MINUTES
TOWNSHIP OF WEST ORANGE
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT SPECIAL MEETING
October 29, 2026
8:00 P.M.

The West Orange Zoning Board of Adjustment held a special meeting on **October 29, 2026**, commencing at 8:00 PM utilizing the virtual Zoom platform.

Chairperson Philip D. Neuer called the meeting to order at approximately 8:00 PM. It was announced that notification of this meeting was given to the Township Clerk, the West Orange Chronicle, and the Star-Ledger and posted on the Township Bulletin Board in accordance with the "Senator Byron M. Baer Open Public Meetings Act" and the "Publication Reform Act."

Chairperson Philip D. Neuer asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. Kelly Carey, Esq., Board Attorney, read the opening statement.

ROLL CALL

Present:	William Michael Barbee, Tal Ben-Zvi, Laurence Cohen, Michael Dannemiller, Robin Miller, Philip D. Neuer, Irv Schwarzbaum, Brent D. Scott Marc Sussman, Alice Weiss
Absent:	Todd Dubovy (Excused Absence)
Also Present:	Kelly Carey, Esq., Board Attorney Diana L. Chandler, Board Secretary Ryan MacNeill, Consultant Engineer Christopher Dochney, Consultant Planner

Ms. Carey and Chairperson Neuer confirmed the presence of a quorum of Board Members.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Future Meetings: November 19, 2026 (Regular Meeting)
  December 17, 2026 (Regular Meeting)
  January 21, 2027 (Regular Meeting)
- Chairperson Neuer recognized **ZB-25-10 Seton Hall Preparatory (700 Prospect Avenue)** Ms. Erica Parlavecchio Esq, on behalf of applicant Seton Hall Prep and Mr. James Turteltaub Esq. on behalf of objector, Kevin Malanga. On request of Mr. Turteltaub's client being away November 19, 2026, an adjournment to the **January 21, 2027, Regular Meeting** via Zoom was requested. Chairperson Neuer approved this adjournment with preservation of notice but informed both parties that they need to be prepared to present or Ms. Parlavecchio will have no choice but to withdraw the application without prejudice and reapply. Ms. Parlavecchio agreed to the extension of the application.

SWEARING IN

- Township Professional(s) Township Professional(s) Christopher Dochney (Consulting Planner) and Ryan MacNeill (Consultant Engineer) were sworn under oath.

RESOLUTION

- **ZB-26-03 - WO Plaza** **(Approved 10/15/2026)**
  235 Prospect Avenue
  Block:152.01 Lot: 1445 &14485.05
  Zone: P-C
  The application requesting Interpretation of the Zoning Code's definitions for "fast food restaurant" and "restaurant" in order to permit several proposed food establishments in the Planned Commercial (P-C) Zone was heard and the establishments were determined to be "restaurants" under the current provisions of the Code at the October 15, 2026, Regular Meeting.
    - After some comments from the Board, this resolution was tabled to the **November 19, 2026, Regular Meeting** so further edits can be reviewed.

APPLICATIONS

1.) **ZB-25-07 Mavis Tire** **(Carried from 9/17/2026)**
460 Prospect Avenue
Block 105, Lot 64.01
The applicant proposes to remove the existing structure and construct a tire center / motor vehicle service station with seven service bays and a retail sales area encompassing 1,142 square feet including a showroom, sales counter, waiting area, and bathrooms. A d-1 use variance relief is required to permit a motor vehicle service station in the general commercial district.

PRESENTATION

- Ms. Lisa John-Basta Esq., entered the record on behalf of the applicant Mavis Tire and provided a brief summary on what the application is asking for and previous testimony.
- Mr. Justin Taylor, Traffic Engineer was sworn under oath and his credentials were accepted as an expert in the field of Traffic Engineering.
- Mr. Taylor presented a Traffic Impact Study dated July 21, 2025 and updated June 26, 2026 where he summarizes his traffic impact study: site access, circulation improvements, parking, and traffic volume projections. Key points include a request for a parking variance (22 spaces provided vs. 25 required by code), use of ITE's "tire store" land use category instead of "motor vehicle service station," and findings that the new use will not negatively impact traffic flow or nearby roadway capacity.

BOARD QUESTIONS

- Chairperson Neuer asked if the actual counts done at this location, how many customers per day would utilize it. Mr. Taylor answered that on a daily basis, the ITE would project 177 trips. If you divide that in half without including the ins and outs it would be approximately 88 daily trips in a combination of customers and employees entering the site each day.
- I. Schwarzbaum asked if those seven (7) bays, the requirement is, 25 spots, and there are 22 spaces. Is that correct? Mr. Taylor said yes, that's correct. Mr. followed up with six (6) bays. What the parking requirement be? Mr. Taylor answered that if reduced it by two

(2), the parking requirement would be 23. Mr. Schwarzbaum followed up and asked if it was five (5) bays? Mr. Taylor said that there would be 21 spaces. Mr. Schwarzbaum said in general, the Board tries to minimize the number of variances, so in confirmation, if it was five (5) bays, there would not be a parking variance. Mr. Taylor confirmed that there would not be a parking variance in that case but the rationale of the ordinance and the ordinance definition required to use one because it's the closest and most applicable, doesn't really fully categorize the operation of the use being proposed which is why the applicant looks towards the ITE for something more current and more applicable to the type of use. When looked at that's how he arrived at the opinion that the parking would be sufficient. Reason being that when the actual use for the number of employees and size, the range of 12 to 18 spaces maximum demand come into play which can be accommodated by what is being proposing at this application site

- Mr. Schwarzbaum asked for confirmation that Mr. Taylor testified that he didn't look at other Mavis' and if he was aware of Mavis locations within five (5) miles. How many bays they have in those facilities? Mr. Taylor answered no, saying that it's not an analysis done.
- Mr. Schwarzbaum asked if there were fewer bays, would there be fewer round trips. Mr. Taylor said that he doesn't think you can draw the direct correlation there that he thinks it would still potentially take the same amount of service calls just with extended hours on how it was to accommodate the demand being generated at the facility.
- L. Cohen asked about the bays facing south as per renderings and if the bays faced west, would that be an impediment of the traffic coming in and out and would that work in Mr. Taylor's opinion. Mr. Taylor said that if the entire module was rotated 90 degrees clockwise, it would be very similar to what was originally submitted and during the Site Plan Review Advisory Board (SPRAB) meeting it was recommended to reconfigure the building to reduce the number of variances as well as have the retail storefront facing Prospect Avenue.
- R. Miller asked Mr. Taylor to restate how many daily trips would Mavis generate. Mr. Taylor answered stating that there would be 177.
- M. Dannemiller asked what day of the week and time of the traffic counts being performed. Mr. Taylor said they were done on May 28, 2026 and the hours counted were 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM – 6:30 PM.
- T. Ben-Zvi asked for any reasoning behind choosing the dates he did. Mr. Taylor said that they normally look for a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday because of anomalous traffic patterns on Mondays and Fridays. All schools were in session and the weather was good, normal traffic patterns were in place. Dr. Ben-Zvi asked if he caught school traffic during those times. Mr. Taylor said that is the reason that the counts were redone in 2026 was to pick up the school peaks.

PROFESSIONALS QUESTIONS

- R. MacNeill asked from a circulation standpoint on deliveries and refuse if there is any issue with the applicant extending into the opposite lane of traffic and if he could just comment on both those circulation patterns? Mr. Taylor answered stating that the site has been designed for them to be able to enter and exit the site staying in their own lane of traffic. The driveway has been widened along Prospect, to ensure that this could occur, over the 18 feet that's currently out there. So deliveries and refuse can circulate to and from the site while staying within their own lane of traffic. Mr. MacNeill asked for him to comment on the parking spaces along Blueberry Bend that are set in a little deeper than typical if that is a benefit to them pulling out into Blueberry Bend being more harmful, or is that a benefit, having them set in further? Mr. Taylor said that the thought was to give extra room in that area, primarily because of the adjacent catering facility. Where they have their steps and a decorative wall on their property, so the applicant wanted to give

extra room for maneuverability from those spaces. As well as to be able to accommodate the truck circulation and the emergency vehicle circulation throughout the site, so it was thought that it was a benefit to recess them a little bit.

- C. Dochney asked about the number of bay doors and how it relates to parking, if the number of service bays that a tire store or an auto service facility provides, is what drives the amount of traffic that comes here. He gave an example that if they had 20 bays, did triple the amount of traffic, or is it more a function of how many people within miles of this particular location are in need of new tires. Mr. Taylor answered stating that from a purely trip generation perspective, usually its evaluated based on square footage but the demand generated to the site is really a function of the demand in the general area. There is an existing Mavis not far north from the application site. They have a certain amount of business that this site would then be replacing. So, it's driven by the number of people within that radius that need new tires. Mr. Dochney asked for confirmation whether reducing the number of service bays would reduce the parking requirement, but it wouldn't necessarily reduce the traffic generated by the site in terms of trips. Mr. Taylor said yes. Mr. Dochney opined that in terms of if the number of bays were reduced, but the size of the building was not, that might not actually change their parking requirements, then presumably the retail space associated would also get bigger and require more parking, so unless the entire building got smaller as well. The actual parking wouldn't go down just with the bay door's going down.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- Sue Donas (108 Coccio Drive) asked if pedestrian safety counting was done. Mr. Taylor said that it is typically done but he did not see it in the data so pedestrian movements may not have been picked up.
- Ms. Donas asked if the site distance at the driveway was measured. Mr. Taylor said that the site distance was measured and that it does meet site distance criteria. Ms. Donas asked if the height of a person would make a difference in that determination. Mr. Taylor said no that it is based upon a vehicle height (an eye height of 3.5 feet).
- Ms. Donas asked if a Crash History Analysis was performed. Mr. Taylor said that a crash analysis was not performed.
- Lisa Correa (34 Cerone Court) asked if Mr. Taylor has ever referred to Mavis as a "motor vehicle station" before this Board. Mr. Taylor said no.
- Ms. Correa asked about the usage of the previous Weichert building being used as a retail operation and thus the impact would be similar. Mr. Taylor said no, that is not correct at all in what was testified to. He said that there is an existing building there, an existing office. He continued stating that based on ITE trip generation for the office building, that was there, similarly sized, it can be assumed that it would generate approximately six (6) more trips in the morning; four (4) more trips in the evening peak hour, and then on Saturday, 24 more trips. Again, because the office building typically does not have as much, operation on a Saturday. But yes, this generates comparable to what was there within, ten (10) peak hour trips.
- Kathleen Voort (247 Coccio Drive) asked coming from the north, where are people supposed to turn and similarly when people exit the site, if they're exiting going north but they want to go south where are they supposed to turn for that? Mr. Taylor said that exiting the site and wanting to travel to the south, someone would have to make a right out of the site, proceed to the next traffic signal, and perform a U turn maneuver which is permitted at the shopping center entrance. If someone is coming south, or coming south along Prospect, Rooney Circle will need to be utilized to then circle around the back of the shopping center and come in, navigate to Point South and be traveling North on Prospect to get there. But this is a destination, land use primarily and people are going to know how they're getting to and from the facility. It's not a random decision to go get their tires

changed. So, like any other mid-block site on a divided roadway, vehicles will find their path to where they're going.

- Ms. Voort asked if in the Traffic Study was there any reference to the Guarino intersection. But yet there was reference to Rooney Circle. Mr. Taylor said that they counted traffic at Rooney Circle, to get a baseline as well as the site driveways. Because in his opinion it was the closest, signal to where the site is proposed. But the rationale behind looking at it goes back to the DOT's definition of a significant impact, and when the DOT sets forth this criteria of a significant impact for when adjacent intersections should be studied to determine if the site-generated traffic potentially has an impact. And that threshold is 100 new peak hour trips. So what they have determined is if it's less than 100 new peak hour trips, the intersection is not significantly impacted and is really not necessary to be studied. In the condition that for Guarino Drive, there are approximately, a maximum of 23 vehicles during any one of the peak hours through that intersection, which is a quarter of what's been established as a significant impact. So, the introduction of a car every few minutes is not going to have any significant impact on the adjacent intersection.
- Ms. Voort asked for clarification and confirmation that Rooney Circle is actually the entire road that runs around the shopping center. Mr. Taylor said yes. That it is the southern terminus of Rooney Circle, where it intersects Prospect, which is just opposite the catering facility.
- Kevin Malanga (Ridge Road) asked how many sites Mr. Taylor has provided analysis and testimony for Mavis. Mr. Taylor answered saying half a dozen over the last ten (10) years. Mr. Malanga followed up by asking for confirmation that he has distinguished between retail tire stores and automobile repair shops and the reason behind his distinction. Mr. Taylor said that typically it's the level of automotive operations that are done at the facility in order to classify it into the correct ITE land use code.
- Mr. Malanga asked if it is advantageous to classify a use as a retail tire store versus an automobile repair shop? Mr. Taylor said that he has never compared them side by side and it is not an analysis that he does.
- Mr. Malanga asked if he is familiar with the types of work that is performed at a Mavis store. Mr. Taylor said yes. Mr. Malanga followed up by asking if Mr. Taylor has ever looked at the Mavis website. Mr. Taylor said yes, but not recently. Mr. Malanga followed up by asking about specific work performed (oil changes, car battery changes, brake services, and mufflers with exhaust repairs) Mr. Taylor said that he isn't sure if he can go down this line of questioning.
- Mr. Malanga asked about the number of spaces being deficient by three (3) spaces. Mr. Taylor said its two (2) because an Electric Vehicle space the requirement is actually reduced by one (1) per the state statute so technically 24 spaces are required and only 22 are provided. Mr. Malanga asked for confirmation of the calculation of what 1.66 spaces per employee is based on. Mr. Taylor said that it is based on ITE parking generation 6th edition with seven (7) employees at this site. Mr. Taylor said yes that seven (7) employees would be the maximum.
- Barry Kirschenbaum (269 DeRose Court) asked for what general maintenance is. Mr. Taylor said that general automotive maintenance typically means light, repairs, oil changes, brake changes, and that sort of nature.
- Mr. Kirschenbaum asked in reference to the Traffic Study was that it was during best weather conditions and what happens during poor weather conditions. Mr. Taylor said during poor conditions, there is a reduction in the traffic along the roadways. The reason behind doing counts during best weather conditions is to show people with their normal traffic patterns.
- David Dockery (Legal Counsel for Eagle Ridge Community) asked about the proposed driveways will provide safe and efficient access to the roadway system. Mr. Taylor said yes. Mr. Dockery asked for confirmation that no crash history study was done. Mr. Taylor

answered in the affirmative. Mr. Taylor said that his opinion was based on the operational characteristics as set forth in the traffic study, as well as a review of the safe sight lines in the area.

- Alan Defina (39 Musano Court) asked that since the traffic studies were done primarily during daytime hours, if there was any consideration given to when it starts to get dark in the evening how visibility might be impacted. Mr. Taylor said that sight lines along the roadway will continue to be what they are and are not impacted by the light or dark conditions.
- Mr. Defina asked if in any of the studies done for Mavis did he evert feel the needs to advise them that the proposed plan was not a good one. Mr. Taylor said that he has definitely worked with them to establish safe travel patterns and appropriate parking accommodations where things have been modified using the Civil Engineer to ensure that the driveways are going to work safely and efficiently.
- Lou Hammel (385 Digaetano Terrace) asked for clarification that the only legal way to enter Mavis is traveling north. Mr. Taylor said yes. Mr. Hammel followed up by asking for confirmation that in order to access traveling north someone would have to go through Essex Green get on to Rooney Circle and then go around the shopping center. Mr. Taylor said yes.
- Linda DiLorenzo (91 Giordano Drive) asked about the allowance of, U-turns at two (2) different spots on Prospect Avenue where she wanted to know if that was considered in the traffic studies that were done, because any traffic studies done would not have had had the number of people in that area making those U-turns, and certainly people making U-turns impact the traffic. Mr. Taylor said that the traffic associated with the people doing that today was encompassed in the background traffic counts. Those are the people that are out there on the roadways now. What they anticipate is, a handful of vehicles coming up to the light and making a U-turn. Again he would refer back to what is considered significant and that 100-trip threshold, the half a dozen cars that might be doing it over an hour, or a car every five (5) minutes or so isn't going to have any impact on the operation of that U-turn facility, or that left turn lane. Ms. DiLorenzo said, okay, and how about how having additional cars making U-turns in two (2) different spots will impact pedestrians trying to cross the street and isn't that going to increase the danger level for people trying to cross? Mr. Taylor said absolutely not. That the U-turns are done while the pedestrians crossing the same leg of traffic have to stop, right? It's done when the left turns are permitted, and the pedestrians crossing Prospect are not allowed to cross at the same time as the left turn lane is going. So there's really no interaction between the U-turn, U-turning vehicle and the pedestrians crossing that intersection.
- Ms. DiLorenzo asked referencing the parking, spot study. Asking for clarification that, it was based on looking at Mavis as primarily a tire store, is that correct? Mr. Taylor answered saying not exactly because the 25 number comes from an application of the closest applicable land use within the ordinance, within the municipality's ordinance. The total number of 25 is because of the number of bays, the number of retail space, and just the use, the intrinsic use of the service station. The justification that used to draw, and the way he came to his professional opinion, is that Mavis looked at a more applicable, similar-type land use that the Institute of Transportation Engineers publish, which is a Tire Store, which is the retail business of selling tires, and is what Mavis does here and the data says that per employee, it would be 1.66 spaces of demand per employee for the (7) employees, that translates into a demand of 12 parking spaces, which is easily accommodated within the 22 spaces that are proposed. Ms. DiLorenzo asked about the other study mentioned where it requires 25 versus the 22, that's still more than a 10% reduction in what there should be, correct? Mr. Taylor said that the applicant is providing 90% of what's required or the closest applicable ordinance, land use, would say that is required.

Break 9 :29 PM- 9 :39 PM

Upon return from break, Chairperson Neuer had a roll call performed and a quorum was again confirmed.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Continued)

- Andrew Matt (6 Cerone Court) asked if Mr. Taylor prepared this study personally. Mr. Taylor said it was prepared under his supervision. That he was reviewing everything as it was prepared and reviewed it before it went out underneath his signature.
- Mr. Matt asked for confirmation utilizing Table 4 what the entering and exiting trips for the weekday evening peak hour are? Mr. Taylor answered that for the evening peak hour the total traffic out is 14, in is 10 vehicles, totaling 24 vehicles. Mr. Matt followed up by asking if the study classifying a trip made to pick up a previously serviced vehicle as a primary trip? Mr. Taylor said yes. Mr. Matt asked for confirmation of Mr. Taylor's previous testimony of 177 daily trips, which is about 88 vehicles asking how many of those are employees, and how many were customers coming back to pick up a car. Mr. Taylor said that the trip generation data does not separate between employees and customers. Mr. Matt asked for confirmation that the demand is eight (8) to 12 spaces based on employees and if that includes the cars of customers waiting on site during a one and a half (1 ½) to two (2) hour service? Mr. Taylor said yes, it does.
- Mr. Matt asked for confirmation on questions about, this site being considered a service station and if he is not aware that the D1 use variance is for a motor vehicle service station. Mr. Taylor said yes, that he understands that the West Orange Ordinance Land use definition that could be applied here is the motor vertical service station but it doesn't have within the Ordinance a specific land use code for both use and parking that is really directly applicable to what is being proposed which is why applications like these rely on national data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers to come up with the projections of both trip generation and parking for the real specific land use.
- Mr. Matt asked for confirmation saying that although this is requesting a D1 variance for a motor vehicle service station, he thought it was more appropriate to use the ITE's data on a tire store. Mr. Taylor said yes, that he felt that what Mavis does is more applicable, or more closely resembles what's within the ITE Land Use Code. Mr. Matt asked if any other considerations were made besides the tire store. Mr. Taylor said that they did not, because this is the most applicable land use code to what Mavis does. Mr. Matt asked for confirmation on Mr. Taylor's testimony about the reasoning about using the national ITE rates, instead of that Mavis'. Mr. Taylor answered that Mavis is closed, and it goes back to utilizing national data. When applicable, and when available for the individual use.
- Mr. Matt referenced Table 6's build analysis relying on the write in, write out restriction with some correspondence with the County and a restriction on Blueberry Bend. Even though the spaces along Blueberry Bend were set deeper for the truck circulation mentioned and Mr. Taylor said yes because they utilize both the site driveway and Blueberry Bend. Mr. Matt followed up by asking where the tire delivery truck stands while unloading. Mr. Taylor said that it is in stages in the Southeast corner of the building up against the face of the building outside of peak hours. Mr. Matt asked if cars are still able to pass in both directions. Mr. Taylor said yes and it is mentioned in the study on page 10 under site access and circulation it says the site plan indicates, the site can sufficiently

accommodate a large wheelbase vehicle, such as a single-unit truck, and emergency vehicles.

- Alan Culler (118 Coccio Drive) asked about the testimony regarding U turns and whether in the traffic study, did he look at what the current, usage of that for U-turns is. Mr. Taylor said that intersection (Rooney Circle), because it did not rise to the level of needing to, based on the NJDOT thresholds.
- Marcia Davis (109 Coccio) asked whether aging was considered in the demographics of his study. Mr. Taylor said that is not a metric typically analyzed. Ms. Davis followed up by asking if he is aware of the demographics of the Eagle Ridge community. Mr. Taylor answered that it was not material to the analysis performed.
- Sandra Kaplan (191 Zeppi Lane) wanted clarification on the notion that traffic at Garino might not be impacted, Sandra Kaplan: Could you explain why there were no studies of the current traffic patterns in and out of the driveways there, because there are people who do make turns into the driveway, thinking that they can make a U-turn around the gatehouse, and sometimes they drive into the wrong way which clearly is a safety issue. So why was that not included as part of the traffic study? Mr. Taylor answered that there are a couple reasons. First off, the thresholds used as traffic engineers on intersections in need of study, right? It's the DOT threshold of 100 new peak hour trips, and the entire development doesn't generate more than a third of what that threshold is. So, the analysis based on that criterion is not something that needed to be done. But a little further, the vehicles entering Guarino, the only people that are leaving this facility that would be entering Guarino is somebody that lives within that gated community that just had their tires done at the Mavis. So the turns into it were not really part of the study or of the analysis, strictly for that reason.
- Michaela Bennett (Old Indian Road) asked about methodology for the trucks and delivery (deliver, turn around, and exit). Mr. Taylor said for vehicle delivery, the vehicle would enter off of Prospect into the driveway navigating the Southeast corner of the building and it would egress out of Blueberry Bend.
- Ms. Bennett asked if it has been determined how trucks will be ingressing and egressing. Mr. Taylor answered saying that vehicle circulation templates provided show the vehicle entering off of the site driveway and exiting off of Blueberry Bend.
- Ms. Bennett asked for confirmation that coming out of this site, someone would have to cross two (2) lanes of traffic to get into that turning lane. Mr. Taylor said yes. Ms. Bennett followed up her questioning asking for confirmation while taking a quick look at an aerial view of that turning lane, where she sees a left-hand turn, but no U-turn, point. Mr. Taylor answered that if she was looking at the same Google Ariel Image, then yes, that's correct.
- Ms. Bennett asked about about the traffic study, and did if he accounted separately for vehicles that are being dropped off and picked up, employee parking, and delivery trucks. Mr. Taylor answered yes, that within the trip generation numbers quoted earlier, as well as the parking numbers, all those types of users are incorporated into the maximum demand. So, about ITE projects 1.66 spaces per employee translates into 12 vehicles demand that can be accommodated within the 22 parking spaces. If you were to utilize the square footage number, it translates into 18 vehicles, again, accommodated by the 22 that are proposed and that is a combination of both employees, customers dropping off their vehicle, and the vehicles being worked on.

- Ms. Bennett asked about trash and the picking up including the involvement of how old tires are going to be picked up. Mr. Taylor said obviously there was a dumpster and its picking up once a week typically or less frequently depending on the need. The tires are taken away be the same people who deliver the tires so that truck is every two (2) weeks and all of the tires are picked up during the day during the potential off peak hours (potentially mid-morning but not overnight.)
- Amy Krompier (58 Musano Court) asked about safety vehicles getting through if the number of cares getting through and they are using spaces what the logistics of how a fire truck would get through bypassing the other vehicles being serviced. Mr. Taylor said that the vehicle being serviced would be directly within the bay. The vehicle's either waiting to be serviced, or the employee vehicles will be parked in the parking spaces, and the emergency vehicle circulates through the circulation aisles. In the event of needing more than one (1) emergency vehicle they would all be able to stage within the circulation aisles of the facility. But there is room within the 30-foot aisle along the face of the building for emergency vehicles to stage. There's also room within Blueberry Bend and the north-south aisle on the eastern side of the parking field for vehicles to stage. So there's adequate room for multiple emergency vehicles to be on site at the same time. In doing a study it modeled a 47-foot-long fire truck circulating through the site and it can adequately circulate through the site. So, that coupled with an ambulance, or a police car, can all be on the site at the same time. If the emergency responders felt that it was necessary to either move vehicles or evacuate vehicles. They would guide that, operation.
- Mindy Feld (193 Zeppi Lane) asked about creating the sidewalk going towards the traffic light at Guarino and asked for confirmation that they are pushing pedestrian traffic so that customers of Mavis can cross at the light where there is indeed a crosswalk. Mr. Taylor said yes that they are providing pedestrian accommodations and a sidewalk across the entire frontage of the building but the intent would be for a customer to drop their car and go to the shopping center (Essex Green) they would travel north along the sidewalk to the north and utilize the crosswalks and pedestrians' accommodations at that signal.
- Barbara Quakenbos (369 Stiles Court) asked if a crash analysis was performed in any safety study for any client other than Mavis. Mr. Taylor said yes that he has, but he could not recall which customers or clients those were.
- Nicholas Strontses (214 Cerone Court) asked if any of the other applications he has done for Mavis were for a use variance. Mr. Taylor said that he believes so, referenced the Marlboro, NJ location but he didn't recall if there were any other ones and it was granted with them opening and operating presently.
- Stephanie Regan (265 DeRose Court) for clarification on Mavis selling tires and also performing minor vehicular maintenance, because they are trying to fit in what Mavis does into the existing guidelines and metrics. Mr. Taylor said that from an Ordinance perspective and a parking requirement perspective, yes, the applicant tried to utilize the most applicable land use. The general automotive maintenance falls right within the purview of the land use code used. Whether it's a personal vehicle or a fleet vehicle tire installation repair and general automotive maintenance is what is done. So, yes, the land use chosen and utilized for analysis is directly applicable to what Mavis does.
- Lara Thompson (79 Vacca Drive) asked how the trucks are getting to Prospect Avenue. Mr. Taylor answered saying that the truck circulation provided shows the vehicles entering from the south and the rationale behind that is that it is a more restrictive turning movement.

When analyzing the driveways, it has been designed to accommodate the right turn maneuver.

It was at this point in the meeting that Ms. John-Basta requested an adjournment to the next available meeting. Chairperson Neuer agreed to carry this application with preservation of notice to a Special Meeting scheduled for December 3, 2026, via Zoom.

Chairperson Neuer adjourned the meeting at 10:57 PM

Adopted: 11/19/2026

Diana Lyn Chandler

Diana L. Chandler, Secretary