

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.

All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.  
All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.  
All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.

All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.

All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.  
All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.

All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026

**Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
April 15, 2026**

The Regular meeting of The Borough of Florham Park Board of Adjustment was called to order on Wednesday evening at 6:30pm., in the Municipal Building, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, New Jersey.

Mr. Jeffrey Noss, Vice Chairman  
Mr. John Novalis  
Mr. Brian O'Connor  
Mr. Michael Shivietz  
Mr. Ed Facas  
Mr. Marc DeBoer (1<sup>st</sup> Alt)

**Members Absent:**

Mr. Michael Cannilla, Chairman  
Mr. Rick Zeien

**Also Present:**

Mr. Michael Mullen, Esq., Board Attorney

**Call to Order:**

Mr. Noss, Vice-Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Statement of Adequate Notice:**

Mr. Noss asked the Board Secretary if the statutory requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been met. Board Secretary Alyssa Van Liew responded that we are in compliance with the requirements.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 1, 2026 Meeting.  
Mr. Facas made a motion to approve the minutes, second by Mr. O'Connor  
Roll Call: On a roll call vote all members present and eligible voted for approval.

**Resolutions of Approval**

2. **John & Marianne Klein** **Application # BOA 26-06**  
11 Vultee Drive  
Block 2802, Lot 12

Applicant is looking to add a master bedroom and bathroom above to an existing 1 story, attached; 2 car garage.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Shivietz

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, DeBoer

3. **Lukasz Kosc** **Application #BOA26-05**  
6 Indian Lane  
Block 2103, Lot 6

Applicant is seeking approval for excess lot coverage variance to install an inground pool and patio.

Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Novalis

Eligible voters: Noss, Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietz, Facas, DeBoer

4. Yvonne Cali Application # BOA 26-04  
39 Lincoln Avenue  
Block 3001, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking variance approval for a side-yard setback encroachment.  
Mr. O'Connor made a motion to approve the resolution, second by Mr. Facas  
Eligible voters: Novalis, O'Connor, Shivietsz, Facas, DeBoer  
Ineligible voter: Noss

**C Variance:**

5. Gerald Verrilli Application #BOA26-07  
3 Cross Lane  
Block 2405, Lot 4

Applicant is seeking approval to repair and replace the rear paver patio and walkway that is in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. Gerald Verrilli is a returning applicant from the BOA, April 1, 2026 meeting. He was reminded he was still under oath. He thanked the board, thanked them for their time and the opportunity along with their feedback and thoughtful review and took it into consideration to come back with a smaller patio. As the first owner of the brand-new home in June 2012, he expanded the patio 148 square feet without a permit. He was unaware that a permit was needed to do so. He applied for a generator permit two years ago and that is when his error came to light.

In his new sketch, he has reduced the patio by 55.7%. He is requesting a modest increase of 65.5 square feet versus what it was when the house was originally purchased in 2012. The amount increase is 0.38% improved lot coverage.

He feels he has mitigating aspects of his property: 2 large drywells under the front lawn that have 647 cubic feet of capacity. His entire gutter leader feeds into the drywells. Surface drain in the backyard adjacent to his patio that feeds into the drywells. If approved it would give him an improved lot coverage of 32.09%, renovating it would decrease it to 31.62%.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis clarified he should have done his due diligence, hire a lawyer, run a title search and prior to obtaining a CO, so he wouldn't be in the situation he is in.

Mr. Steve Azzolini commented from an attorney's point of view. He said he would request the lot grading plan from the builder so his client would know how much they have to work with prior to completing the sale to avoid the current situation.

Mr. Novalis stated how he doesn't think that because he put in drywells, the gutter system and everything else warrants Mr. Verrilli to expand the size of his patio. Mr. Novalis asked the applicant, Mr. Verrilli if he considered going back to his original size. He replied to him letting him know if so, he would have to reposition sprinklers, dispose of patio furniture and other things that wouldn't benefit him going to the patio's original size.

Mr. Noss acknowledged the efforts Mr. Verrilli made on his property; Mr. O'Connor told him the efforts he has made on the property don't have anything to do with him expanding the patio and now looking for relief from the board for his mistake.

Mr. Facas counter-offered and asked for a motion to approve.  
Mr. DeBoer second the motion.  
All members present voted yes, except Mr. Novalis and Mr. O'Connor.

6. Domenico Vitulli Application #BOA26-03  
265 Brooklake Road  
Block 2009, Lot 7

Applicant is looking to add one story addition to the right side of the home.

Mr. & Mrs. Domenico and Jamie Vitulli are present and being represented by Mr. Steve Azzolini, Esq. who is also present.

Mr. Azzolini expressed how his clients are: seeking bulk variance relief for: side yard setback, increase in building and lot coverage in connection with this one story existing single-family home. Lot coverage increase is 112 square feet over permitted. 2.63% over existing building coverage. Client's uncle built the home in 1957 to whatever the framework was back then. It did not comply with the modern standards for today. It was built out as a wide spread-out ranch. The garage is small. It doesn't fit one car completely in with passengers being able to comfortably exit. They are looking to have a car in the garage and have the ability to exit the car. You have to go into the basement to enter the home from the garage. There is no connection from the garage to the home. The addition is to allow direct access from the garage to the home. The applicant is also proposing a drywell system to capture 833 square feet of the new roof area into the drainage area since it would be 112 square feet over.

Mr. Azzolini gave an exhibit, labelled A1 from Google Earth showing the property hasn't changed since 2002.

An addition was done in 1992 where a room was added in the back, CO was issued and closed; Exhibit A2. Exhibit A3 is the ordinance cited by the Zoning Officer, 250-7.1 for the width of the driveway. The ordinance didn't come into effect until 2008.

Exhibit A4 is the bulk table from the year 1995; which indicates there was no lot coverage in 1995. The building coverage was 15% for the R-15 Zone, now it is 14%.

Exhibit A5 shows what is on the side of the neighboring property.

Client's uncle built the house, her mom bought it from him and she purchased it from her mom. The existing building coverage is 16.04%, required is 14%, built is 1957, addition in 1992. Since then, no changes have been done to the home. Looking to go up to 18.4%, an increase of 2.63% over existing coverage. It is a one-story addition, modest addition, not massive, according to Mr. Azzolini.

Mr. Noss and Mr. Novalis inquired and Mr. Azzolini confirmed the height of the proposed addition; it will not be going on top of the garage; they fix the roof line to make it all look nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Mrs. Jamie Vitulli is sworn in by Zoning Board of Adjustment Board Attorney, Mr. Michael Mullen and testifies on her behalf. She states that the home was built by her uncle, her parents loved the house so when the opportunity to purchase the house came up, her parents did so around 1999. Her dad passed away about two years ago, mom has Parkinson's disease and requires more care, so her and her family-her husband and two children; decided to move to the home.

She testified that there were no changes made to the driveway since it was built and no changes made to the home since 2002. The garage is very tight, can't open the doors comfortably, with mom's declining health, she will need a wheelchair in the future. They anticipate future needs of a ramp as well to accommodate her mother and her needs.

She wants to propose the modest addition of accommodating two people to now five people to have access from the garage to the house. They have to enter the home now from the basement. If you have to go from the house to the garage, you do so from the front door. She also spoke with the neighbor who agreed with their project because they are encroaching 3 or so feet into the side yard setback.

Mr. Michael Mullen swore Mr. Domenico Vitulli in to speak and testify on his behalf. He had a survey done to clarify the property line.

The Architect, Mr. Nicolas Salerno, of 478 Ridgedale Ave, East Hanover, NJ. He has been doing this for over 45 years. He is accepted as an expert in architecture. The proposed garage is 5 feet high and 34 feet deep. It will grant direct access to the family room from the garage. He doesn't think the upgrades will infringe on the neighborhood as the next-door home is massive. It will not intrude on the light, air, and space of the neighbors. They are proposing the new garage to be 14 feet wide and 6-7 feet high.

Mr. Novalis suggested they take in 3 feet to the left, from the house and not needing a variance and getting so close to the neighbor to still consider the neighbor's right to expand on their property.

Mr. Azzolini said how his client's house was built to the rules and regulations to back then, the next-door neighbor's house was built a couple years ago to the standards of today. Mr. Novalis reiterated how he can take 3 feet from the home, near the chimney near the family room and dining room area.

Mr. DeBoer inquired what is the existing garage door? Mr. Salerno replied telling him it is 8 feet and a standard garage door is 9 feet. Mr. DeBoer said why not keep the accessories in the framed shed in the backyard instead of the garage. Mr. DeBoer lives on the same road, Brooklake Road, so he understands wanting the home accessories closer than further but there is another way to access them.

The Board, applicant's attorney, and applicant discussed potential resolutions to try and meet on common ground to be approved. Mr. Azzolini suggested we should hear the neighbor's testimony to help the applicant's case and how the encroachment wouldn't be an issue for her.

Mr. DeBoer suggested them to make it an 11-foot garage and the side yard setback variance can go away. They haven't discussed the very big driveway and why isn't there any convo about changing that. There hasn't been any discussion about addressing the stonewall.

Mr. Azzolini said how they had talks about removing the shed which is 230 square feet. Mr. O'Connor asked about doing a PERC test. Mr. Azzolini said how they do not want to do it if it is not needed as it is a very expensive test.

Break from 8:04 PM – 8:15 PM

Mr. Azzolini, Architect - Nicolas Salerno, and applicants – Domenico & Jamie Vitulli spoke and they are willing to decrease the side yard setback, going from 10 feet to 9 feet. The lot coverage is 112 feet over and they will remove a part of the shed, at least a minimum of 112 feet so they will not need a lot coverage variance. They will still do the stormwater management and it will also reduce the building coverage lightly. These changes will make the application more reasonable and more aligned with the law.

Mr. Mullen said they have the option to go home, think about it, before looking for a decision to be made this evening.

Within the discussion amongst the parties in the room, they confirmed with the proposed conditions, the applicants would be only 1% over on the existing building coverage. They confirmed the two variances they are seeking approval are side yard setback, which will be 9 feet rather than 10 feet; and building coverage not to exceed 7 feet, .4%. Mr. Azzolini wanted the driveway to be considered as a pre-existing condition. They must also do the PERC test to put the drywell in.

We did a vote to ensure the present board members are comfortable with voting on the application tonight with the new proposed revisions. All present voted yes.

Mr. Facas made a motion for the application to be approved with the side yard set back of 9 feet, building coverage not to exceed 17.4%, Mr. O'Connor seconded the motion. A PERC test must be done and the drywell installation must accommodate the results.

All members present and eligible voted Yes for the applicant.

On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Alyssa Van Liew  
Board Secretary

April 15, 2026