

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING

July 15, 2026

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

Members present were:

Luis Amberths
Terry Andrus
Andrew Groetsch
Eric Hernandez
Albert Fisher
Joseph Repice
Joseph Stefano
George LoBiondo

Members absent: Ryan Flaim, Rudolph Luisi

Others Present were:

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

The meeting was being held in accordance with the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act. Notice of the meeting was given on December 16, 2025, and was posted on the official bulletin board in City Hall, posted on the City's website, and published in the Vineland Daily Journal.

Ms. Moscillo went over revisions to the agenda.

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the June 17, 2026, meeting.

Roll call:

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

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the resolutions from the June 17, 2026, meeting.

Resolutions 2026-26, 2026-27, 2026-28, 2026-29, 2026-30, 2026-31, 2026-32, 2026-33, 2026-34.

Roll call:

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

LYNN RICHARD, 2308 Scarpa Drive, Block 2502, Lot 24, Zone R-3, installation of a 6-foot-high fence on a corner lot with two front yards.

Ms. Lynn Richard testified on her own behalf. She explained that she had recently purchased the property and was seeking approval to install a six-foot vinyl privacy fence around the portion of the property functioning as her backyard. Because the property is a corner lot, both Scarpa Drive and Chapel Drive are treated as frontage, which limits the height and type of fencing permitted in the area. Ms. Richard explained that she lives at the property with her sister, mother, and niece and desired additional privacy and security. She stated that the proposed six-foot vinyl fence would provide the privacy she needed, while also enclosing the backyard for safety and helping to prevent people from entering the property. She also referenced security alerts involving people passing through backyards and checking vehicles and stated that the fence would provide an additional barrier. She further noted that the property has experienced visits from wildlife, including turkeys and foxes, and that the fence would help keep such animals out of the yard.

Ms. Richard presented information regarding the proposed fence and explained that she preferred a vinyl privacy fence rather than an aluminum fence because the vinyl fence would provide greater privacy. She stated that the proposed fence would be located sufficiently away from the corner and that the existing sight triangle would remain unobstructed. She also explained that the gas line would remain accessible outside of the fenced area. She clarified that the requested six-foot fence would be located along the Chapel Drive frontage and would extend toward the house, connecting with the neighboring fence.

Mr. Crudele stated that the application was consistent with similar corner-lot fence situations and that the primary concern was ensuring that the fence did not create a sight obstruction or hazard. He indicated that the proposed fence appeared to be sufficiently set back from the right-of-way and that there was no objection from the zoning staff.

Mr. Headley stated that corner lots can present a hardship for property owners who wish to safely enclose and enjoy their rear yards, particularly where there are children, pets, or other safety concerns. He stated that he had no objection to the application.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

JERSEY TOP QUALITY CONSTRUCTION, LLC, 269 E. Garden Road, Block 1301, Lot 2, Zone A-5, construction of a single-family dwelling with requested bulk variances for lot area, lot frontage, lot width and side yard setback.

The applicant was represented by Peter Bonfiglio, Esq. The applicant sought several C-1 bulk variances in connection with the proposed construction of a single-family dwelling. Mr. Bonfiglio stated that the A-5 Zone requires a minimum lot area of 100,000 square feet, while the subject property contains approximately 37,262 square feet. The application also requested relief from the required 250-foot frontage, where the property has 100 feet; the required 250-foot lot width, where the property has 100 feet; and the required 40-foot side-yard setback, where 30.8 feet is proposed.

Mr. Paul Bracham testified on behalf of the application. He confirmed that the purpose of the application was to construct a single-family home on the vacant property. He further confirmed that the adjacent properties on both sides were vacant.

Mr. Bonfiglio explained that the property's narrowness and undersized nature created an existing hardship because the lot was significantly smaller than the minimum area and width required in the A-5 Zone. He maintained that the hardship was not created by the applicant and that, without the requested variances, the property could not reasonably be developed, even though a single-family dwelling is a permitted use in the zone. He further stated that granting the variances would not create a detriment to the public good or substantially impair the intent of the zoning plan because the proposed use is permitted within the A-5 Zone.

Mr. Crudele stated that the property was representative of the long, narrow agricultural lots found throughout Vineland and that there are numerous properties in the agricultural zone with frontage limitations. He stated that there was no objection to the application. Mr. Headley agreed with Mr. Crudele.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

BMM HOLDINGS QOZB, LLC, 220 S. Seventh Street, Block 4010, Lot 13, Zone R, construction of a two-family dwelling with requested bulk variances for lot depth and lot area.

The applicant was represented by Matthew Robinson, Esq. He described the matter as a relatively straightforward application involving an undersized lot. Although the property is one of the larger lots in the immediate surrounding area, it remains undersized under the applicable district regulations. The applicant proposed construction of a new duplex, which is a permitted use in the zone, and sought two C bulk variances. He identified the variance plan as an exhibit and also submitted renderings and corresponding floor plans of the proposed duplex.

Mr. Phil Black, owner of BMM Holdings, testified on his own behalf. He confirmed that he intends to construct a new duplex on the property. He explained that a five-unit building had previously occupied the property but had been condemned and demolished by the City. The property was subsequently foreclosed upon by the mortgage holder, and Mr. Black purchased the vacant lot from the mortgage company. He confirmed that the prior use had been a five-unit structure and that the current proposal would reduce the number of units to two. Mr. Black also testified that he operates a construction and development company and has experience constructing single-family homes throughout Vineland and South Jersey.

Andrew Schaefer, Licensed Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the existing nonconformities involved a lot depth of 100 feet where 150 feet is required and a lot area of 10,000 square feet where 15,000 square feet is required. He confirmed that the application sought two C variances and that no setback variances were requested. Mr. Schaefer stated that the proposed development would remain well below the maximum permitted impervious coverage and that the proposed design fits within the applicable setback requirements. He also identified a proposed rain garden at the rear of the property as part of the site's water-management measures.

Mr. Black testified that each side of the proposed duplex would contain three bedrooms and two and one-half bathrooms. Each unit would have its own attached garage as well as driveway parking sufficient for two vehicles. The proposed parking arrangement would satisfy the applicable RSIS parking standards for a three-bedroom unit.

Mr. Schaefer testified that the requested relief was justified under the C-1 criteria because the lot's undersized condition and reduced depth constituted an existing hardship that could not reasonably be corrected by acquiring adjoining property. He noted that the surrounding neighborhood contains other duplexes and apartment buildings on smaller lots and that the proposed development would be consistent with the character of the area. He further testified that, under the C-2 criteria, the proposal would provide benefits including improved aesthetics, additional off-street parking, and redevelopment of a vacant lot that could otherwise attract undesirable activity. He stated that the proposed development would not create a detriment and would eliminate certain existing conditions associated with the vacant property.

Mr. Crudele stated that the property had previously contained a five-unit dwelling that had been demolished and that the proposed duplex would constitute a conforming use in the zone. He stated that redevelopment of the property into a conforming use would be beneficial and that there was a need for this type of housing in the downtown area. He recommended that the submitted elevations and floor plans be memorialized as part of the approval. He also requested that the first- and second-floor room counts be memorialized. The proposed floor plan was described as containing, on each side, a first floor with a family room, kitchen, dinette, and powder room, and a second floor with three bedrooms, including a master bedroom, two full bathrooms, and a laundry area.

Mr. Black confirmed that the floor plans accurately represented the proposed construction.

Mr. Headley stated that the proposed duplex would not be detrimental to the surrounding area and noted that similar duplex development occurs on smaller lots elsewhere in the area.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

ALEX GOLDBERG & ASHLEY HERNANDEZ, 1138 E. Landis Avenue, Block 3112, Lot 19, Zone R-P, maintain an existing 6-foot-high fence on a corner lot with two front yards.

Mr. Goldberg and Ms. Hernandez were sworn in and testified regarding their request to maintain an existing six-foot-high fence on their corner-lot property.

Ms. Hernandez explained that they had installed the fence and subsequently learned that, because the property is a corner lot, the area in question is considered front yard for zoning purposes. She stated that the fenced area extends toward the sidewalk and that a significant portion of the property consists of what is treated as front yard. She explained that they have a special-needs son who is approximately six feet, four inches tall and that a four-foot fence would not adequately contain him. She testified that much of the rear portion of the property is already paved with asphalt, making it costly to remove the asphalt and replace it with grass. The enclosed area adjacent to the garage represents the principal grassy portion where their son can safely play.

Ms. Hernandez further explained that their son had previously gotten out of the yard at their former residence and was involved in a bicycle accident that resulted in significant injuries, including a fractured skull and other injuries requiring hospitalization. She stated that the purpose of the six-foot fence was to provide a safe, enclosed area where their son could play without access to traffic or the paved portions of the property. She also explained that they had not been aware of the zoning requirements when the fence was installed and had been advised by the fencing company that a permit was not required. Once they learned of the zoning issue, they immediately began the application process. The applicants requested permission to maintain the fence in its existing location rather than moving it

farther into the property, which they stated would substantially reduce the already limited grassy area available.

Mr. Crudele stated that there was no objection to the application, particularly in light of the circumstances presented. He also noted that he was familiar with the property and that the white vinyl fence was not out of character with the neighborhood. He stated that the fence appeared attractive and that there were no sight-distance concerns because the neighboring driveway configuration provided adequate visibility.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Fisher made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

SJ GLASS AND DOOR, 3278 S West Boulevard, Block 7004, Lot 10.1, extension request for resolution #2023-48.

The Board's professional staff explained that the applicant had previously received a one-year extension and was now requesting two additional one-year extensions. The existing extension was scheduled to expire on July 19, 2026, and the requested extensions would extend the approval through 2028. The applicant submitted a fee of \$1,960, representing payment for two years of extensions.

Board Planner/Engineer Ryan Headley explained that, while the Board has historically worked with applicants and granted extensions as a courtesy, he considered a two-year extension at this point unusual. He recommended limiting the approval to one year. He explained that, under the Municipal Land Use Law, extensions are generally justified when an applicant is delayed by a governmental agency, such as a required permit or approval. Although the Board has traditionally been accommodating when applicants encounter delays or unforeseen circumstances, he expressed concern about granting extensions further in advance than circumstances would justify and noted that doing so could encourage applicants to seek multiple extensions immediately after obtaining an approval.

Board members discussed the request, including the fact that the applicant had already submitted and paid the \$1,960 fee for two years. A Board member noted that the applicant had been a good neighbor,

had complied with the City's requirements, and had submitted site plans that were satisfactory. The Chairman noted that limiting the extension to one year would potentially require the City to address the fee already submitted and could create an administrative issue for the applicant. The Board was advised that the motion could either grant the two-year extension as requested or limit the extension to one year. The Chairman also noted that if a motion for two years failed, a subsequent motion for one year could be considered.

No members of the public appeared to speak on the matter. The public hearing was closed upon motion and second, with the motion receiving approval by roll call vote. Mr. Stefano then made a motion to grant the requested two-year extension, citing the fact that the applicant had already paid the applicable fee, had been a good neighbor, maintained a well-kept property, and had operated in Vineland for many years. The motion was seconded. The motion to grant the two-year extension was approved by a majority roll call vote, with the Chairman voting against the motion and the remaining voting members voting in favor. Accordingly, the two-year extension was granted.

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the extension.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

Meeting adjourned at 7:46 PM

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Eric Hernandez: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Luis Amberths: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Yasmin Perez, Secretary

Zoning Board of Adjustment