

**Township of South Hackensack
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
August 22, 2011
MINUTES**

At 7:38 p.m. the meeting was Called to Order. Pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act, adequate notice of this meeting was advertised in The Record and the Herald News and by posting a copy of the meeting notice on the bulletin board in the clerk's office where notices are customarily posted.

The Secretary called the roll.

Member Present

Lou LoPiccolo
Brian Veprek
Joseph D'Amico
John Falato
Angelo Marrella
Greg Padovano, Township Attorney
Berge Tombalakian, Boswell Engineering

Members Absent

James Diraimondo Bill Regan
Victor Santos Luis Perdomo

MINUTES:

Veprek **motioned**; D'Amico seconded to approve the **Minutes** of the July 25, 2011 meetings. All in favor.

OLD BUSINESS

BOA2011-08 – Memorialize Resolution

Barricella

112 Phillips Avenue

Block: 13.03 Lot: 3.04

“C” Variance – Addition – 1 family into 2 family residences.

Veprek **Motioned**; LoPiccolo **seconded** to accept the Resolution to the applicant.

Vote: Yes: Veprek; Falato; LoPiccolo; D'Amico; Marrella

Not Qualified to Vote: Diraimondo; Regan; Santos

Absent: Perdomo.

August 22, 2011

BOA2011-09 Carried from July 27, 2011 Meeting.

North Jersey Media

89 Leuning Street

Block: 54 Lot: 1.01

“D” Variance – Use – News Paper Distribution Center

Joseph L. Basralian, Esq., Winne, Banta, Heterington, Basralian & Kahn, PC, 21 Main Street, Hackensack, NJ represented the applicant.

Mr. Burgis of Burgis Associates, 25 Westwood Avenue, Westwood, and NJ testified as an expert planner.

Ray DeRiso, Zoning Officer for the Township of South Hackensack, testified regarding the matter.

Exhibits A-1, dated 8/22/11; photograph of exterior showing loading load.

Exhibit A-2, dated 8/22/11; Hubschman Engineering, PA, drawing illustrating the building units and parking spaces.

Exhibit A-3, dated 8/22/11; Joseph Burgis, Ariel Photograph.

North Jersey Media previous obtain approval to occupy 30 Wesley Street for newspaper distribution. This was a temporary site.

They now seek to occupy 89 Leuning, Unit D The property is located within the C-Industrial Zone. The applicant is requesting an interpretation of the Township Zoning Ordinance for a use variance to permit use of a portion of an existing building for distribution of newspapers and promotional materials for North Jersey Media; The Record Newspaper. The applicant is proposing to occupy 10,300 sq. ft.

The daily newspapers and associated materials will be delivered by box truck and be warehoused for a limited time. The newspapers would then be picking up by private couriers for distribution in the area. Couriers will pick up papers from 3:00 AM to 5 AM and they would be on site for a limited amount of time (approximately 10-15 minutes). The number of couriers would be approximately 100.

Three to four employees would be there on a daily basis during various shifts. There are approximately 250 parking spaces which would be adequate parking for the proposed use.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Rocco Meeks, Jr, Leuning Street, stated that he opposed the project.

CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

August 22, 2011

Veprek motioned to accept the application providing that the North Jersey Media trucks travel from route 80 onto Wesley onto Scheiffer, avoiding Leuning Street. Also, North Jersey Media is to advise their carriers as well.

Veprek **Motioned**; Marrella **seconded** to grant the variances to the applicant.

Vote: Yes: Veprek; Falato; LoPiccolo; D'Amico; Marrella

Absent: Perdomo; Diraimondo; Regan; Santos

NEW BUSINESS

BOA2011-10

9 Romanelli Realty, LLC

3 Romanelli Avenue

Block: 58 Lot 23

"D" Variance – Use for Wingmen Garage

A letter dated 8/15/11 from Gregory Asadurian, Esq. representing 9 Romanelli Realty was received by the Board. The letter requested an adjournment and to be placed on the September Agenda.

An announcement was made that this matter will be carried to the September 26, 2011 meeting at 7:30 pm. No further notice is required.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

There was no board discussion.

At 8:20 p.m. the meeting was **adjourned**. Veprek **motioned** to adjourn the meeting; **second** by Marrella. **All in favor.**

Respectfully Submitted,



Lydia Heinzelman

Planning/Zoning Board Secretary

August 22, 2011

RESOLUTION

**TOWNSHIP OF SOUTH HACKENSACK
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

**APPLICATION OF FRANCESCO BARICELLA
112 Phillips Avenue
Block 13.03, Lot 3.04**

Application No. 2011-08

WHEREAS, Francesco Baricella (hereinafter referred to as the "Applicant"), 112 Phillips Avenue, South Hackensack, New Jersey, applied to the Township of South Hackensack Zoning Board of Adjustment (the "Board") for variances in connection with the proposed construction of an addition to existing dwelling to be utilized as a two-family dwelling, as further described herein; and

WHEREAS, the property subject of the application is identified on the Tax Map of the Township of South Hackensack as Block 13.03, Lot 3.04 and is more commonly known as 112 Phillips Avenue, South Hackensack, New Jersey (hereinafter the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in the A One and Two Family Residential Zone; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant initially sought the following variances as part of its application:

<u>SOUTH HACKENSACK ORDINANCE</u>	<u>PROPOSED</u>	<u>REQUIRED/ PERMITTED</u>
Maximum Area of Entire Dwelling	4,047.5	3,750 s.f.
Maximum Area – Second Unit	921.8	900 s.f.

WHEREAS, the Applicant submitted architectural renderings prepared by AMRARCH Design Studios, A.M. Ragab, AIA, 39 Camden Road, Hillsborough, New Jersey, dated March 30, 2011 with last revision date of June 17, 2011 as part of the application and during the public hearing (the "Plans"); and

WHEREAS, after due notice and publication, the matter was called for a public hearing on July 25, 2011, at which time the Applicant represented himself; and

WHEREAS, the Board made a physical inspection of the Property during such times as the Board members may have indicated; and

WHEREAS, the Board has carefully considered the exhibits introduced into evidence and the testimony of the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, Ray DeRiso, South Hackensack Zoning Officer, testified during the public hearing regarding this matter; and

WHEREAS, the Board's engineering consultant, Boswell Engineering, presented testimony during the public hearings and submitted review memoranda to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the current matter represents a second application by the same Applicant concerning the same Property. Therefore, it is necessary for the Board to determine as a threshold or jurisdictional issue whether to even consider the current application and determine whether the application, on the merits, is precluded by the application of the doctrine of res judicata; and

WHEREAS, the Board has carefully reviewed the issue of res judicata as applied to the current/third application. In reviewing whether res judicata will bar the Board's ability to hear the application, the Board carefully considered the following five factors:

1. Whether the second application is substantially similar to the Prior Application;
2. Whether the same applicants or parties are involved in both the current application and Prior Application;
3. Whether there is a substantial change in the current application from the Prior Application itself or conditions surrounding the subject Property;
4. Whether there has been an adjudication on the merits in the Prior Application; and
5. Whether both the current application and Prior Application involve the same cause of action; and

WHEREAS, the Board takes notice that the New Jersey Supreme Court in Russell v. Tenafly Board of Adjustment, 31 N.J. 58 (1959) held that where the same property owner and the same parcel of property are involved in a subsequent application, the matter is not barred on the grounds of res judicata unless the second application is shown to be "substantially similar to the first, both as to the application itself and the circumstances of the property involved." Russell, 31 N.J. at 65 (citation omitted) (emphasis supplied). The Court in Russell went on to hold that "[t]he question for the [Board] on a second application for a variance concerning the same property, is whether there has occurred a sufficient change in the application itself or the conditions surrounding the property to warrant entertainment of the application." Russell, 31 N.J. at 66. (Citations omitted); and

WHEREAS, the Board also notes that the New Jersey Supreme Court's decision in Gruber v. Mayor and Township Committee of Rarriton Township, 39 N.J. 1, 12 (1962), held that although a subsequent application may be similar to the previous one, surrounding circumstances may have changed such that the prior denial would be an error. The Court also held that a zoning board possesses the discretion of whether to reject an application on the ground of res judicata and that exercise of discretion may not be overturned on appeal absent the showing of "unreasonableness." Id.; and

WHEREAS, the Board notes that the New Jersey courts have held that res judicata does not bar the making of a new application for a variance or for modification or enlargement of one already granted or for lifting of conditions previously imposed in the connection with the grant of a variance, upon "a proper showing of a change of circumstance or other good cause warranting a reconsideration by the local authorities. . . . to hold differently would offend public policy by countenancing restraint upon the future exercise of municipal action in the absence of sound reason for such restraint." [Springsteel v. Town of West Orange, 149 N.J. Super. 107, 113 (App. Div. 1977), cert. denied, 75 N.J. 10 (1977) (emphasis added)]; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant initially applied to the Board under calendar 2011-04 for a variance to construct an addition to an existing single family dwelling to be converted to a two-family home on the Property and sought variance approval to permit 4,388 gross s.f. of a 922 s.f. for a second dwelling unit (the application was amended during the public hearing to propose a second dwelling unit of 900 s.f.). The initial application was denied by the Board on May 23, 2011 which denial was memorialized by Resolution dated July 25, 2011 (the "Prior Application"); and

WHEREAS, the Board has now carefully reviewed the issue of res judicata as applied to the current application as compared to the Prior Application. In reviewing whether res judicata

should prevent the Board from hearing the current application, the Board carefully considered whether the current application is substantially similar to the Prior Application denied by the Board and hereby makes the following findings with regard to the issue of res judicata; and

A. Francesco Baricella is the owner of the subject property commonly known as 112 Phillips Avenue, South Hackensack, New Jersey which Property is also identified as Block 13.03, Lot 3.04 on the current Tax Map of the Township of South Hackensack. The Property is located within the A One and Two Family Residential Zone.

B. The Property is comprised of 10,532 square feet and is currently improved with a single family residential dwelling.

C. The witness testified that the Applicant proposed to construct an addition along the rear of the existing dwelling and to construct a single car garage along the northerly side of the existing dwelling resulting in a second curb cut and driveway, as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board.

D. The Applicant proposed to utilize the dwelling, with the proposed addition, as a two family dwelling (as permitted in the A Zone), as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board and as testified by the witness. The Application initially sought the following variances in connection with the proposed development:

E. The following is a comparison of the variance sought under the current application and First Application, as filed:

SOUTH HACKENSACK ORDINANCE PROVISION	PROPOSED (Prior Application)	PROPOSED (Current Application)	Difference From Prior Application
Maximum Gross Area of Entire Dwelling	4,388 s.f.	4,047.5 s.f.	(340.5 s.f.)
Maximum Area of Second Dwelling Unit	922 s.f. (the application was amended during the public hearing to propose 900s.f.)	921.8 s.f.	(.2 s.f.) as initially proposed

F. The Board makes the following findings regarding the issue of res

judicata:

- (1) The current application is similar to the Prior Application submitted under Application No. 2011-___ in that the current application involves the same Applicant, same piece of parcel of property and same proposal of development.

Although the Applicant under the current application is seeking the same two variances as under the Prior Application, the amount of deviation sought in the current application is substantially less than sought in the total application.

In fact, based upon the testimony from the Applicant, the Applicant is seeking 340.5 s.f. less of gross building area than was sought under the Prior Application.

- (2) Francesco Baricella was the applicant under the First Application and is the Applicant under the current application.
- (3) There has been a significant change in the application. Specifically, the proposed dwelling was substantially reduced in total size and the proposed second dwelling unit size was also reduced.
- (4) The Prior Application was heard by this Board during the course of two public hearings and a formal decision was rendered by this Board on May 23, 2011, which decision of the Board was memorialized by a written resolution adopted by the Board on July 25, 2011.
- (5) Based on the factual facts identified within the Resolution of the First Application, it is clear that both the First Application and current application involve the same cause of action, and applicant, however, the amount of variance sought under the current application is substantially different from the amount initially sought under the First Application.

G. No member of the public or interested party appeared or spoke regarding the issue of res judicata.

H. Based upon the facts presented under the current application, the Board finds that the Applicant is seeking substantially less variance and therefore has presented an application which is different from the Prior Application, as filed, and is not barred by the principle of res judicata.

I. The Board, having made the determination that the current application is not barred based on the grounds of res judicata, the need not proceed further to hear additional testimony from the Applicant regarding the current application.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the current Application of Francesco Baricella under Calendar 2011-08 which seeks variance approval to construct an addition to an existing single family dwelling which is to be converted to a two family dwelling, as permitted in the A Zone, with a total excess gross building area 4,047.5 s.f. and a total of 921.8 s.f. for a second dwelling unit, as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board, and as testified by Applicant during the public hearing, be and the same is hereby determined not to be barred by the application of res judicata. This determination does not constitute a decision on the merits of the current application.

A motion was made to proceed with the public hearing on the current matter based upon the determination that the applicant was not barred by the doctrine of res judicata was adopted by the following vote at the meeting prior to adoption of the memorializing Resolution:

Moved by: Joseph D'Amico
 Seconded by: Brian Vepek

	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Not Qualified To Vote</u>
Brian Vepek, Chairperson	X				
Bill Regan, Vice Chairperson	X				
James Diramondo				X	
John Falato	X				
Joseph D'Amico	X				
Lou LoPiccolo	X				
Luis Perdomo	X				
Victor Santos, Alt. #1				X	
Michangelo Marrella, Alt. #2	X				

Dated: July 25, 2011

WHEREAS, after considering the issue of res judicata, the Board proceeded with the public hearing in this application; and

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the testimony of the Applicant hereby makes the following findings of fact with regard to the current application:

A. Francesco Baricella is the owner of the subject property commonly known as 112 Phillips Avenue, South Hackensack, New Jersey which Property is also identified as Block 13.03, Lot 3.04 on the current Tax Map of the Township of South Hackensack. The Property is located within the A One and Two Family Residential Zone.

B. The Property is comprised of 10,532 square feet and is currently improved with a single family residential dwelling.

C. The witness testified that the Applicant proposed to construct an addition along the rear of the existing dwelling and to construct a single story single car garage along the northerly side of the existing dwelling resulting in a second curb cut and driveway, as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board.

D. The Applicant proposed to utilize the dwelling, with the proposed addition, as a two family dwelling (as permitted in the A Zone), as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board and as testified by the witness. The Application sought the following variances in connection with the proposed development:

SOUTH HACKENSACK ORDINANCE	PROPOSED	MAXIMUM PERMITTED
Maximum Area of Entire Dwelling	4,047.5 s.f.	3,750 s.f.
Maximum Area of Second Dwelling Unit	921.8 s.f.	900 s.f.

E. The Applicant has proposed a total gross area of the residential dwelling of 4,047.5 s.f. where a maximum of 3,750 s.f. are permitted under the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, a variance is necessary.

F. The Applicant also proposes to maintain a second dwelling unit comprised of 921.8 s.f. within the building's proposed structure where a maximum of 900 s.f. is permitted. Therefore, a variance is necessary.

G. The existing lot is comprised of 10,532 s.f. where the minimum permitted lot in the A Zone is 5,000 s.f. The Applicant testified that due to the nature of the large site, the proposed permitted two family use, albeit exceeding the maximum gross area permitted under the ordinance, is not excessive and is appropriate given the total area of the Property.

H. Mr. Claude Buldo, 110 Phillips Avenue, South Hackensack appeared and testified in opposition to the development as proposed by the Applicant based upon various objections including the proposed size of the dwelling and its location with the proposed addition and second attached garage, relative to adjacent properties and dwellings.

No other members of the public testified regarding the Application. The Board listened to the comments of the interested party and based its decision not upon the number of persons who advocated a particular position, but upon the merit of the comments presented.

I. The Applicant provided sufficient testimony and evidence regarding the proposed size and gross area of dwelling within the surrounding neighborhood and provided sufficient evidence regarding the proposed development's impact upon the surrounding neighborhood during the public hearing.

J. The Applicant's request for variance under the application to permit total lot gross area of 4,047.5 s.f. where a maximum of 3,750 s.f. is permitted under the Township Ordinance can be granted without substantial detriment to the surrounding neighborhood especially since the existed dwelling is a split level type dwelling which results in a practical hardship regarding its conversion to a permitted two family dwelling. Furthermore, with the exception of the proposed single story single car garage portion of the development, the entire addition will be located within the rear yard of the Property and will not be visible from the front yard of the Property along Phillips Avenue.

K. The entire addition, inclusive of the proposed single story single car garage, will be constructed in compliance with all bulk setbacks required under the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed garage portion of the addition will be located 5 feet 3 inches from the side yard setback of the Property where a minimum of 5 feet is required under the Zoning Ordinance and will be located over 13 feet from the adjacent dwelling, in compliance with the

Zoning Ordinance. The proposed development, as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board, as amended, and as testified by the Applicant will not result in additional obstruction of air flow to adjacent property owners and an overdevelopment of the Property given the large size of the Property (over 2x the minimum lot size under the Zoning Ordinance).

L. The proposed improvements to the Property, inclusive of the proposed two-family dwelling, attached garage and second driveway area are further shown on the following portion of the Plans submitted to the Board as part of the current application:



M. Aside from the variance sought for maximum gross building area and second dwelling unit size, the Application complies with all other use and bulk requirements of the A One and Two Family Zone.

N. The Board has reviewed the comments and testimony of presented on behalf of the Board's engineering consultant, Boswell Engineering, in particular is review memorandum submitted to the board in connection with this matter. The Applicant stipulated during the public hearing to comply with all requirements and conditions as may be required by Boswell Engineering, including, but not limited to, review memorandum dated June 24, 2011.

L. The Applicant testified that the proposed dwelling would be utilized in accordance with the permitted uses of the A One and Two-Family Residential Zone and that no more than two separate dwelling units would be utilized on the Property at any time.

O. The subject Property is significantly larger than the minimum lot size permitted in the A Zone and is comprised of more than double the minimum lot area required under the Zoning Ordinance. Accordingly, although the Applicant's proposed dwelling exceeds the maximum gross dwelling area permitted in the A Zone, it will not visually appear to result in an overbuilding on the Property which is significantly oversized.

Furthermore, the style and character of the proposed dwelling is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The addition will not detrimentally impact the zone plan or surrounding residential area based, in part, upon the fact that the entire addition, exclusive of the single story single car garage will be located in the rear yard of the Property and will not be visible from surrounding parcels along Phillips Avenue.

P. The benefits of the requested variances outweigh any detriment. The variances sought herein are not detrimental to the public, provided there is compliance with the

conditions of this Resolution. The Applicant has satisfied the criteria required to permit the requested variances N.J.S.A 40:55 D-70(c)(2) as further referenced herein and as discussed during the public hearing.

Q. The Applicant's request for variance to permit construct of a two-family dwelling unit comprised of a gross area of 4,047.5 s.f. where a maximum of 3,750 s.f. is permitted and second dwelling unit 921.8 s.f. where a maximum of 900 s.f. is permitted under the Zoning Ordinance, can be granted without detriment the Zone Plan or Zoning Ordinance of the Township of South Hackensack given the large size of the subject lot, and character of the proposed dwelling which is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

R. The proposed variances will result in the utilization of the Property as a two-family residential use, as permitted in the A Zone and will not detrimentally impact the surrounding residential neighborhood given the fact that all bulk setback requirements of the Zoning Ordinance will be complied with under the current application.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Application of Francesco Baricella, to construct an addition to an existing residential dwelling (to be utilized as a two-family residential dwelling which use is permitted in the A Zone), as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board and as testified by the Applicant, be in the same herein is approved as follows:

1. **Location and Type:** The proposed addition, inclusive of the attached single story single car garage, shall be constructed and located as testified by the Applicant during the public hearing and as shown on the architectural plans prepared by AMRARCH Design Studio with the last revision date of June 17, 2011, as submitted to the Board under the current application. The proposed addition shall be comprised of a maximum of 4,047.5 s.f. of gross area, as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board and as testified by the Applicant. The second dwelling unit

within the residential building shall be comprised of a maximum of 921.8 s.f., as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board and as testified by the Applicant.

The addition, inclusive of the proposed single story single car attached garage, shall comply with all bulk setback standards applicable in the A Zone under the current Zoning Ordinance, as shown on the Plans submitted to the Board and as testified by the Applicant.

The Applicant shall be permitted to utilize the proposed two and one-half story dwelling unit as a one or two-family dwelling unit in accordance with uses permitted under the A One and Two Family Zone of the Township of South Hackensack. In no event shall the Property be utilized for any use not specifically permitted under the current Zoning Ordinance.

2. **Compliance with Engineering Comments:** The Applicant shall comply with all comments and recommendations of the engineering as noted in the testimony of the Board's engineering consultant during the public hearings and as noted in the engineering report(s) prepared by Boswell Engineering including, but not limited, its review letter dated June 24, 2011, to the extent not done so on the Plans submitted to the Board and as to the extent not addressed by the Applicant or Board during a public hearing or addressed herein.

3. **Legal and Engineering Fees:** The Applicant shall be responsible for all legal and engineering fees of the Zoning Board of Adjustment associated with this application.

4. **Other Fees:** All additional fees, if any, required by the Township Ordinances shall be paid.

5. **Reliance by Board on Testimony and Application:** The approval granted herein is specifically granted based upon the testimony of the Applicant, the exhibits, the application, and any amendments to same, and as shown on the plans submitted to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, all of which have been relied upon by the Board herein.

6. **Compliance with Ordinance:** Except for the variance approval granted herein, the Applicant shall comply with all other provisions of the Zoning Code of the Township of South Hackensack.

7. **Compliance with Laws:** The Applicant shall comply with all Township Ordinances, and any and all State and Federal laws and applicable regulations.

8. **Non-Severability of Conditions:** The relief granted to the Applicant is specifically made subject to the conditions referred to herein. In the event any condition is held to be invalid, unenforceable, or unlawful, the variance approval granted herein shall be unenforceable. It is the intent of the Board that the variance approval not be approved if any condition is invalid, and that the conditions are not severable from any variances or relief granted herein.

9. **Appeal Period:** The Applicant has been advised that there is an appeal period for the relief granted herein for a period of forty-five (45) days from the date of publication of notice of the relief granted pursuant to this Resolution in a newspaper of general circulation approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Accordingly, any work or construction done prior to the expiration of the appeal period is accomplished at the sole risk of the Applicant.

Said Resolution was adopted by the following vote at the meeting prior to adoption of the memorializing Resolution:

Moved by: Brian Veprek
 Seconded by: Michangelo Marrella

	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Not Qualified To Vote</u>
Brian Veprek, Chairperson	X				
Bill Regan, Vice Chairperson		X			
James Diramondo				X	
John Falato	X				
Joseph D'Amico	X				
Lou LoPiccolo	X				
Luis Perdomo	X				
Victor Santos, Alt. #1				X	
Michangelo Marrella, Alt. #2	X				

Dated: July 25, 2011

Said Resolution was memorialized at the meeting after the Resolution was adopted (as set forth above), by the following vote:

Moved by: *veprek*
 Seconded by: *LoPiccolo*

Not Qualified
 To Vote

For Against Abstain Absent

	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Absent</u>	Not Qualified To Vote
Brian Veprek, Chairperson	✓				
Bill Regan, Vice Chairperson					X
James Diramondo					X
John Falato	✓				
Joseph D'Amico	✓				
Lou LoPiccolo	✓				
Luis Perdomo				✓	
Victor Santos, Alt. #1					X
Michangelo Marrella, Alt. #2	✓				

Dated: August 22, 2011

SOUTH HACKENSACK ZONING BOARD

By: *Brian P Veprek*
 Brian Veprek, Chairperson

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY

By: *Lydia Heinzelman*
 Lydia Heinzelman
 Secretary to the Zoning Board of Adjustment

The newspapers of **New Jersey** make public notices from their printed pages available electronically in a single database for the benefit of the public. This enhances the legislative intent of public notice - keeping a free and independent public informed about activities of their government and business activities that may affect them. Importantly, Public Notices now are in one place on the web (www.PublicNoticeAds.com), not scattered among thousands of government web pages.

County: Bergen

Printed In: The Record, Hackensack

Printed On: 2011/08/25

SOUTH HACKENSACK BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC NOTICE NOTICE is hereby given that the Board of Adjustment of the Township of South Hackensack, by resolution duly adopted on August 22, 2011, for the reasons set forth in its resolution of that date, granted variances for application No.2011-08, Francesco Baricella, and designated as Block 13.03 Lot 3.04 and more commonly known as 112 Phillips Avenue, South Hackensack, New Jersey, for variances in connection with the proposed construction of an addition to existing dwelling to be utilized as a two family dwelling. A copy of that resolution is on file in the office of the Township Clerk, 227 Phillips Avenue, South Hackensack, New Jersey, and is available for inspection by member of the public during the regular business hours of that office. Lydia Heinzelman Board of Adjustment Secretary August 25, 2011-fee:\$28.35 (30) 3142157

Public Notice ID: 17097188