

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. via Zoom webinar by Chairwoman Robin Malley with the reading of the Open Public Meetings Act.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL:**

Robin Malley, Chairwoman	Present
Barbara Bushell	Present
Dianna Cereijo	Present
Sanjeev Dhawan, Vice Chairman	Absent
Christina Hembree	Present
Michael Kaufman	Present
Philip Maniscalco	Present
Lynda Picinic	Present
S. Robert Princiotto, Esq.	Present
Evan Jacobs, Engineer	Present
Elizabeth Leheny, Planner	Not Requested
Meg Smith, Secretary	Present

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes of the August 24, 2021 meeting were approved as amended on a motion from Mr. Kaufman seconded by Ms. Picinic. Ms. Hembree abstained from this vote due to absence at the August 24th meeting. All other Board members voted in favor of the approval.

**RESOLUTIONS OF APPROVAL**

**Woodcliff Lake Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Inc.  
45 Woodcliff Avenue**

**Block: 2004 Lot: 4  
R-22.5 Zone**

Request for time extension for variances previously granted which include a D-3 Conditional Use Variance for impervious surface coverage of 53% where 30% is allowed. This coverage is being reduced from 56% previously. Amended Site Plan proposes a second ingress/egress and A/C equipment to be placed in the front yard setback.

Ms. Bushell made a motion to approve the resolution and this motion was seconded by Mr. Maniscalco. Ms. Hembree was absent for the original vote on August 24, 2021 and was not eligible to vote. On a roll call vote, all other board members present were in favor of the motion.

**Jane & Steve Sanders  
64 Heather Hill Lane**

**Block: 901 Lot: 1  
R-30 Zone**

Requesting variances for two additions which would require two variances: 1) Rear yard setback of 43.16 feet where 50 feet is required, and 2) Front yard setback of 48.3 feet where 50 feet is required. A third addition in the rear of the property will not require a variance.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion to approve the resolution and this motion was seconded by Ms. Bushell. Ms. Hembree was absent for the original vote on August 24, 2021 and was not eligible to vote. On a roll call vote, all other board members present were in favor of the motion.

**APPLICATION (cont'd)**

**Gerald & Karen Barbara  
15 Franklin Street**

**Block: 2506 Lot:3  
R-22.5 Zone**

Requesting variances for a two-story addition and extension of the front porch which would require the following variances: 1) Building coverage from 14.7% to 21.8% where 15% is permitted, 2) Front yard setback for the second story addition of 26.6 feet where 35 feet is required, 3) Front yard setback for the front porch of 26.9 feet where 35 feet is required, 4) Front yard setback for the front steps of 23.9 feet where 35 feet is required, 5) Side yard setback for the right side of the front porch of 11.7 feet where 20 feet is required, 6) Side yard setback for the left side of the front porch of 11.75 feet where 20 feet is required and 7) Combined yard setback of 27.15 feet where 60 feet is required.

Received: 5/5/21; Deemed administratively complete on 5/17/21; Deemed Complete by Board Engineer: 6/14/21; Revised plans received 9/20/21; Revised Engineering Review 9/24/21.

Ms. Cereijo is recusing herself from this application as her home is within 200 feet of this property.

Mr. Barbara, owner and applicant presented revised Architectural Plans. Mr. Barbara explained that the door originally proposed between the garages has been removed which has increased the side yard setback to 15.45 feet and he has made the driveway smaller.

Mr. Princiotto stated that the revised plans would eliminate the variance for total maximum coverage. Mr. Princiotto stated that Total Building coverage was reduced from 22.8% to 21.8% and combined side yard setbacks has been revised to 27.15 feet.

Mr. Barbara reviewed the revised Site Plan.

Mr. Princiotto stated that the revised garage plans changed the second-floor design of the house.

Mr. Barbara agreed and stated that the balcony originally proposed on the second floor above the garage was removed and the size of the master bedroom and closet is now smaller.

Mr. Barbara shared his screen on Zoom and reviewed the original vs. the revised floor plans.

Mr. Barbara stated that no changes were made to the proposed front porch.

Ms. Malley questioned the chimney.

Mr. Barbara stated that the chimney would remain the same but he would be removing the steps on the right side of the home and closing up the existing door.

Mr. Barbara stated that by opening up the garage wall the ramp from the van will provide access to the home for his handicap parent.

The meeting was opened to the public with a motion from Mr. Kaufman, seconded by Mr. Maniscalco.

The phone number was provided to the public to call in with any questions or concerns regarding this application. The public was also advised that if they were participating via Zoom that they could raise their hand to ask a question or make a comment.

With no members of the public wishing to address the applicant or the board, the meeting was closed to the public with a motion by Mr. Maniscalco, seconded by Mr. Kaufman.

Ms. Hembree questioned water collection and drainage on the property.

Mr. Barbara stated that he has had an Engineer design a plan with seepage pits to collect water from the property and the roof.

Ms. Hembree stated a concern with over building on a property and with living thru recent changes in severe weather.

Mr. Barbara stated that he would agree to put in extra capacity to ensure that there is not a drainage / water problem.

Mr. Jacobs, Board Engineer, stated that this is not a major development but a smaller project proposing an addition of 641 sq. feet of new impervious coverage. Mr. Jacobs stated that the proposed seepage pit will collect ground and roof water and is more than needed to control water. Mr. Jacobs stated that a Soil Movement Application will be required before Construction permits can be issued but that he was satisfied that the proposed plan addressed drainage concerns.

Mr. Princiotto asked Mr. Jacobs if he was aware of any drainage concerns in areas near this property.

Mr. Jacobs stated that he was not aware of any drainage concerns in area near this property.

Ms. Hembree stated that there have been drainage issues on Glen Road and Pascack Road.

Mr. Barbara stated that his property is not in the wetland area and that the Glen Road / Pascack Road intersection is at the bottom of the block.

Mr. Jacobs stated that Franklin Street is about 1,000 feet away from Bear Brook and the reservoir.

Chairwoman Malley stated that the Board is trying to accommodate this request but that this lot is half the size of what is required by zoning standards.

Mr. Barbara state that he made sure that drainage is not an issue and has adjusted side yards as best he could.

Mr. Kaufman stated that he believed that Mr. Barbara tried to address concerns of the board.

Mr. Maniscalco stated that he appreciated the changes made to address board concerns and noted that this is just over 600 sq. feet of additional coverage.

Ms. Picinic stated that review of this application is a balancing act and noted that the applicant has tried to make changes to address board concerns. Ms. Picinic stated that she is most concerned about the neighbor to the left of this property.

Chairwoman Malley stated that she is on the fence as well and is concerned about other neighbors who may want to expand as there is very little distance between the houses and that this can change the look of neighborhoods in Woodcliff Lake.

Mr. Maniscalco questioned the size of the lots to the left and right of this lot.

Mr. Jacobs shared his screen and provided an aerial map to show the neighboring properties.

Ms. Bushell questioned the distance between the two garage doors.

Mr. Barbara stated that it was 3 ½ feet between the garage doors.

Mr. Barbara shared his screen and reviewed the photo of his house and the neighboring house on the left side next to his garage and proposed addition.

Chairwoman Malley questioned if the applicant would consider an oversized single car garage.

Mr. Barbara stated that there would not be enough room to park and not enough driveway.

Chairwoman Malley asked Mr. Jacobs to review the variances requested. Mr. Jacobs detailed variances which include: Front yard setback where 26.6 feet is proposed and 35 feet is required, side yard setback where 11.7 feet is proposed and 20 feet is required (existing non conforming), combined yard setback is proposed at 27.15 sq. ft where 60 feet is required and maximum building coverage of 21.8% where 15% is required. Mr. Jacobs noted that a variance for maximum total impervious coverage now complies in the revised plans.

Mr. Kaufman noted that across the street from this property there are tight lots with only about 5 feet between houses. Mr. Kaufman stated that in the scope of the block, he believes that this proposal fits the neighborhood.

Mr. Maniscalco questioned if any landscaping is planned.

Mr. Barbara stated that he would like to add nice landscaping.

Chairwoman Malley requested that a landscaping plan be provided to the Shade Tree Committee.

Mr. Kaufman made a motion to approve this application, and this motion was seconded by Ms. Bushell. Ms. Cereijo has recused herself from this application and did not vote. On a roll call vote, all other board members present were in favor of the motion.

### **APPLICATIONS (New)**

**Yiwei Zhang**

**269 Chestnut Ridge Road**

**Block: 701 Lot: 1**

**R-30**

Requesting variances for a second story addition which would require three variances: 1) Side yard setback of 19.9 feet where 20 feet is required, 2) Side yard setback of 19.3 feet where 20 feet is required and 3) Combined side yard setback of 39.2 feet where 60 feet is required.

Received: 6/30/21; Deemed administratively complete on 7/8/21; Deemed Complete by Board Engineer: 7/26/21;

Ms. Sedarat, attorney for the applicant stated that this property is located across from the EAO Zone and is currently a one story ranch with a one car garage. This application proposes a second story which would not change the footprint of the existing home. Ms. Sedarat stated that with proposed addition

this would be a four bedroom and two bath home with a laundry room. Second floor addition is approximately 1,652 sq. feet.

Ms. Sedarat stated that this renovation would improve several pre-existing non-conformities at the property including:

- 1) Right yard setback from 18.4 feet to 19.9 feet, where 20 feet is required
- 2) Left yard setback from 17.8 feet to 19.3 feet where 20 feet is required
- 3) Combined side yard setback from 36.2 feet to 39.2 feet where 60 feet is required

Ms. Sedarat stated that the Borough Engineer has concerns regarding the number of stories which is triggered by the exposed basement. Ms. Sedarat stated that the exposed basement is due to the changing slope and that the basement can not be seen from the front of the house. Ms. Sedarat stated that because the basement is exposed that the addition / renovation would now be considered a third story.

Ms. Sedarat stated that the Engineer also had concerns regarding height, specifically the calculation for ridge to lowest grade, but believes that there was an error in Engineering review.

Ms. Sedarat summarized that this application requires six variances. The six variances include four pre-existing non-conforming variances which include right yard setback, left yard setback, combined side yard setback, driveway less than 10 feet from the side or rear property line and three of these would improve with the proposed renovation. The other two variances include building height and number of stories.

Ms. Sedarat again stated that looking at this property from the street now seems to be a 1 story dwelling and that the proposed addition will look like a 2 story dwelling from the street.

Mr. Feury, Engineer for the applicant, was sworn in and provided his background. Mr. Feury stated that renovations with this application include a second story addition, a shed, a slate walk, a circular driveway, steps to be removed and replaced, and a patio in the rear yard. Mr. Feury explained that this property is 30,003 sq. feet of which 25,306 sq. feet is in Woodcliff Lake and 4,697 sq. feet in Saddle River.

Mr. Feury detailed the variances requested and stated that several pre-existing variances would be improved by this renovation. Frontage required in this zone is 150 sq. feet and this property has approximately 100 sq. feet existing.

Mr. Feury stated that there were 40 trees on this property but that 14 trees have already been removed and 26 trees are remaining. This application will not require any further tree removal.

Ms. Zhang, owner, was sworn in and stated that she believes that 13 trees have been removed and that 5 other trees will need to be replanted with construction.

Ms. Sedarat questioned Mr. Feury asking if this was an exceptionally narrow lot.

Mr. Feury stated that it was narrow and only 96.2 feet in width.

The meeting was opened to the public with a motion from Ms. Bushell, seconded by Ms. Picinic.

The phone number was provided to the public to call in with any questions or concerns regarding this application. The public was also advised that if they were participating via Zoom that they could raise their hand to ask a question or make a comment.

With no members of the public wishing to address the applicant or the board, the meeting was closed to the public with a motion by Ms. Hembree, seconded by Mr. Kaufman.

Mr. Kim, Architect for the applicant, was sworn in and provided his background. Mr. Kim presented photos of the existing property and then presented proposed drawings. Mr. Kim explained that the proposed design had to be friendly with residential and commercial. He stated that the current home is dark and doesn't stand out. The proposed design would be simple and brighter.

Chairwoman Malley questioned the small area in the basement.

Mr. Kim stated that this would remain as a guest bedroom for when the owners' parents visit.

Chairwoman Malley asked if the kitchen would be removed and stated that no kitchenette or separate entrance should be added.

Mr. Kim agreed and stated that this would be a single family dwelling.

Ms. Bushell asked to see the photo of the current garage.

Mr. Kim shared his screen and showed photos. He explained that this renovation would add one more garage bay.

Ms. Bushell questioned if the area in the back of the house was a guest house.

Ms. Sedarat stated that this was not a guest house.

Mr. Kim stated that this space had no kitchen and one sink.

Ms. Sedarat stated that this space was used as a bedroom / study with pantry and sink.

Ms. Zhang stated that this space is existing and that they will be closing the door and windows.

Mr. Princiotto questioned how the space would be used.

Ms. Zhang stated that it would be an office.

Mr. Princiotto questioned if there were any photos of existing rear elevation.

Ms. Zhang shared her screen and presented photos of existing property.

Mr. Princiotto questioned if the new garage would be part of the existing basement.

Ms. Zhang stated that the door would remain and that this space is not directly connected to the house.

Chairwoman Malley and Ms. Cereiyo asked if there would be a wall between the garage and the guest area.

Ms. Sedarat stated that this space had been previously used as a small apartment. Ms. Sedarat stated that the applicant would agree to a condition that this area would never be used as a

separate apartment or dwelling and that no kitchen would be added.

Mr. Maniscalco asked if the kitchen has been or would be removed.

Ms. Zhang stated that the sink and cabinets would be removed.

Ms. Bushell asked if you would need to go outside to access the house for a bathroom.

Ms. Zhang stated that the guest area had a bathroom.

Mr. Jacobs, Board Engineer, questioned if there is a requirement for 2 egresses from the guest area and should be considered before the door is removed.

Mr. Kim stated that he did not believe that removing the doorway would be a problem.

Mr. Jacobs stated that mathematically this would be a three story building and that the height from the base could be no more than 37 feet and is proposed to be 37 feet 2 inches.

Ms. Sedarat stated that the applicant would remove the 2 inches to comply with the height and remove the variance requested.

Mr. Princiotto asked if the applicant had any photos of the neighboring houses.

Ms. Zhang shared her screen and photos #1 to #4.

Ms. Bushell questioned the style of neighboring houses.

Mr. Princiotto stated that from the photos it looked like one ranch style and one colonial style home.

The meeting was opened to the public with a motion from Ms. Hembree, seconded by Ms. Picinic.

The phone number was provided to the public to call in with any questions or concerns regarding this application. The public was also advised that if they were participating via Zoom that they could raise their hand to ask a question or make a comment.

With no members of the public wishing to address the applicant or the board, the meeting was closed to the public with a motion by Ms. Hembree, seconded by Ms. Picinic.

Ms. Sedarat summarized the application and detailed the variances being requested. She stated that several variances being requested are pre-existing and would be mitigated by the renovations. Ms.

Sedarat stated that the proposed design is harmonious with the Office district across the street and with neighboring homes. She stated that this renovation would not impair the Zoning Code and noted that there were no objectors.

The meeting was opened to the public with a motion from Mr. Kaufman, seconded by Ms. Cereijo.

The phone number was provided to the public to call in with any questions or concerns regarding this

application. The public was also advised that if they were participating via Zoom that they could raise their hand to ask a question or make a comment.

With no members of the public wishing to address the applicant or the board, the meeting was closed to the public with a motion by Ms. Cereijo, seconded by Ms. Picinic.

Ms. Cereijo asked if the applicant would agree to comply with the ridge to natural grade.

Ms. Sedarat stated that the applicant would comply.

A motion was made by Ms. Picinic to approve this application with conditions including compliance with the Engineering review letter, a landscaping plan to Shade Tree noting the 5 new replacement trees required, no separate apartment or kitchen added to the guest bedroom and adjusting the plans for compliance with building height.

Mr. Princiotto questioned the size of the guest room / home office.

Mr. Kim stated that the guest area was 24 feet by 19 feet, approximately 460 sq. feet.

Ms. Cereijo asked for a condition for no additional plumbing.

Ms. Zhang stated that the existing kitchen would be removed.

Mr. Princiotto questioned the size of the existing bathroom in the guest area.

Mr. Kim stated that the bathroom was approximately 70 sq. feet.

Ms. Cereijo seconded the motion made by Ms. Picinic to approve this application with conditions noted. On a roll call vote, all other board members present were in favor of the motion.

Mr. Princiotto discussed scheduling for the next meeting. The application for 14 Evergreen and the Master Plan Draft Recommendations will be presented. A closed session will also be scheduled for update on litigation.

The meeting was adjourned on a motion from Ms. Bushell and seconded by Ms. Hembree, and carried by all.

Respectfully submitted,

Meg Smith