esq., entered his appearance on behalf of the applicant. Witness Carlos Lange, 473 Highland Avenue, was sworn. Mr. Peterson stated that the applicant was previously here in 2023, seeking to maintain a constructed garage, which was denied. Mr. Peterson advised that he would present the testimony of Applicant Carlos Lange, who was duly sworn. Chairman Zecchino asked the Applicant to describe the changes between this and the prior application, Mr. Peterson stated that the previously proposed dormers and second floor, with a stairway for access to the upper floor for use as storage are now proposed to be removed, so that the roof will be open and there will be no second floor, stairway, or storage use. Mr. Peterson further noted that the removal of these elements will preclude any illegal conversion of the garage for apartment or habitable use. Mr. Peterson further stated that there was a discrepancy in Mr. Lange's prior testimony in that he identified himself as a "builder." Mr. Peterson stated that Mr. Lange is not a builder; he works at Teterboro Airport and English is not his first language. Mr. Peterson stated he believed this was a major factor in the previous denial, as the Board may have believed that Mr. Lange had a more sophisticated understanding of the construction and zoning law than he actually does, and that the construction of the garage without permits was a mistake that has cost Mr. Lange dearly in terms of money and time.

Chairman Zecchino then asked to poll the Board to determine whether they believed this to be a substantial change in the plans sufficient to overcome res judicata on the previous denial. Commissioner Molner made a motion to hear the application; Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion. Voting in favor are Commissioners Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chairman Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino. The motion passes, the Board agreed to hear the revised application.

Mr. Peterson then advised the Board that the application requires two C variances for the rear yard setback, where 5 feet is required and 2 feet proposed, and from the maximum gross floor area of an accessory structure permitted in the RB-2 zone, where 300 square feet is the maximum

permitted and 440 square feet is proposed. Mr. Peterson stated that he would rely on the testimony provided at the April 5, 2023 hearing, and would not provide additional testimony in support of the application, noting only that the removal of the dormers and second floor of the proposed garage meets the concerns expressed by the Board in relation to the prior denial. The setbacks are a de minimus condition that will not adversely affect the neighboring property owners or impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance or zone plan. Mr. Peterson confirmed with Mr. Lange that he agreed with all representations made.

At the conclusion of the testimony, Commissioner Molner made a motion to approve, stating that in the future, citizens need to be clear on the need to obtain the requisite approvals from the zoning and building department before construction is commenced. Commissioner Sochon seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chairman Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino. The motion passes, the application is approved.

3. DAVID ABRAMCHIK, 80 Nugent Dr., Block 69.01, Lot 1.21; Zone: R-A3

The applicant is proposing an addition to expand an existing single family home which requires the following bulk variances; rear yard setback proposed at 34.9' where 35' is permitted, the proposed dormer is creating a third story where 2 stories are permitted, combined yard setback proposed at 15.16' where 16' is permitted, and lot coverage proposed at 32.52% where 27% is permitted.

Dominic Iannarella, Esq. entered his appearance on behalf of the Applicant, and introduced Joseph Donato, the site engineer, who provided his qualifications, and which were accepted by the board as an expert in the field of site engineering. Mr. Donato testified in reference to plans, sheet A-0, site plan, zoning schedule, A-1 showing the existing basement footprint and first floor. He testified that the Applicant is proposing to close off the mudroom and enlarge the existing dining room and bedroom to the right side of the house where currently the side yard setback is 13.8' and reduced to 7.36', which combined with the side yard setback on the other side triggers the combined side yard setback variance of 15.16'. Mr. Donato further testified that the rear of the house will be expanded as well; this will increase the lot coverage. Where 27% is permitted, they are proposing total coverage of 32.52%. Mr. Donato further testified that in total, the existing house, proposed addition, existing covered porch, and covered front porch results in lot coverage of 35.18%. However, Mr. Donato noted that if the open air, but covered porches are removed, the enclosed building coverage is only 27.78%, much closer to the maximum permitted. Thus, the enclosed living space constitutes only a slight increase in the allowable building coverage.

Chairman Zecchino then asked about the height- when you put a dormer in, we consider that to be 3 stories. Mr. Donato stated that the dormer is very small, it's for the steps which are 6'6" wide, just to provide a landing. The dormer is at the rear of the property and will not be visible from the street. Attic height will be 7 feet tall. Mr. Donato confirmed that the roof height is not changing over existing conditions, and the appearance of the house from the street is not being changed; the dormer will only be visible from the rear of the house.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Donato further stated that the Applicant is also proposing a front yard setback to the proposed new roof over the front stoop, where a setback of 20.5' is proposed to the new landing. Variances are needed for the proposed third story; the front yard setback for the new roof to the landing; and for the building coverage. Mr. Donato stated that the front yard setback is only to the proposed one-story roof extending over the front landing/stoop at 20.5'.

Mr. Iannarella summarized the relief sought, noting that the lot coverage variance is caused primarily by the proposed porches, which will be roofed but not enclosed. The variance for the third-floor dormer is essentially to accommodate the stair bulkhead; this is not a true three-story house, more of a 2.5 story house. Mr. Iannarella described the variances as de minimus and requested approval.

Commissioner Molner made a motion to approve, noting that his main concern was the third story but the Applicant addressed his concerns and he is satisfied that it and the front yard setback are de minimus. Vice Chairman Scorziello seconded the motion; voting in favor are are Commissioners Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chairman Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino. The motion passes, the application is approved.

ADOPTION OF MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTIONS/MINUTES

1. **COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION**, 168 and 202 Main Avenue & 20 Bridewell Place, Block 72.06, Lots 36, 38, 42; Zone: M-2
Approval of D(1) use variance to demolish the existing fueling station on Lot 36 in order to expand the parking lot, relocate the gas station within lot 38 and add 4 additional pumps, requiring a D3 conditional use variance in that the relocated gas station will be within 200 feet of a public park.

Vice Chairman Scorziello made a motion to approve. Commissioner Molner seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Braid, Eramo, O'Connor, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chair Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino.

2. **TERESA VARGAS** 1084-1088 Main Ave., Bl. 8.01, Lot 29; Zone: BC
Denial of use variance, parking variance, and various bulk variances to replace an existing one-story commercial structure with a 2-story mixed commercial and residential use building.

Commissioner Eisenman made a motion to approve the resolution of denial; Commissioner Eramo seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Eisenman, Eramo, Sochon, and Chairman Zecchino.

3. **STELMACH AUTO CARE** 1 Grove St. & 1425 Broad St.; Block: 27.13 & 76.02, Lot: 1; Zone: RA2 & BA

Approval of use variance to expand the existing auto repair shop to include a towing yard, towing office area, and indoor storage of vehicles.

Vice Chairman Scorziello made a motion to approve; Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Eisenman, Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Vice Chair Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino.

4. TFJ HAZEL LLC

Approval of Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval, Minor Subdivision (lot consolidation) approval, d(1) use variance, d(5) density variance, and bulk ("c") relief to construct a three (3)-story mid-rise (two (2) stories of residential use over one (1) level of parking), multi-family residential building containing forty (40) dwelling units (currently proposed to contain twenty (20), one (1)-bedroom units and twenty (20), two (2)-bedroom units) and resident amenities (the "Proposed Building"), along with ninety-three (93) on-site parking spaces forty (40) covered/ under the Proposed Building and fifty-three (53) surface parking spaces), and related site improvements.

Vice Chair Scorziello made a motion to approve, Commissioner Sochon seconds the motion. Voting in favor are Commissioners Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chairman Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino.

5. Minutes of the May 22, 2024 Special Meeting.

Commissioner O'Connor made a motion to approve. Vice Chair Scorziello seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Braid, Eramo, O'Connor, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chair Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino.

6. Minutes of the June 5, 2024 Regular Meeting

Commissioner Sochon made a motion to approve. Vice Chair Scorziello seconded the motion; voting in favor are Commissioners Eramo, O'Connor, Sochon, Molner, Foukas, Vice Chair Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino.

There being no further business before the Board, Commissioner Foukas moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sochon, with the unanimous approval of all Board members present, the meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
JESSICA L. SWEET, ESQ.,
COUNSEL SECRETARY