

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING

June 17, 2026

The public hearing began at 7:00 P.M.

Members present were:

Luis Amberths
Terry Andrus
Albert Fisher
Joseph Repice
Joseph Stefano
George LoBiondo

Members absent: Ryan Flaim, Andrew Groetsch, Eric Hernandez, Rudolph Luisi

Others Present were:

Amanda Moscillo, Zoning Board Solicitor
Yasmin Perez, Zoning Board Secretary
Ryan Headley, Zoning Board Engineer/Planner
Pat Finley, Zoning Officer
Elizabeth Jambor, Assistant Planner

Ms. Moscillo went over revisions to the agenda.

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the May 20, 2026, meeting.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the resolutions from the May 20, 2026, meeting. Resolutions 2026-22, 2026-23 and 2026-24.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

MATTHEW MOORE, 1231 Kathy Lane, Block 108, Lot 19, Zone A-5, side yard setback variance of 30-foot whereas 40 feet is required for an addition to an existing single-family dwelling.

Matthew Moore appeared and testified on his own behalf. He testified that he was seeking side yard setback variance relief to permit an addition to his existing single-family dwelling while maintaining the property's existing nonconforming side yard setback of 30 feet, whereas 40 feet is required. He explained that the property is currently developed with a single-family home and that the proposed addition would not alter the residential use of the property.

He stated that the purpose of the addition was to improve the functionality and livability of the residence while minimizing any impact on neighboring properties. Mr. Moore further testified that he believed the requested

variance was reasonable, consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, and could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good or substantial impairment of the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed addition would continue along the existing setback line and would not decrease the existing side yard distance.

Mr. Finley commented that the application represented the type of variance the Board commonly considers, the lot is undersized and predates the current bulk zoning requirements. He stated that the proposal would not increase the existing nonconformity because it would maintain the same setback line, and the property would continue to be used as a single-family residence. He expressed no objection to the requested variance.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

MAYBELLINE RIVERA & ROBERT GATTO, 588 N. Third Street, Block 2203, Lot 14, Zone R-2, construction of a 900 square foot garage for vehicle storage.

Robert Gatto appeared and testified on his own behalf. Mr. Gatto testified that he was seeking approval to construct a 900-square-foot pole barn on his residential property. He explained that he owns a Dodge Challenger Hellcat, a vehicle that is frequently targeted for theft, and that he wished to provide a secure location to store it. He further testified that he travels out of state for approximately six months each year and needed a secure building to protect the vehicle while he was away. In addition, he stated that he planned to retire in approximately eight years and intended to use the pole barn as a place to work on personal projects.

Mr. Finley stated that he had no objection to the request. He explained that the proposed 900-square-foot accessory structure was a modest increase over the size permitted in the zone. He further testified that the proposed structure complied with all required setbacks, that the property was a sufficient size to accommodate the building, and that the proposal was not out of scale with the lot.

Mr. Gatto testified that the existing carport was only a temporary structure used to protect his vehicle until the pole barn could be constructed and confirmed that it would be removed once the new building was completed.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

ROBIN & ROBIN REALTY LLC, 710 S. Eighth Street, Block 4903, Lot 7, Zone R-3, variances for minimum lot size of 9,906 square feet whereas 13,500 square feet required, frontage and width of 50 feet whereas 90 feet required, and side yard setback of 12.7 feet whereas 15 feet required for the construction of single-family dwelling.

The applicant was represented by Terrence J. Bennett, Esq.

Javier Martinez appeared on behalf of Robin Robbins Realty, LLC and presented the application for bulk variance relief to permit the construction of a new single-family dwelling on a vacant lot.

Mr. Bennett testified that the application required four bulk variances. He explained that the first three variances resulted from changes to the City's zoning standards after the lot had originally been created. According to the tax records, the homes on the adjoining properties were constructed during the 1920s, and the subject parcel was created as a separate building lot at that time. He stated that, although the lot was intended to be developed, subsequent amendments to the zoning ordinance increased the bulk requirements, rendering the lot nonconforming. He testified that the fourth variance related to the unique characteristics of the property. He explained that the lot had remained vacant for many years and contained several mature trees that the applicant wished to preserve. In order to retain those trees while accommodating a reasonably sized single-family dwelling, the proposed design required slightly reduced side yard setbacks. Whereas the ordinance requires 15-foot side yard setbacks, the proposed dwelling would provide approximately 12.7 feet on each side, requiring relief of approximately 2.3 feet per side.

Mr. Finley stated that he had no objections to the application. He stated that the property is an existing nonconforming lot with a typical 50-foot width commonly found in the older sections of the City. He explained that, because the parcel is located on the opposite side of Chestnut Avenue in the R-3 Zone and not R, the side yard setback requirements are greater than those that would apply in the older residential zoning district, where 10-foot side yard setbacks are permitted. Mr. Finley also noted that the City had recently sold the vacant property at public auction with the expectation that it would be developed as a single-family residential lot.

Mr. Headley testified that the adjoining lots to the north and south are of similar size, are developed with comparable single-family homes, and contain similar, or even greater, existing setback deficiencies. He stated

that, although those neighboring conditions predated the current ordinance, the proposed dwelling would be consistent with the character of the neighborhood and would not appear out of place.

Diego Rivera, 2479 S. Lincoln Avenue, gave comments regarding the application. He stated that he resides directly across the street from the property and stated that neighboring residents had maintained the vacant lot for many years while it remained undeveloped. He testified that he believed the lot was too small to accommodate a new home and expressed concern that the proposed dwelling would be situated too close to the adjacent homes. He also explained that there were existing traffic and parking concerns in the neighborhood and stated that additional development would further impact the area. He testified that, several years earlier, he had inquired with the City about acquiring the vacant parcel. Based upon his understanding at that time, he believed the property was not a buildable lot and was intended to be conveyed only to an adjoining property owner. He produced a letter from the City concerning the City's offer, Objector's Exhibit O-1.

Mr. Finley explained that the letter did not indicate the lot was unbuildable. Rather, he explained that when the City offers an undersized parcel directly to adjoining property owners before a public auction, the conveyance is conditioned upon the parcel being merged with the adjoining property so that it cannot be developed separately. He further explained that because the objector declined the offer, the City subsequently sold the parcel through a public auction, permitting the purchaser to seek the approvals necessary to develop the lot.

Mr. Finley explained that while the current R-3 Zone requires a minimum lot width of 90 feet for newly created lots, numerous existing lots in the neighborhood have 50-foot frontages and were created long before the current zoning standards were adopted. He explained that if the property were located in the older residential district on the opposite side of Chestnut Avenue, the required side yard setbacks would be 10 feet rather than 15 feet. He further noted that the applicant was proposing side yard setbacks of approximately 12.7 feet, which was consistent with the established development in the surrounding neighborhood.

Silvestre Ramales, residing at 725 S. Eighth Street, was sworn in with the assistance of a translator, Diego Rivera. He testified that his primary concern was the amount of traffic on that portion of the street. He explained that he has a child with special needs and was concerned that additional residential development across the street could increase traffic and create a safety hazard for his family.

Natividad Morales, 722 S. Eighth Street, testified through the same translator. She questioned whether the proposed structure would be a single-family dwelling or a multi-family or rental property.

Mr. Bennett responded that the application was for one single-family dwelling only, and no duplex or multi-family use was proposed. He responded to the concerns raised by the neighboring residents. He stated that many of the surrounding residents had come to view the vacant parcel as an informal extension of their neighborhood because it had remained undeveloped for many years. However, the City had made the decision to sell the property at public auction with the intention that it be developed as a residential building lot.

The applicant stated that he had no intention of creating problems within the neighborhood. He testified that the construction of a new single-family home would improve the appearance of the vacant parcel and would likely improve surrounding property values. He further stated that he understood Spanish and confirmed that one of the objectors had indicated she would not object if the property were developed with a single-family residence, but was concerned that it might become a duplex or other multi-family dwelling.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

ACOSTA RENTALS LLC, 625 E. Cherry Street, Block 4115, Lot 7, Zone R, certification of non-conforming use for a two-unit family dwelling.

The applicant was represented by Terrence J. Bennett, Esq. He explained that this application was one of four related applications involving existing nonconforming duplex properties owned by Acosta Rentals, LLC. Mr. Bennett testified that each of the four properties had been acquired by the applicant more than twenty years ago. He stated that each property was already developed and occupied as a duplex at the time of purchase and had continuously remained in that use. The applicant had submitted the City's Property Record Cards for each property, demonstrating the longstanding duplex use, as well as the rental registration documents for each property. He stated that these records established the historic existence of the duplexes and supported the applicant's request.

Loida Acosta, principal of Acosta Rentals, LLC, 4930 Covered Bridge Road, Millville, New Jersey. She testified that the property at 625 E. Cherry Street was purchased in 1994 and that it was already occupied as a duplex at the time of purchase. She stated that the property has continuously remained a duplex since that time. The property has been consistently registered as a rental property and has undergone the required inspections over the years. The annual inspection and registration records support the longstanding existence of the duplex.

Mr. Finley confirmed that he had reviewed the documentation submitted with the application. He noted that the Property Record Card identifies the structure as a "2-family conversion." Although the exact date shown on the record card could not be verified with certainty, he testified that the card dates back to at least 1971, providing substantial evidence that the property was being used as a duplex at that time. Mr. Finley further stated that the applicant had submitted a current floor plan depicting the existing layout of the dwelling, along with a recent survey identifying the property's existing conditions and bulk nonconformities.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Andrew Groetsch: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Rudolph Luisi: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

ACOSTA RENTALS LLC, 627 E. Cherry Street, Block 4115, Lot 8, Zone R, certification of non-conforming use for a two-unit family dwelling and an additional single-family dwelling on a single lot.

The applicant was represented by Terrence J. Bennett, Esq.

Loida Acosta, principal of Acosta Rentals, LLC, testified regarding the application for 627 E. Cherry Street. Ms. Acosta confirmed that she purchased the property in 1987 and testified that the existing use has remained unchanged since the time of purchase. She explained that the property consists of a two-family dwelling together with a separate single-family dwelling located to the rear of the lot, and that both have continuously existed in that configuration during his ownership.

Mr. Finley reviewed the documentation submitted with the application and stated that the Property Record Card identifies the principal structure as a "2-family conversion." He noted that the record card lists the principal dwelling as having been constructed in 1902 and the detached rear dwelling as having been constructed in 1930. The record card does not specifically indicate whether the principal structure was originally built as a two-family dwelling, but it was historically common in Vineland for smaller detached dwellings to be constructed behind principal residences on the same lot. Although such a configuration would represent a significant nonconformity under current zoning standards, it was not unusual when originally established. He also stated that the applicant had submitted a current survey depicting the property's existing conditions and existing bulk nonconformities, together with floor plans of the buildings.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

ACOSTA RENTALS LLC, 715 E. Montrose Street, Block 4103, Lot 3, Zone R, certification of non-conforming use for a two-unit family dwelling.

The applicant was represented by Terrence J. Bennett, Esq.

Loida Acosta, principal of Acosta Rentals, LLC, testified regarding the application for 715 E. Montrose Street. Ms. Acosta confirmed that she purchased the property in 2002 and testified that it was already being used as a duplex at the time of purchase. She stated that the property's use has remained unchanged throughout ownership.

Mr. Finley reviewed the documentation submitted with the application and noted that the Property Record Card identifies the structure as a two-family dwelling. Unlike the previous applications, the record card does not describe the building as a conversion, but instead identifies it as a two-family dwelling constructed in 1900, with subsequent ownership changes reflected over the years. Mr. Finley testified that the applicant had also submitted a current survey depicting the existing site conditions and existing bulk nonconformities, together with floor plans documenting the present layout of the building.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes
Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

ACOSTA RENTALS LLC, 229 W. Plum Street, Block 2915, Lot 5, Zone R, certification of non-conforming use for a two-unit family dwelling.

The applicant was represented by Terrence J. Bennett, Esq.

Loida Acosta, principal of Acosta Rentals, LLC, testified regarding the application for 229 W. Plum Street. Ms. Acosta stated that he purchased the property in 1990 and that it was already being used as a duplex at the time of purchase. She testified that the property has continuously remained a duplex and is presently occupied as such.

Mr. Finley reviewed the documentation submitted with the application and testified that the Property Record Card identifies the principal structure as a two-family conversion. The record card indicates the building was originally constructed in 1915, although the exact date of its conversion to a two-family dwelling could not be determined. Mr. Finley noted that the property record contains entries dating back to the 1970s and 1980s and suggested that the conversion likely occurred by the early 1980s. Based on the available records, he concluded that the property has existed as a duplex for at least 40 to 50 years. He also noted that the applicant submitted a current survey depicting the existing site conditions and bulk nonconformities, together with detailed floor plans documenting the existing layout of the building.

Mr. Finley asked the applicant to clarify the use of two rooms shown on the first-floor plan that were labeled as a study and a den. Ms. Acosta confirmed that neither room is used as bedrooms.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

THOMAS BELL III, 48 N. Myrtle Street, Block 3101, Lot 12, Zone R, certification of non-conforming use for a two-unit family dwelling.

The applicant was represented by Terrence J. Bennett, Esq. Mr. Bennett explained that the longtime owner of the property had recently passed away and that Mr. Bell was assisting with the administration of the estate.

Gregory Bell testified regarding the application. He explained that the property had belonged to his father and that, following his father's death, ownership passed to all eight of his father's children, including himself. The Solicitor confirmed that, as a titled owner, Mr. Bell was competent to testify regarding the property's history and use.

Mr. Bennett stated that additional documentation had been submitted prior to the hearing, including historic rental agreements dating back to approximately 1990, together with other records demonstrating the longstanding rental use of the property.

Mr. Bell testified that the property is currently vacant and that he has been overseeing and maintaining it. He stated that he has been associated with the property since 2011 and confirmed that the rear apartment had existed as a residential rental unit.

Mr. Finley clarified that the property is not a traditional duplex. Rather, it consists of a single-family dwelling located at the front with a detached garage containing a one-bedroom apartment. He explained that the application specifically concerned the certification of the apartment located over the detached garage. He conducted an extensive review of the City's historical records because a Certificate of Occupancy was required in connection with the pending sale of the property. Through that review, staff found substantial evidence confirming the longstanding existence of the one-bedroom apartment above the garage. Although no original approval for the apartment itself was located, Mr. Finley testified that the Board had previously considered an application several decades earlier seeking to enlarge the apartment and had denied that request. In his opinion, that prior action demonstrated that the Zoning Board had recognized the apartment as an existing use. The matter was brought before the Board because the apartment had fallen vacant in recent years following the deaths of the longtime owners and because renovation work had begun without obtaining the necessary approvals. As portions of the apartment had been gutted and altered, questions arose regarding the extent of the previously existing nonconforming use. Rather than making an administrative determination regarding abandonment, Mr. Finley explained that it was appropriate to seek a formal certification from the Board. He stated that, based upon the historical documentation, he was satisfied that a one-bedroom apartment had continuously existed above the garage for many years. Mr. Finley reviewed the submitted floor plans, which depicted the apartment as one bedroom, a combined kitchen, dining, and living area, located entirely on the second floor above the garage. He requested that a room shown only as "Room" on the first floor be relabeled as residential storage room to clarify that it is not part of the apartment. He also cautioned that any future renovations must remain consistent with the one-bedroom apartment approved by the Board and that any expansion or modification would require additional zoning approvals.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

RESTEK CORPORATION, 510 N. West Boulevard/412 Erin Street, Block 2234, Lots 7 & 8, Zones RB-1/R-1, preliminary/final major site plan approval to construct a 7,860 square foot building addition to an existing 9,185± square foot scientific glass manufacturing facility along with associated site improvements.

The applicant was represented by Michael Gruccio, Esq. He testified that Glasstron, Inc. owns and operates the scientific glass fabrication facility located on the property. Restek Corporation, the applicant, owns one hundred percent of the issued and outstanding shares of Glasstron, Inc. The property itself is owned by Plus One Property, LLC, of which Restek owns one hundred percent of the membership interest. He further explained that Restek is

owned through an employee profit-sharing and employee stock ownership trust (ESOP), which includes approximately 55,134 participants. He stated that this ownership explanation was consistent with the disclosure statements submitted with the application.

The property consists of two separate lots and is split-zoned. As condition of any approval, the applicant agreed to consolidate the two lots through the recording of an all-inclusive deed. The application was for preliminary and final major site plan approval following the Board's prior approval of a use variance for the expansion of the existing scientific glass fabrication facility. He noted that the Board granted the use variance on February 18, 2026, and adopted a memorializing resolution on March 18, 2026, Resolution No. 2026-12. Mr. Gruccio explained that the previously approved use variance authorized the expansion of the existing precision scientific glass fabrication facility by 8,700 square feet. He explained that the current site plan proposes a slightly smaller addition totaling 7,860 square feet, representing a reduction of approximately 840 square feet from the area authorized under the use variance. He stated that the application sought preliminary and final major site plan approval for the reduced building expansion together with associated site improvements. Mr. Gruccio testified that the property is located within both the RB-1 (Residential Business) and R-1 (Residential) zones. Because neither zoning district permits the existing industrial use, the previously approved use variance was required to authorize the building expansion. He further reminded the Board that evidence presented during the use variance hearing established that the scientific glass fabrication facility was originally constructed and began operations in approximately 1970, at a time when the entire property was zoned for industrial purposes. Mr. Gruccio explained that, in addition to the building expansion, the site plan includes a number of improvements and upgrades to the property. He indicated that those technical aspects of the application would be presented in detail by the applicant's engineer, Steve Nardelli of Fralinger Engineering.

Stephen Nardelli, Professional Engineer and Professional Planner, and Matthew Wolfe, Engineering, Maintenance, and Facilities Manager for Restek testified on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Nardelli discussed truck loading and delivery operations along Aaron Street. He testified that revised plans illustrated the proposed truck circulation pattern. He explained that deliveries are made using box trucks, which enter an existing paved area adjacent to the building. Mr. Nardelli testified that the revised circulation plan also permits portions of the existing pavement to be removed and replaced with landscaped areas, therefore reducing impervious coverage and improving the streetscape. He addressed the proposed trash enclosure, explaining that the original site plan did not include an exterior refuse enclosure. The revised plans now provide a trash enclosure adjacent to an existing access drive near the rear of the building, allowing refuse collection vehicles to safely access and service the enclosure.

Mr. Headley stated that the addition of the enclosure addressed the Planning Division's comments. The trash enclosure should be located at least six feet from the property line, as required for accessory structures, to avoid the need for an additional variance. Mr. Nardelli agreed to relocate the enclosure to comply with that requirement.

Mr. Nardelli reviewed the submitted truck turning exhibits, which demonstrate that the largest anticipated delivery vehicles, including trash collection trucks, can safely maneuver throughout the site. He testified that the turning templates confirm adequate circulation for loading, unloading, and trash collection without conflicts. Mr. Headley indicated that the turning analysis satisfactorily addressed the engineering review comments. He then reviewed the requested variances and design waivers identified in the Planning Report.

Item 6a, regarding the front yard setback along Erin Street, Mr. Nardelli testified that the ordinance requires a 20-foot setback while the existing building maintains a 15-foot setback. The proposed building addition simply extends the existing building line and does not increase the existing setback. Item 6b, lot coverage, maximum lot coverage is 45 percent, whereas 50 percent is proposed. He testified that the modest increase results from the building expansion together with associated parking and site improvements. Item 6c, buffer along Erin Street, the existing condition consists primarily of pavement extending from the curb to the building. As previously

described, the revised plans reduce paved areas and introduce landscaping wherever practical while still maintaining truck access.

Mr. Gruccio noted that the applicant was requesting approval to maintain the remaining nonconforming conditions identified in the Planning Report in item 7.

Mr. Nardelli then addressed item 8, stormwater management waivers. Item 8a, he testified that the applicant proposes a four-foot-high solid fence surrounding the stormwater basin in lieu of the six-foot fence required by ordinance. In his opinion, a four-foot decorative fence would provide an improved appearance while continuing to serve its intended purpose. Item 8b and c, he testified that waivers were requested to permit portions of the stormwater basin within the required front and side setback areas because of the unique configuration of the property, which fronts on three separate streets. He explained that the basin had been located to maximize available parking while providing the required stormwater management. Mr. Headley indicated that the requested waivers were acceptable.

Mr. Nardelli addressed item 9, landscape and parking lot design waivers. Item 9a, the ordinance requires larger landscaped parking islands; however, the proposed islands provide seven feet of width because of the constrained layout of the site. He explained that this configuration remains functional while accommodating the required parking and circulation patterns. Item 9b, waiver from providing parking space row length without a tree island break, 14 and 15 space rows provided whereas 12 space row is required. Item 9d, street shade trees, La France Street (1 trees provided vs. 5 trees required at 1 per 50 feet of frontage). The landscape plan provides additional perimeter landscaping and street trees where feasible, including along the frontage adjacent to the proposed stormwater basin. Mr. Nardelli testified that, in his professional opinion as both an engineer and planner, the proposed landscaping plan is appropriate for the size of the property and the nature of the industrial use while achieving the landscaping standards. Item 9e, waiver from street shade trees, N West Boulevard (4 trees provided vs. 6 trees required at 1 per 50 feet of frontage). He explained that along Erin Street, no shade trees are proposed because of the proximity of the existing building to the street and the operational requirements associated with truck access and loading activities. He testified that, although shade trees cannot be accommodated in that area, the portions of pavement being removed parallel to Erin Street will instead be converted to landscaped green space, improving the appearance of the frontage while preserving the necessary truck maneuvering area. Mr. Nardelli further testified that the revised landscaping plan proposes one shade tree along France Street, together with additional landscaping associated with the stormwater basin. Along Northwest Boulevard, the plan provides four shade trees, including two within newly grassed areas created by the removal of existing pavement and two additional trees elsewhere along the frontage. Mr. Gruccio noted that the applicant would comply with item 9f to provide an irrigation system. Mr. Nardelli then addressed item 9g, he testified that the landscape plan would be revised to substitute lower-growing evergreen plantings along the frontage while retaining taller evergreen screening where appropriate along the side property lines.

Item 10a, waiver for driveway width-minimum, two-way, 20 feet provided whereas 24 feet required. He explained that this driveway is intended primarily for maintenance personnel and equipment, including lawn maintenance vehicles, and is not designed to serve regular vehicular traffic.

Item 11, Mr. Nardelli testified that the applicant would comply and install the required bicycle rack. Item 11b, he explained that current stormwater management regulations require significantly larger detention basins than in previous years, making site design more challenging on constrained properties. The basin's location was determined by the site's topography and grading requirements while also preserving the parking needed to serve the facility and its employees. The property contains three separate street frontages, portions of the basin necessarily extend into required front yard setback areas. Mr. Nardelli explained that the proposed location is the most practical under the circumstances.

Item 11c, waiver for the shape of a stormwater management basin in a front yard (Curvilinear edge required). The applicant proposes a more functional basin geometry that better accommodates the site area while continuing to meet all stormwater management performance standards. Mr. Nardelli testified that the proposed design is appropriate for the operational needs of the site and remains fully compliant with applicable stormwater requirements.

Item 14, Mr. Gruccio verified the number of employees occupying the facility during the principal work shift. He stated that there are 42 employees during a primary work shift. Mr. Nardelli explained that the revised site plan provides 49 off-street parking spaces, exceeding the ordinance requirement of one parking space per employee. He therefore confirmed that no parking variance is required.

Mr. Nardelli testified that the applicant requested a waiver for item 17e, provide other data which may pertain to the particular site and use, including traffic and environmental studies or impact analyses.

Mr. Gruccio referred to item 6, of the Engineering Report concerning the stormwater management basin. Mr. Nardelli explained that the report recommends locating the one-foot freeboard elevation of the basin so that it complies with the minimum required yard setbacks. He testified that because the freeboard berm lies immediately adjacent to the basin itself, the same setback relief requested for the basin would apply to the freeboard area.

Matthew Wolfe, Maintenance, and Facilities Manager for Restek, testified on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Wolfe confirmed that the facility employs 42 employees during its principal work shift, consistent with the parking calculations previously presented to the Board. He testified that the proposed site plan provides sufficient off-street parking to accommodate the facility's staffing needs. He also testified regarding delivery operations at the facility. He confirmed that pickups and deliveries utilizing the Erin Street frontage are typically done by box trucks rather than larger tractor-trailers.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve Resolution 2026-25.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

VCMS, LLC, 918 N. Delsea Drive, Block 2104, Lot 82, Zones B-2/R-2, use variance for the expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming residential use.

The applicant was represented by Michael Gruccio, Esq. He advised the Board that Mr. Vincent Crocilla was present to answer any factual questions regarding the application.

He explained that the application sought use variance approval to permit a 137-square-foot expansion of an existing pre-existing nonconforming dwelling located on a 1.73-acre property. He testified that the proposed expansion would occur entirely within the existing footprint of the building by extending the walls of the second-floor dwelling unit to align with the walls of the first-floor unit. As a result, the second-floor apartment would be enlarged by approximately 137 square feet, improving its functionality without increasing the building footprint.

By way of historical background, he testified that the two-family dwelling received a use variance from the Zoning Board on May 19, 1999, authorizing the lawful continuation of the duplex. He explained that, although the exact circumstances surrounding the original conversion of the building were unclear, the Board's 1999 approval formally recognized and legitimized the property's use as a two-family dwelling. The existing duplex has remained a lawful pre-existing nonconforming use since that time.

Mr. Gruccio described the overall property layout, explaining that the site contains two principal buildings. The front building is located within the B-3 zone and contains a commercial use on the first floor with a residential dwelling unit on the second floor, both of which are permitted uses within that zone. This application concerns only the rear building, which contains the existing two-family dwelling. The project would not increase the number of bedrooms within the second-floor apartment. Instead, the additional floor area would simply extend the existing exterior walls so that the second-floor unit aligns with the first-floor walls, creating a more practical and livable interior layout. He characterized the proposal as a de minimis expansion of an existing nonconforming use. He noted that, although the rear building requires a use variance because of the property's unique circumstances, two-family dwellings are permitted in zone. He explained that, if the building existed independently within an R-2 zoning district, the residential use itself would be permitted.

Mr. Finley stated that he agreed with Mr. Gruccio's characterization of the application as a very minor expansion of an existing nonconforming use. He testified that the proposed addition of only 137 square feet would improve the habitability of the second-floor apartment without intensifying the existing use. He also commented that the applicant is a relatively new owner of the property and has undertaken substantial improvements to rehabilitate the site, which had previously been in a deteriorated condition.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

Meeting adjourned at 8:42 PM

Roll call:
Terry Andrus: Yes
Albert Fisher: Yes
Joseph Repice: Yes
Joseph Stefano: Yes
Luis Amberths: Yes
George LoBiondo: Yes

Yasmin Perez, Secretary
Zoning Board of Adjustment