



Township of Montclair

205 Claremont Avenue

Montclair, NJ 07042

tel: 973-509-4954

fax: 973-509-4943

MONTCLAIR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT



Janice E. Talley, PP/AICP
Director of Planning and Community Development
jtalley@montclairnjusa.org

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT APRIL 1, 2015

ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Janice Talley. Ms. Talley read the notice of compliance with the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act and indicated that appropriate notice was forwarded to the officially designated newspaper of Montclair and posted in the Municipal Building. The schedule of meetings is also posted on the Town website.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Talley called the roll. Present were Chair Harrison, Vice Chair Fleischer, Mr. Kenney, Ms. Baggs, Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Checca, Mr. Susswein, Mr. Moore, Ms. Brinkman, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Talley and Mr. Petto.

MINUTES: The minutes of the March 4, 2015 were offered for any suggested changes. Mr. Harrison provided edits. Ms. Baggs also provided a change. A motion to approve the minutes was offered by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Susswein and approved unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

App. 2399: 491 Bloomfield Avenue, LLC. 491 Bloomfield Avenue. *Use variance to permit office on the first floor and site plan application for addition*

David Owen represented the applicant and provided preliminary comments reviewing the proposed project. Mr. Owen called Bob Silver, lead developer for the applicant to testify.

Mr. Silver provided an overview of other projects that have been completed by the applicant in the area.

Mr. Silver stated that the subject property has been vacant since 2011. He indicated that based upon the proposed plans, tenants have shown an interest in the subject property.

Mr. Silver explained that a medical animation firm is interested in the project's concourse level space. On the first floor of the subject property, a coffee shop is interested in the eastern half of the floor and an insurance agency is interested in the western half. The second floor, which will be built as part of the proposed plans, and the third floor addition will be available for rent. Mr. Silver noted that the project will seek LEED certification as well.

Mr. Silver discussed the parking arrangement for the project. He stated that 59 parking permits for the fourth level of the North Fullerton garage have been secured for the project.

Mr. Kenney had a concern about the parking and asked if these permits would allow for shared parking. Mr. Silver replied that the permits are available only from 6:00AM to 8:00PM Monday through Friday and they are not available outside of those times.

Mr. Harrison asked if the number of spaces was 59 in total.

Ms. Baggs asked if adaptations were considered in the design of the bridge if the parking deck needed to be replaced in the future. She asked if responsibilities for replacing the bridge had been determined.

Mr. Harrison asked how snow is removed from the upper level of the parking deck. Mr. Silver stated that the Township has handled snow removal. He also noted that the parking deck can close during inclement weather, which is noted in the parking permit agreement.

Mr. Owen then called Paul Sionas, the project architect, to provide testimony.

Mr. Sionas distributed Exhibit A-1, slides of the PowerPoint presentation he had prepared. He also submitted Exhibit A-2, revised plans originally dated November 24, 2014 with revisions dated February 2, 2015.

Mr. Sionas reviewed the details project and presented his presentation.

Questions from the Board were then received.

Mr. Fleischer asked questions with respect to historic preservation. He asked what the rationale was for the twenty foot high entryway with the large clock at the entry from fourth level of the North Fullerton parking garage. Mr. Sionas responded that the intent was to create a visible entry which would be visible from all areas of the parking deck. Mr. Fleischer responded that the height seemed questionable and not necessarily in the right place.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the reinstallation of the balustrade along the front façade. He noted that it would visually link the building with the adjacent property. Mr. Sionas stated that there was no discussion of the reinstallation with the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Mr. Sionas noted that the windows would have the same rhythm.

Mr. Fleischer noted that three feet is a very small setback for the proposed third floor addition. He said that this did not seem in alignment with historic preservation, noting that it is barely set back from the front of the building. Mr. Sionas responded that the HPC did not discuss the setback distance. He noted that the HPC did mention the use of a different brick to distinguish the addition. Mr. Fleischer suggested perhaps a different material should be used. Mr. Sionas noted that they will be returning to the HPC to discuss final materials.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the windows for the project. He noted that he understands the need to replace the windows as discussed during Mr. Sionas' presentation. However, Mr. Fleischer stated that the replacement windows should replicate the historic windows and not be replaced by a picture window. He asked if a window could be replicated that is comparative to the historic façade. Mr. Sionas noted that the mullions have been removed in the proposed project and that the HPC was supportive. He also noted that the HPC supported the installation of the picture windows.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the proposed use on the first floor and whether the proposed use on the east side of the property has no retail potential. Mr. Owen answered that questions on use will be addressed by other experts that would be testifying.

Mr. Fleischer asked how the tenant was selected. He stated that he is concerned about maintaining storefronts and noted that a suitable retail tenant should be found.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the large sign on the front façade. He noted that historically there has always been a sign on the façade and was surprised there was no replacement. He noted it would require another variance but thought it was important.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the trash and recycling area and if there was a possibility to obtain more than 42 inches of clearance for a full swinging door opening to the area. Mr. Sionas replied it would be difficult given the need for trash and recycling, which is required for LEED certification. He stated that the recycling require more room. He noted that the doors will be sliding or rolling.

Mr. Reynolds noted that the proposed use of the storefront by an insurance agent was a concern.

Ms. Baggs asked Mr. Sionas to review the public access to the building. Specifically, she asked if a member of the public would have access from the fourth level of the North Fullerton parking deck through the building to the street. Mr. Sionas stated that the entrance to the building from the fourth level of the parking deck would be keyed and locked.

Ms. Baggs asked if the parking area would be for tenants of the building only. Mr. Silver replied yes.

Mr. Kenney asked about the stairwells in the parking deck, located on the north and west sides. He was what would be done to the existing stairs in the parking deck. Mr. Sionas noted that they are in poor condition. Mr. Silver replied that the parking deck is not owned by applicant. He noted that encouraging conversations have been held with the Township to address the condition of the stairs. Ms. Talley noted that the Township has contracted with a new management company to maintain the parking deck. Mr. Kenney asked if the stairs were functional. Mr. Sionas replied yes.

Mr. Kenney asked if any accessible parking would be provided. Mr. Sionas responded that two parking stalls adjacent to the entrance to the building from the fourth floor of the parking deck would be ADA compliant.

Mr. Susswein asked about the proposed signage for the front façade. He noted that the requested signage is not in accordance with the Township ordinance. He asked if the ordinance is out-of-date. Mr. Sionas replied that Mr. Steck would address the signage, however Mr. Sionas noted that the sign above the entry doors is nice and standard.

Mr. Moore noted the lights to be mounted on the side of the building along the pedestrian walkway/stairway from the parking deck to Bloomfield Avenue. He noted that they are mounted nine feet high and extend over the walkway/stairway. He expressed concern about the impact that youth may have on the fixtures given the proximity to the YMCA. He asked if any security would be installed in the

walkway/stairway. Mr. Sionas replied that the lighting was meant to be attractive and provide safety. He also noted that security cameras are to be installed.

Mr. Moore asked if the plans could connect the building to the parking deck with a publicly accessible stairwell. Mr. Sionas noted that there is already an existing public stairwell.

Ms. Brinkman asked if the applicant had considered creating a public lobby in the front of the building to avoid removing the existing window areas and limestone work. Ms. Brinkman noted concern about matching the limestone around the proposed new doors on the front façade. She noted that the third floor addition should be lighter than the remaining building to allow it to recede visually. Ms. Brinkman asked about the cornice and if there was capping or casing on it presently. Mr. Sionas replied that the aluminum casing would be removed as well as the old light box.

Ms. Brinkman asked about the installation of the LED lights into the columns and if there would be any damage to the stone.

Ms. Brinkman asked about the pedestrian bridge and if there is any chain link fence and if it would be replaced. Mr. Sionas replied that the existing chain link fence would remain. Ms. Brinkman noted concern about items being thrown from the bridge.

Mr. Harrison asked about how customers would access the interior of the building, whether from the front or the side. Mr. Sionas replied that customers could enter the building from either the front or the side, as directed by the tenants.

Mr. Harrison asked about the coffee shop and the proposed State Farm tenants in the front of the building. He asked if their customers would enter from the front or the side of the building. Mr. Sionas replied that those tenants would have doors on Bloomfield Avenue through the front of the building.

Mr. Harrison noted that there is permit parking on the third and fourth level of the North Fullerton parking deck. He asked how drivers would know the spaces are permit only and if there would be any signage. Mr. Owen presented a copy of the 4th level parking permit for the Board to review, a Fullerton Deck Day Permit.

Mr. Silver noted that updates were forthcoming to the parking ordinance and that day and night permits would be available for the third and fourth level of the parking deck.

Mr. Harrison asked if the signs for the coffee shop and State Farm were to be illuminated. Mr. Sionas replied that they would be illuminated with a halo behind each letter.

Mr. Harrison asked how many lights were mounted on each canopy light fixture over the walkway/stairway. Mr. Sionas replied 14 lights per fixture.

Mr. Harrison asked if there had been any thought to have retail in the building on Bloomfield Avenue and relocate the office area to the rear. Mr. Sionas replied no.

Mr. Harrison asked about the trash enclosure and if the area was practical for trash removal. Mr. Sionas stated that there would be scheduled removal during off-peak hours. Mr. Harrison noted that the YMCA is adjacent to the parking deck and many

members visit during early morning hours. He stated that could limit removal opportunities.

Ron Demyers, State Farm Insurance agent and potential first floor tenant was then called by Mr. Owen to testify. Mr. Demyers state that his current office is located on Grove Street in Montclair.

Mr. Owens question Mr. Demyers about the nature of his business.

Mr. Demyers explained that State Farm now provides banking services and is one of only ten insurance companies that operates banks. He explained that his office generates significant pedestrian activity and noted that his office is number two in volume in the state of New Jersey and number six nationwide.

Mr. Owen asked about the hours of operation of the State Farm office. Mr. Demyers replied that the office is open Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00PM, Wednesdays from 9:00AM to 7:00PM and Saturdays from 10:00AM to 1:00PM. He noted that additional hours are available by appointment.

Questions from the Board were then asked.

Mr. Reynolds asked how many customers the office has on an average day. Mr. Demyers replied between 50 and 70 customers per day.

Ms. Brinkman asked where the banking services take place in the office if there are no tellers. Mr. Demyers explained that State Farm operates a virtual bank. He noted that customers can open accounts at the bank.

Mr. Kenney asked if Mr. Demyers had worked with project architect Mr. Sionas to develop the layout. Mr. Demyers replied yes.

Mr. Kenney asked how the general office space noted on the plans would be used and how busy it would be. Mr. Demyers replied that the area would have four to five cubicle offices. He said employees in these spaces would answer calls, assist walk-in customers and provide online support.

Mr. Kenney asked how the large area on the plans located near the general office area would be used. Mr. Demyers replied that the insurance broker would locate in this area.

Mr. Kenney asked if this layout was similar to the current office. He also asked if the reception desk will be busy. Mr. Demyers replied that this is similar to his current office. Mr. Demyers also noted that he expects to be busy and that the office typically has between 15 and 20 clients during peak times.

Mr. Kenney asked how many employees Mr. Demyers typically has between 9am and 5pm on a typical weekday.. Mr. Demyers replied that he typically has ten employees.

Mr. Kenny asked how a potential customer would move through the spaces of the proposed office. Mr. Demyers explained that customers would check in first with the reception desk and then work with an individual at their desk.

Mr. Kenney asked about the role of the conference room and how it would be used. Mr. Demyers stated it would be used for educational opportunities for a variety of groups, such as how to balance a check book, and information sessions on group life insurance

for small businesses. Mr. Kenney asked about the location of the conference room and if the illustrated location was preferable. Mr. Demyers said that the location is preferable.

Mr. Susswein asked if there would be an Automated Teller Machine (ATM) available. Mr. Demyers replied no.

Mr. Susswein asked how many checking accounts the office supported. Mr. Demyers replied more than 500.

Mr. Susswein asked if the business would be impacted if it was not located on the ground floor. Mr. Demyers replied that the business would be very impacted. He explained that a ground floor location is important. Mr. Demyers noted that competitors, Chase, Bank of American and TD Bank are all financial institutions that sell insurance. He explained that his office is an insurance agency that provides banking services through a virtual bank.

Ms. Talley asked if the windows in the front façade of the office would be covered. Mr. Demyers replied no.

Mr. Owen then called Peter Steck, planning expert to testify.

Mr. Steck distributed a handout, marked as Exhibit A-5, to review the planning summary of the project. Mr. Steck reviewed the handout. He stated that the application combines improvements to the site and reuse of an existing building. He noted that the project is consistent with the 1987 Master Plan and the Central Business district, within which the subject property is located. Mr. Steck reviewed the requested variances and noted the subject property's peculiar suitability for the proposed use.

Questions from the Board were then asked.

Mr. Fleischer wanted to clarify that the ordinance regarding canopy signage is for lettering six inches in height and not twelve inches in height. He also expressed objection to the clock tower rear entrance from the fourth level of the parking deck. He noted that the entrance is for employees only. Mr. Fleischer also noted that the clock seems out of scale. He asked why it was important. Mr. Steck responded that it could be removed.

Mr. Fleischer asked why twelve inch letters from the canopy and a blade sign were needed in a pedestrian area. Mr. Steck noted that the building fronts on Bloomfield Avenue. Mr. Silver responded stating that six inch letters could be used instead.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the encroachments on the rear property line and asked if the trash enclosure and bike racks could be set into the rear façade. Mr. Steck responded that the bike racks are not a significant issue and that the trash enclosure is the larger issue. He noted that trash cannot be stored inside the building due to the fire hazard.

Mr. Fleischer asked if the entry from the fourth level of the parking deck could be moved back ten feet. He noted that this is an addition and has flexibility. Mr. Steck replied that the space is necessary to accommodate the staircase. He also noted that this is not a historic portion of the building, houses the HVA equipment and that it is in context with the current building setback. Mr. Steck also noted that the entryway provides protection during inclement weather and the shorter pedestrian bridge is better given the height of

the bridge. Mr. Fleischer stated that he is trying to understand why the entry couldn't be moved back to comply with the setbacks and believes alternative configurations do exist.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the clock and noted that it only seems to benefit employees of the building. He noted that the former placement on Bloomfield Avenue was nice, as shown in the historic photos. He asked if it could be located in a place where more people could see it.

Mr. Reynolds also noted the stated impracticality of the office use in the front of the building given that it was not designed for retail use. He stated that he understands many of the variances being sought and Mr. Demyers made a strong case for his proposed use. However, Mr. Reynolds wondered what the impact would be if Mr. Demyers' office grew too large for the space and left, he asked what would happen? Mr. Steck stated that Mr. Demyer's is licensed as a bank in New Jersey and conditions could be placed on the space to specify future use.

Mr. Kenney asked what other permitted uses could be allowed in the space. Mr. Steck replied that a number of other uses could be permitted. He stated that the rear office space in the building is not technically on the first floor. Mr. Kenney asked if a (d) variance was granted for the rear office space, could any type of tenant move in. Mr. Steck stated that any office could move in there. He stated that the intent of the historic ordinance was to ensure space in the first floor is available for retail when competition with office space was high.

Mr. Kenney asked if two signs per business were allowed. Ms. Talley replied that two signs are permitted, the awning sign and the blade sign.

Ms. Baggs asked what alternative locations were possible for the bike rack. She noted that she understands their role in the LEED certification, but asked if other locations were available. Mr. Steck replied that the question is best for Mr. Sionas. Mr. Steck stated that the location on site was the most suitable location. Ms. Baggs asked why a bike rack couldn't be located on the sidewalk on Bloomfield Avenue. Mr. Steck stated that the applicant does not have permission to install the bike rack on public property.

Mr. Fleischer asked how the retail space was marketed to potential tenants. He asked why only an insurance agent was offered as a tenant. He asked if other retail operations or restaurants were considered. Mr. Steck replied that an extreme hardship situation does not exist. Mr. Silver referred to the façade and noted that retail would be difficult in the space. He stated that he does not have approvals to market the space to tenants at this time. He also stated that more suitable retail facades exist. Mr. Silver stated that no marketing has been conducted to advertise the space and that the potential tenant came to him. Mr. Fleischer stated that there seems to be speculation about the rental market for commercial space.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the clock could be moved from the rear of the building. Mr. Silver replied that the clock does not work on the front of the building.

Mr. Harrison stated that he understands the difficulty in using the front façade for retail use. He asked if the applicant was aware of other banks that have been converted to restaurants. Mr. Steck replied that often restaurants in banks take advantage of high

ceilings, however that is not financially feasible in this project. Mr. Silver stated that he understands a restaurant is permitted in the space, however he believes it is not suitable for office tenants. He stated he does not want any food prepared on site. He noted the coffee shop will be serving pre-packaged goods.

Comments from the public were then accepted.

Michelle Peterson, a potential tenant of the project on the concourse level, provided comments. She appreciated the Board's consideration of the bridge. She noted that the signage proposed is more for clients to locate the various tenants of the building to assist in wayfinding. She noted the importance and value of the bike space to their tenancy. Ms. Peterson stated that preservation of space within the building is important.

There were no further comments from the public.

Mr. Owen provided a full summary of the application and the requested variances.

Final comments from the Board were then provided.

Mr. Susswein stated that Montclair Center recently was awarded a Main Street award. He stated that the creative re-use of historic properties is key in Montclair. With respect to the office, Mr. Susswein stated that the project appears to be excellent office space. He stated that an open-ended office use should not be approved. However, he noted that the prospective tenant, the insurance agent, is also licensed as a bank. He stated that he could be persuaded to approve the project by considering the tenant a bank use without the need for a variance.

Mr. Kenney stated that in general the project is great. He noted some small issues. Mr. Kenney stated that the way banks function has changed and that people today use banks differently. He stated that in some ways, a traditional bank may be worse than the proposed insurance agency with banking services because there is not as much foot traffic. Mr. Kenney stated that the variance is warranted for the front office space. However, he stated that he has reservations about the rear office space and does not support it.

Mr. Fleischer stated that he has no concerns about the rear office space. He stated that he loves the project. However, he noted that the front retail space concerns him. He stated that he assumes there will be a long-term lease with the potential tenant and that this is not an appropriate location. Mr. Fleischer stated that he is OK with other aspects of the project. He stated that the size of the lettering on the signage is concerning. He stated that there was no convincing evidence presented to justify putting an office space on the first floor in the business district.

Ms. Checca stated that the project is great. She stated that she has no problem with the office space in the rear of the building. However, she noted concerns about the front insurance agency tenant especially once the tenant leaves. She agreed with Mr. Susswein's approach to consider the insurance agency as a bank which would not require a variance.

Mr. Reynolds agreed with Ms. Checca's comments. He stated that he also would like to consider the insurance agency as a bank.

Mr. Sullivan addressed the members of the Board and stated that the best way to approach would be to not rule the space as a bank, but to instead grant a d(1) variance but with a condition that any change in use of the space would have to come back before the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Reynolds agreed with this approach and supported it.

Ms. Baggs stated that she appreciated the clarification by Mr. Sullivan as a good way to resolve the situation. She stated that the project is very suitable for Montclair. She noted that encouraging the construction of LEED certified buildings is a stated goal in the Township. She noted concerns about the pedestrian bridge as this element is between the building and the parking deck. Ms. Baggs noted that conditions may arise in the future that could impact the pedestrian bridge. She stated that this should be considered and asked if it could be addressed in the resolution.

Ms. Brinkman stated the project is a great adaptive reuse. She stated that the variance for the insurance agent tenant is appropriate. She noted that the use is consistent with the history of the building. She stated that she was unsure about the rear office space use. Ms. Brinkman noted that the trash and recycling refuse area needs to be addressed.

Mr. Moore stated that the adaptive reuse of the building is good. He stated that keeping the insurance agency here in Montclair is good. He stated that he supports the d(1) variance. Mr. Moore stated his appreciation for the LEED certified building. He noted that he likes the pedestrian bridge, but does have concerns about the alleyway lighting.

Mr. Harrison stated that Mr. Silver has completed many great projects. He stated that there are a number of variances in this application where he does not have any concerns. He stated that the pedestrian bridge will active the fourth level of the parking deck, which is not highly used. He stated that he has no concern with the signage, fencing, nor parking issues. He stated that he feels conflicted on the setback for the rear building addition. Mr. Harrison stated that he does not have any issue with the office use in the rear of the first floor. He noted that he does not see the justification for the insurance agency use in the front of the first floor. He asked why it couldn't be located elsewhere. He stated that a signage variance could be approved to inform clients of the insurance office location in the building. He stated the business is largely a 9am to 5pm operation, and street activity is needed.

The Board then conducted votes for each component of the project.

Mr. Sullivan introduced the variance for use of the rear first floor as office space. Mr. Fleischer made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Reynolds. The roll was called with Mr. Harrison, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Fleischer, Mr. Susswein and Ms. Checca voting yes, and Mr. Kenney and Ms. Baggs voting no.

Mr. Sullivan introduced the variance for the State Farm office on the westerly side of the first floor with a condition restricting any future use to be analogous and have a bank license. Mr. Kenney made a motion to approve seconded by Ms. Checca. Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Susswein, Ms. Checca, Ms. Baggs and Mr. Kenney voted yes. Mr. Fleischer and Mr. Harrison voted no.

Mr. Sullivan introduced the (d) variance for the bridge encroachment, subject to an easement obtained from the Township of Montclair by the applicant. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Susswein. Mr. Kenney, Mr. Susswein, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Fleischer, Ms. Checca, Mr. Reynolds voted yes. Ms. Baggs voted no.

Mr. Sullivan introduce the (d) variance for the trash enclosure, subject to an easement obtained from the Township of Montclair by the applicant. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Kenney, seconded by Mr. Susswein. Mr. Kenney, Mr. Fleischer, Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Baggs, Ms. Checca and Mr. Susswein voted yes. Mr. Harrison voted no.

Mr. Sullivan introduced the (c) variance for the rear yard setback. A motion to deny the rear yard setback was made by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Kenney. Mr. Kenney, Mr. Fleischer, Ms. Baggs, and Mr. Harrison voted yes. Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Checca, and Mr. Susswein voted no.

Mr. Harrison reviewed the conditions discussed by the Board for the site plan approval. The conditions are as follows:

1. The approval granted herein to permit State Farm to occupy the western half of the first floor is expressly limited to an insurance agency which, as part of its operation, also includes a licensed bank.
2. The State Farm use shall meet the requirements of Montclair Code Sections 281-8.5B(3) and 347-110.2E(1) which require that windows be transparent and are not covered with opaque material.
3. The applicant shall obtain an easement from the Township of Montclair to permit the pedestrian bridge on Township property which shall be recorded with the Essex County Register.
4. The applicant shall execute a license agreement with the Township of Montclair to permit the trash enclosure on Township property.
5. The trash enclosure shall be redesigned to replace the swinging gates with sliding gates in order to avoid conflict with the handicap parking spaces on the ground level of the municipal parking deck.
6. The applicant shall purchase day time parking permits for all 59 parking spaces located on the upper level of the municipal parking deck and shall be precluded from purchasing night time parking permits on the upper deck. This condition shall not preclude tenants of the building on the subject property from purchasing night time parking permits on the upper level.
7. The applicant shall obtain permission from the Township, if required, in connection with the installation of festoon lights along the façade facing the walkway connecting Bloomfield Avenue to the municipal parking deck.
8. The three bicycle racks proposed at the ground level of the rear of the building shall be reoriented so that bicycles utilizing the racks will not be located on Township property.
9. The applicant shall return to the Montclair Historic Preservation Commission for review of the setback of the third floor addition as well as materials and color.
10. Canopy letter height shall not exceed six inches.
11. Illumination levels in the alley and rear lighting plan shall be a minimum of .5 footcandle in compliance with Montclair Code Section 281-8.3E.

12. The stone entablature at the top of the building shall be cleaned and repaired to remove the shadows created by the former PNC bank sign.
13. The applicant shall be bound by all representations made on its behalf by its attorney and professionals during the course of the public hearing.
14. The applicant shall be responsible for all inspection fees required under Montclair Code Section 202-27 as well as escrow fees incurred in connection with review of this matter.

A motion was made by Mr. Kenney to approve the variances and site plan with conditions as specified, seconded by Mr. Fleischer. All members voted yes.

NEW BUSINESS


App. 2398: Zecchino/Nicolo's Bakery. 8 Baldwin Street. *Use variance and site plan application for 995 square foot addition.*

Ms. Talley discussed the upcoming schedule for the Board. She noted the backlog of applications and requested from the Board to schedule a meeting on May 6, 2015. She asked if this item could be carried to the May 6, 2015 meeting. The attorney for the applicant, Robert Gaccion agreed to carry the application.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 am.

Respectfully submitted,



Graham Petto, AICP
Zoning Board of Adjustment Assistant Secretary