

**ROGER McLARNON, in his capacity as  
Zoning Officer for the City of Margate,**

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**STEVEN B. BAGLIVO,**

Defendant.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
CHANCERY DIVISION  
ATLANTIC COUNTY  
DOCKET NO: **ATL-C-89-24**

CIVIL ACTION

**ORDER**

**THIS MATTER** having been opened to the Court by Plaintiff, Roger McLarnon, Zoning Officer for the City of Margate, by way of Motion for Summary Judgment, and by Defendant, Steven B. Baglivo, by way of Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment; the Court having considered the parties' submissions, the arguments of counsel, and for good cause shown, and for the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum of Decision;

IT IS on this 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026, **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED**.
2. Defendant's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment is **DENIED**.
3. The Court finds Defendant is in violation of Margate Planning Board Resolution 47-2022 and the City of Margate's zoning requirements by: a. Creating and/or maintaining twelve (12) residential dwelling units on the subject property where only six (6) were approved; b. Failing to dedicate two (2) parking spaces to each approved residential unit as required by the Planning Board approval; c. Deviating from the site plan for the parking lot as approved by the Planning Board.
4. Defendant is hereby **ENJOINED** and **ORDERED** to abate the unlawful residential density by reducing the number of residential dwelling units at the Property to no more than six (6) in conformance with Resolution 47-2022, unless and until Defendant obtains the requisite "D" variance relief and all other necessary approvals and permits. Defendant's abatement of the zoning violations must include efforts to address the housing status of any affected tenants.

5. Defendant is further **ORDERED** to dedicate two (2) parking spaces to each of the six approved residential dwelling units, and to bring the parking lot and site configuration into conformity with the approved site plan.
6. The Court retains jurisdiction over this matter to enforce compliance and for consideration of any further appropriate relief.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
**Hon. J. Christopher Gibson, P.J.Ch.**