

MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
CITY OF CLIFTON
April 3, 2024
7:00 P.M. REGULAR MEETING

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

AVRAHAM EISENMAN (2A) (Arrived 7:22 p.m.)
DAVID BRAID (1A)
7ALESSIA ERAMO
MICHAEL MOLNER
SCOTT SOCHON
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 7:00 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. Special notice of the change in meeting time for tonight’s meeting was published in the Bergen Record and the Herald News on March 3, 2024, 48 hours prior to the meeting as required by the Open Public Meetings Act. 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. GEELAND, LLC 811-813 Rt 46, Block 34.03, Lots 75 and 77 – R-A2

The applicant is requesting preliminary and final site plan approval, with use and bulk variances to raze the existing commercial building and construct a 4-story 125,200 sq ft self storage facility, parking, lighting, landscaping, stormwater management, and related site improvements.

Attorney: Michael D. Sullivan, Esq.

Chairman Zecchino announced that this application has been continued to May 1, 2024.

2. IVAN CABARCAS, 66 West 2nd Street Block: 9.07 Lot: 20- Zone: M2

The applicant is requesting a use variance to replace an existing 2 story commercial property

with a 3-family house which is an expansion of a nonconforming building/use in the M2 zone. Applicant also requesting bulk variance relief, a variance for a nonconforming driveway width, driveway buffer proposed at 0' where 5' required, and any other relief that may be required.

Attorney: Dominic Iannarella, Esq

Chairman Zecchino announced that this application will be carried to April 17, 2024.

3. **JONATHAN & NAOMI LEB**, 58 Parson Road, BLOCK: 57.01 LOT: 22 Zone: RB1
The applicant is proposing to convert an existing two family home to a single family home as well as a rear and second floor addition which requires the following bulk variances; lot coverage proposed at 32.53% where 27% permitted, rear yard setback proposed at 24.75' where 35' required, and 3 stories proposed where 2 stories permitted.

Chairman Zecchino announced that this application will be carried to April 17, 2024.

Chairman Zecchino then announced that the agenda would be taken out of order, as follows:

4. **RICHARD LUO** 190 Beverly Hill Rd, BLOCK: 55.07 LOT: 50, Zone: RA3
The applicant is proposing a second-floor dormer addition which requires the following bulk variances; front yard setback proposed at 23.9' where 25' required, side yard setback proposed at 5.1 where 6' required and combined yard setback proposed at 9.7' where 16' required.

Richard Luo, 190 Beverly Hill Road, appeared *pro se*; he testified that he wants to add a second floor addition to the front of the house. They already have an addition to the rear. Front addition requires a small dormer extension on the front and sides of the house, they are asking for a C variance from the minimum front and side yard setback requirements, which are pre-existing nonconformities. Mr. Luo stated that the nonconforming setbacks are pre-existing, they are just extending the pre-existing nonconforming front yard setback of 24.9 feet, where 25 feet is required to the front face of the building for the proposed second-floor addition, and the nonconforming side yard setback of 5.1 feet, where 6 feet is required, on the left side of the house. The existing nonconforming side yard setback of 4.6 feet to the west is not being extended. The existing nonconforming combined side yard setback of 9.6 feet will not be exacerbated. Mr. Luo testified that the purpose of the addition is because they had another baby and need more room. No interested parties appeared.

At the conclusion of the testimony, Commissioner Molner made a motion to approve the application; Commissioner Braid seconds. Voting in favor are Commissioners Braid, Eramo, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino.

NEW HEARINGS

1. **DAN WISOTSKY, 399 South Parkway BLOCK: 58.06 LOT: 13 Zone: RA3**

Dan Witsotsky, 399 South Parkway, appeared *pro se* and testified that he is proposing to add a first floor living space to his existing residence for his elderly parents, ages 90-91, who

currently live elsewhere without first floor access. Mr. Witsotsky stated that he worked with architect for a year to come up with what they think is a fair plan, which he described as a two-story addition to the front/right side of the house, and a one-story addition to the rear. This plan requires a variance for lot coverage, where 27% is the maximum permitted; 24.54% exists, and 33.98% is proposed, and a variance from the minimum rear yard setback requirement, where 35 feet is required; 35.67 feet currently exists, and 27 feet is proposed. Mr. Witsotsky testified that in preparing the plans, he looked at prior applications approved by the Board and tried to keep the design consistent with past approvals. The Chairman asked if the front of the house will stay the same; Witsotsky says it will be untouched. Mr. Witsotsky further testified that there was an addition constructed to the rear of the house previously, which they are now proposing to square off and add another story. Mr. Witsotsky notes that the zoning office was very helpful to him throughout this process.

The Chairman then opened the hearing to the public; two interested parties appeared in opposition to the application. Mary Logue, 418 Rutherford Blvd., testifies that she's the neighbor to the rear, and states that Mr. Witsotsky did an addition to the rear a few years ago. Ms. Logue stated her concerns about his addition and patio coming too close to her fence. She wants to know where the measurements are coming from, and asked "If you're squaring off the whole back, is the setback measurement from the porch?" Ms. Bolcato provided Ms. Logue with a copy of the plans and explained the variance for the rear yard setback and the proposed location of the patio in relation to Ms. Logue's house. Ms. Logue asked that they keep the noise down.

Elaine Stabile, 427 Rutherford Blvd., testifies that she also owns a house to the rear of the subject property, and stated that there is too much construction in the town, she works from home. She said this house had a large addition recently, this one will directly affect her. She complains that the Board keeps approving construction and now this is a noise-polluted city just like New York. Ms. Stabile further stated her concerns regarding truck traffic in the neighborhood, loud construction workers, and her frustration with noise pollution affecting her quality of life here in Clifton.

The Chairman then closed the meeting to the public. Mr. Witsotsky closed by stating that he has lived in the house for 30 years and never had a problem. This addition would not have required a variance several years back. He said his prior construction crews have been wonderful and did not create any disturbance. Assuming it will be the same crew, he doesn't expect any noise problems or construction impacts to the neighbors.

Vice Chairman Scorziello then stated that he appreciates the objectors taking the time to present their concerns to the Board, but notes that the Applicant is requesting only minor bulk variances, and states that there is no evidence any of the neighbors' concerns were caused by this Applicant, and makes a motion to approve the application. Commissioner Sochon seconds the motion. Voting in favor are Commissioners Braid, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino. Voting against: Commissioner Eramo.

At this time, Commissioner Eisenman arrived and took his seat on the dais.

2. JOSH LOWY, 18 Conover Ct. BLOCK: 71.03 LOT: 5 Zone: RA3

Applicant Josh Lowy appeared *pro se*, and presented the testimony of Architect/Planner William J. Martin, AIA, PP, whose qualifications were accepted by the Board as an expert in

both fields. Mr. Martin testified that the existing dwelling is a two-story single family home in the RA3 zoning district surrounded by other homes and a cemetery. He then handed out a packet of documents containing seven (7) sheets, which was marked as Exhibit A-1 and described as follows: Sheet 1-a partial zoning map showing property highlighted in red; Sheet 2- a Google aerial photograph of the neighborhood aerial looking south; Sheet 3- another Google aerial photograph, similar view to 2, but looking north; Sheet 4- a photograph of the front of the existing house; Sheets 5 and 6- photos of neighboring homes; Sheet 7- a rendering of the proposed new house.

Mr. Martin described the proposal to expand the existing L-shaped house to add a two-story addition to the rear. The Applicant is requesting a variance to extend the preexisting nonconforming rear yard setback of 28.42 feet where 35 feet required, by “squaring off” the L-shape at the rear of the house. Mr. Martin further stated that the house will be rebuilt to raise the ceilings which are lower than typical. The new portion of the attic will be open, as will the new portion of the basement, which will also be unfinished. The existing portion of the basement has rooms as shown on the plans. The lot coverage will be below the maximum permitted. Mr. Martin presented testimony in support of the variance relief as follows: it will advance the Master Plan goal of modernization of housing stock and will serve as an aesthetic enhancement to the neighborhood. Mr. Martin testified that the variance can be granted under the C2 criteria as a better planning alternative. Mr. Martin stated it will have no negative impacts, no noise, no substantial detriment to public or zone plan.

Chairman Zecchino then noted that the Applicant’s legal notice mentions a 3rd story due to the intersecting gable; the Chair stated that he has no issue with the addition, but the 3rd story becomes an issue, as they are proposing full attic stairs and a laundry area in the attic. Mr. Martin stated that the proposed building height will be 26’, which is lower than the maximum height of 30 feet permitted by Ordinance. Mr. Martin says it’s the shape of the roof that is creating the 3rd story; he notes that the house across the street is taller than what is proposed, and he purposefully kept the attic height lower to comply with the height limitation. Chairman Zecchino responded that it is the fact that this is technically a 3rd story that is the issue.

Commissioner Sochon asked if the ordinance prohibits laundry and exercise area in the attic; Ms. Bolcato responded that the zoning office considers it to be the same as having laundry in the basement.

Mr. Martin states that the attic is fully open; the reverse dormer to the rear will be used for HVAC equipment. Chairman Zecchino says that there’s an issue with the attic as a 3rd floor because it becomes livable space and the zoning officer has issues enforcing the use of these rooms. Vice Chair Scorzillo asks what’s the purpose of the Laundry room in the attic? Mr. Martin replies that it is for easy access to the bedrooms. Vice Chair Scorziello comments that the Board has not previously seen laundry in the attic. Mr. Martin says it was his idea.

Mr. Lowy testified that he wants to maximize functionality for the family; they tried to keep it under the maximum height and they tried to meet the requirements. Mr. Martin states that they are raising the second floor roof only 6 inches; it is presently 7.5 feet, to be raised to 8 feet.

Commissioner Molner asks which design elements are creating the 3rd floor? Mr. Martin says the flattened reverse gable is to be used for HVAC equipment; there are no walls in the attic. Chair suggests revising the plan to rectify the third story issue and remove the laundry in

the attic, as they should be able to fit that on the second floor. In response, Mr. Martin proposes to separate the rear gable by a hatchway and completely cut it off. Chairman Zecchino says he understands they are under the height but this is still a 3rd floor and they have to remove the gable so this is only a 2-story house. The rear addition is fine, but the Board cannot approve the third floor. Mr. Martin replies that the Zoning Officer told him that if the rear facing reverse gable dormer were separated from the rest of the attic and lowered by two feet it would meet the two-story requirement. Commissioner Molner asks about the height once the dormer is lowered. Mr. Martin says the height will be two feet lower; it would go down to 8 feet at the highest point of the attic interior and will slope down along the side walls. Chairman Zecchino notes that by reducing the height now, the interior is less likely to be converted to illegal living space. Mr. Martin states that the Zoning Officer wants the reverse gable to be brought down to 5 feet for the HVAC equipment. As for the laundry proposed in the front gable, Mr. Martin states that the Zoning Officer did not have a problem with that, but the Chairman replies that the Board doesn't want laundry in the attic, it should be moved to the second floor.

The Chairman requests that Mr. Martin revise the plans to eliminate the third floor. Mr. Martin states that he will revise so the rear gable drops to 5 feet. Commissioner Sochon asks if they are going to lower the front ridge; Mr. Martin says he's going to leave the front and lower the rear; the rear gable is what makes it 3 stories.

Commissioner Eramo asks if they are planning to demolish the existing house; Mr. Martin replies that they are not. In response to Commissioner Eramo's question to clarify the old and new sections of the basement shown on the plans, Mr. Martin says that a new partial basement will be constructed under the rear addition because the existing rear portion of the house is on a slab; they have to build out a new basement in that area under the addition, otherwise it would be unstable. Mr. Martin states further that the existing basement has rooms, the new basement will be open, unfinished, used for storage, for kids playroom.

Mr. Martin requests that the application be continued so that the applicant can provide revised plans; Chairman Zecchino announces that the application will be continued on May 15, with no further notice to be provided.

3. LILIANA OTALVARO, 610 Gregory Ave. BLOCK: 13.13 LOT: 47 Zone: RB2

Liliana Otalvaro appeared *pro se*. Ms. Otalvaro testified that this application was previously approved on January 5, 2022; it was extended once, but she did not pull permits or request a second extension within the required time, due to a death in the family and related personal circumstances. Ms. Otalvaro states that the application is exactly the same as that which was approved on January 5, 2022. She is proposing to demolish an existing single-family home and build a new two-family home, requiring bulk variances from the minimum lot width (75' required; 50.14' existing); minimum lot area (7500 SF required; 6267 SF existing) driveway setback (proposed less than 5' from the left side lot line), and height/stories, where the proposed basement has more than 50% of its clear height above grade, which makes the basement a story, therefore the proposed house is three stories where 2 ½ stories are permitted.

Commissioner Eramo noted that she was not on the Board at the time of the prior approval, and requested clarification as to whether the 2-family is permitted and whether there are other 2-family homes in the neighborhood. Ms. Otalvaro confirms that there are other 2-family homes in the neighborhood. Chairman Zecchino states that the 2-family is permitted in the RB-2 zone, but

the lot is deficient as to area required for a 2-family, she would need a lot of 7,500 SF but her lot is 6,200 SF.

At the conclusion of the testimony, Commissioner Molner made a motion to approve the application; Vice Chair Scorziello seconds. Voting in favor are Commissioners Eisenman, Braid, Eramo, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello, and Chairman Zecchino.

CONTINUED HEARINGS

5. TERESA VARGAS, 1084-1088 Main Ave., Block 8.01, Lot 29; Zone: BC

Glenn Peterson, Esq., appeared on behalf of the applicant, Theresa Vargas; Mr. Paterson stated that he will be presenting the testimony of three witnesses. Mr. Paterson gave an opening statement, stating that the subject property is currently used as an existing medical building/outpatient surgery center. In 2020 there was damage to the building. The applicant intends to rebuild the second floor to add a story that will be used for new 2nd floor residential use.

Mr. Peterson then called Anwar Alkhatib, RA, 151 West Paterson Street, Rochelle Park, NJ, who provided his qualifications and stated that he works with Evans Architects, AIA, who designed the plans. Mr. Alkhatib's qualifications were accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Alkhatib described the subject site as 3 tracts; Tract 1 is the area of the proposed development; Tract 2 is the existing medical building; Tract 3 has an existing residential dwelling. Mr. Alkhatib then described the proposed new addition to the existing building; he noted that the rear parking lot will be improved and will contain a trash enclosure. Mr. Alkhatib then testified in reference to the first floor plan, which depicts four commercial spaces and one residential dwelling on the ground floor. He then described the second floor plan, which depicts four one-bedroom apartments. Mr. Alkhatib then described the proposed building elevations.

In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. Alkhatib stated that they designed this mixed use building to fit in with the existing pattern of development on Main Avenue. The old building is one story. Chairman Zecchino then suggested removing the 2-family dwelling in the rear of the site. This would allow them to have more parking and the site would function better.

Commissioner Eramo then asked the witness to provide additional details regarding the 11-space parking lot, with two spaces in front of the 2 family house. Commissioner Eramo asked if these 11 spaces will be reserved or designated for specific residents or uses? Does the Surgicenter use the parking now? In response Mr. Peterson stated that the Surgicenter is open 6 am to 3 pm, and [atients coming for surgery do not drive themselves. Commissioner Eramo questioned whether the people driving need to park their cars, and suggested that the Applicant designate the spaces for specific uses. Commissioner Eramo asked whether the trash enclosure is large enough for all of these uses. Mr. Graviano stated that the refuse area should be doubled; they probably have the space; Mr. Alkhatib says the Applicant will agree to do so.

Mr. Graviano then asked how many parking spaces currently exist; Mr. Alkhatib replies that there are 14. Chairman Zecchino says they are way too under with parking, the proposed plan

requires 54 spaces, they are proposing 14. Mr. Graviano comments that the site has severely limited parking, if the applicant isn't willing to demolish the 2-family, he believes 5 new residential units are excessive. Mr. Graviano comments further that the 2 story mixed use is appropriate, but they need parking. He states that demolishing the 2-family makes the most sense, as it would allow the applicant to add additional parking and improve the site circulation. He further noted that the spaces are proposed at 9' x 18', which is deficient.

Commissioner Eisenman asks what is the existing square footage of the surgery center? Mr. Graviano says it is 9000 square feet; Commissioner Eisenman comments that the site is really underparked for a 9000 square foot surgery center. Chairman Zecchino says the building needs to be rebuilt but there needs to be either more parking or less units. Removing the 2-family makes the most sense.

Mr. Peterson then called William J. Martin to testify as a professional planner; his qualifications were accepted by the Board. Mr. Martin stated that in preparation for his testimony, he reviewed the application, visited site, reviewed ordinance, MLUL, and the City Master Plan. Mr. Martin distributes Exhibit A-1, marked in evidence, containing the following sheets:

- Sheet 1: zoning map
- Sheet 2: google aerial showing site and surrounding area
- Sheet 3: similar view to 2
- Sheet 4: photo taken today of the surgery center and the altered one-story building. Photo taken today of rear portion of the property from the Prescott Ave looking towards the rear

Mr. Martin then stated that the 2-family house has one 2-bedroom and one 3-bedroom unit. He stated that the parking is accessed from Prescott Ave to the rear. Mr. Martin further testified that the Applicant is proposing to modify the existing one-story building, shorten the frontage and the depth to add five new parking spaces along the rear. Addressing the zoning requirements, Mr. Martin testified that the property currently exists in 2 zones. The zone line cuts through the property. The commercial buildings are in the BC zone, the rear portion of the property (2 family) is in the R-B1 zone. Property also within the Main Avenue overlay zone, the purpose of which is to promote the improvement of businesses. Mr. Martin stated that the R-B1 zone permits 2-family homes on 7500-square foot lots. He described this as a preexisting nonconforming use. Mr. Martin then described the surrounding area as a mix of commercial and residential, some with residential over retail. Regarding parking, Mr. Martin stated that the municipal lot across the street allows for 48 hour parking, but Main Avenue does not allow for overnight parking on the street. Mr. Martin further stated that there is another municipal parking lot nearby; the site also has access to mass transit, with two bus stops right in front of the site.

Mr. Martin stated that the proposed variance relief will advance various goals of the City Master Plan: (1) it will encourage a mix of land uses including residential – this is a balance of land uses consistent with this goal; (2) it will help address the community need for moderate income housing; (3) it will encourage reuse/rehabilitation of older residential areas, as this proposal reuses existing nonresidential building but adds residential; (4) it will revitalize older business units: this proposal will create some additional parking to the extent possible on the site. Mr. Martin continued that the Main Avenue overlay zone criteria will be adhered to the extent

possible. He stated further that the plan advances Master Plan goal 8, which calls for the enhancement of the Main Avenue corridor. A Portion of the rear building will be removed, this will expose the alley way to the left of the existing building, making parking accessible.

Mr. Martin then described the variance relief required, as follows:

- D(1) use- mixed uses and commercial uses in BC Zone
- D(1) for more than one use on the site
- D(1) for mixed residential uses and commercial uses in the RB-1 zone
- C: front yard setback -0.1 feet existing and proposed; 5' required
- C: side yard setback 3.8 feet existing and proposed; 11.5' required
- C: parking- 54 spaces required; 15 proposed
- C: parking setback to be within more than 10 feet of the lot lines
- C: Planter beds required in the front yard, none proposed
- C: Main Ave façade

Addressing the positive criteria, Mr. Martin stated that the proposal will advance the following purposes of zoning enumerated in the MLUL:

- Purpose A- municipal action guiding appropriate use of lands to promote health safety & welfare, this proposal promotes reasonably priced housing and retail.
- Preservation of the environment: this is a reuse of an existing dilapidated building which is being made smaller footprint
- Purpose G- promote a variety of uses- provides more commercial and residential space to meet needs of neighborhood residents
- Purpose I: good civic design and arrangement; the Site is well-suited for this building as described.

Mr. Martin testified that the benefits of the proposed variances outweigh any detriments.

Addressing the negative criteria, Mr. Martin testified that the project will rehabilitate a building in need of work; it will serve as an aesthetic improvement to the neighborhood; it will improve property values; the project as proposed uses sound engineering practices. Mr. Martin stated that the addition of five new apartments will not create substantial traffic or impacts to neighborhood, and concluded that there will be no impairment to the master plan or zone plan.

Chairman Zecchino then asked Mr. Martin if this is good planning to have a site so deficient in parking. Mr. Martin stated that the owner should be able to manage the parking deficiency, and again noted that there is a municipal parking lot across the street to allow for 48 hour parking. The Board discussed the use of that municipal parking lot, and the Chairman commented that it is full all the time, or mostly full. Mr. Martin stated that the difference between what's there now and what they're proposing is really only 5 cars, and with careful management by the owner, this should not result in substantial impacts. Chairman Zecchino asked wouldn't it be a better layout/site if you took out the 2-family house. Mr. Martin agreed it would be a better parking lot layout but removing the 2-family house would reduce the available housing in the area. Vice Chairman Scorziello stated that the City Council often hears that more parking is needed in town, and he understands that this might not make it worse but it won't make it better. Mr. Martin responds that in his opinion, they are only really adding 5 vehicles to the parking lot and that's not a substantial impact.

Chairman Zecchino states that because the existing building has essentially been demolished, now is the time to improve the property and rectify the pre-existing nonconforming issues. Mr. Graviano observed that this is a very irregular site layout, and opines that the Board would not have an issue with the 5 units if the 2-family were removed. If the 2-family is not removed, then 5 units are too much. Commissioner Molner states that although the existing tenant for surgical center has very minimal parking needs due to transportation provided, but that could easily change with a different medical use. Mr. Peterson then conferred with the Applicant and requested a continuance to June 5, 2024. The Application will be carried without the need for further notice.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Following an affirmative vote of all members present, the Board then closed the meeting to the public and went into Executive Session to review and discuss the terms of a written settlement agreement in TJF Hazel, LLC Vs. City of Clifton Zoning Board of Adjustment, Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Passaic County, bearing Docket No. PAS-L-003197- 22, pertaining to property located at 252 Hazel Street and 237 West Third Street, Block 16.11, Lots 1 and 2, which application was denied by the Board on October 19, 2022, for a three story mid-rise 54-unit multi-family residential building. The Board agreed to hold a Whispering Woods hearing on the Plaintiff's amended application for 40 residential units on May 15, 2024. The Board unanimously agreed to authorize Chairman Zecchino to execute the proposed settlement agreement.

The Board then concluded Executive Session and reopened the meeting to the public. Chairman Zecchino made a statement on the record advising the public that a Whispering Woods hearing on the Plaintiff's amended application for 40 residential units would be held on May 15, 2024.

ADOPTION OF MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTIONS/MINUTES

1. STEPHEN & MIRIAM BRICKMAN 43 Garfield Ave. BLOCK: 50.12 LOT: 12; Zone: RA1
Approval of application for a new single family residence, requiring bulk variances from the minimum rear and side yard setbacks (individual and combined); maximum lot coverage; maximum stories; maximum curb cut and driveway width, and minimum lot width

Offered by Commissioner Molner and Seconded by Commissioner Sochon. Voting in favor: Comrs. Eramo, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello and Chairman Zecchino.

2. CHAIM & ESTHER KOWALSKY 63 Cresthill Ave., BLOCK: 70.01 LOT: 5 Zone: RA3
Approval of application for addition to a single-family home, requiring bulk variances for minimum rear yard setback to deck and maximum lot coverage.

Offered by Commissioner Sochon and Seconded by Vice Chairman Scorziello. Voting in favor: Comrs. Eramo, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello and Chairman Zecchino.

3. ESMELIN FELIZ 259 Vernon Ave., BLOCK: 5.10 LOT: 20 Zone: RB1
Approval of application to legalize two already constructed gazebos, requiring a variance for

maximum lot coverage.

Offered by Commissioner Sochon and Seconded by Vice Chairman Scorziello. Voting in favor: Comrs. Eramo, Sochon, Vice Chair Scorziello and Chairman Zecchino.

4. 270 PARKER AVENUE INC. 59 Durant Ave. BLOCK: 4.18 LOT: 2 Zone: PD1 Approval of application to expand an existing non-conforming two-car garage into a four-car garage which requires an expansion of non-conforming use variance and bulk variances for minimum front and side yard setbacks, and a variance from the setback requirement from the garage to a principal structure.

Offered by Vice Chairman Scorziello and Seconded by Commissioner Sochon. Voting in favor: Comrs. Eramo, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello and Chairman Zecchino.

5. QUICKS REALTY LLC 802 Van Houten Ave., Block 36.10, Lot 16 – BC
Approval of application for use and bulk variance relief to construct a new mixed use retail and residential building, and to maintain two other principal uses (one residential and one retail) on the same property.

Offered by Vice Chairman Scorziello and Seconded by Commissioner Sochon. Voting in favor: Comrs. Eramo, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello and Chairman Zecchino.

6. Minutes of the March 20, 2024 Regular Meeting

Offered by Commissioner Sochon and Seconded by Commissioner Molner. Voting in favor: Comrs. Eramo, Sochon, Molner, Vice Chair Scorziello and Chairman Zecchino.

There being no further business before the Board, Commissioner Sochon moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Braid, with the unanimous approval of all Board members present, the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

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