

BOROUGH OF WOODCLIFF LAKE
LANDUSE BOARD MEETING
September 24th, 2024
MINUTES

Call to Order:

This meeting was called to order at 7:06p.m. at the Borough Hall by Chairman Belgiovine.

Adequate Notice Statement:

Chairman Belgiovine announced that the Meeting was in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Law, P.L. 1975, Chapter 231. Notice of this meeting was posted in two newspapers, The Record and The Ridgewood News. The public was advised of the Planning Board's rule that the meetings will be concluded by 10:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call:

Corrado Belgiovine: *Present*

Nilufer DeScherer: *Present*

Nikki Marsh: *Absent*

Gerald Barbara: *Absent*

Carlos Rendo: *Absent*

Thomas Panso: *Present*

Lynda Picinic: *Present*

Jane Ann Whitchurch-Carluccio: *Present*

Robert Friedberg: *Absent*

Christina Hembree: *Present*

Sanjeev Dhawan: *Present*

Brian LaRose: *Absent*

Brian DiStefano: *Present*

Michael Kaufman: *Present*

Sal Princiotta, Esq.

Present

Anthony Kurus, Engineer

Present

Francis Reiner, Planner

Present

Clairese Neumann, Secretary

Present

Minutes

The minutes were approved on a motion from Ms. Picinic seconded by Mr. DiStefano. All were in favor.

Resolution of Approval

The Gables- Signage

The resolution was approved on a motion from Mr. Panso, seconded by Vice Chairman Dhawan. All were in favor.

CONTINUED APPLICATION

240 BROADWAY- TOWNHOMES/2 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES

Mr. Leher opened the application by asking Mr. Princiotta if he should address the objection that came from Wells, Jaworski, Leibman, LLP.

Mr. Van Neck, Esq. of Wells, Jaworski, Leibman LLP, attorney of the objector began by stating the notice was improper, the proposed project would require another D-1 Variance, that

accessory uses need to be on the same lot, not separate lot. He stated the application would also require another use variance for parking and stormwater.

Mr. Leher stated if the decision is jurisdictional, they may need to start the application all over again. He stated a lay person was noticed for general notice of the application. Mr. Leher stated no borough professional letter indicated the need for driveway relief. He stated the application was already noticed for all D and C variances. He stated all driveways would go through the lots to connect. He questioned if the opposing party wanted separate stormwater drainage for each lot. He stated each lot has their own parking and meets all requirements. Guest parking would be between lots 1503 and 1504.

Mr. Reiner, Board planner stated the objected variances were not noted in their letter.

Chairman Belgiovine believed the board had jurisdiction and let Mr. Leher continue the application after a five-minute recess.

The objection was noted on the record, requested by Mr. Van Neck, Esq.

Mr. Leher's first witness, Mr. Lawrence Appel, the project architect, was sworn in by Mr. Princiotto. Mr. Appel prepared the renderings and elevations for the project. She stated revised plan were submitted 9/24/24. She stated the two single family homes are transitional to the townhomes. The luxury townhomes will be 2 ½ stories with a garage at ground level. The measurements are made to the natural grade of the property. He stated there would be a height difference with pitched roofs versus flat roofs. She stated if the roof peak were changed, it would ruin the architecture and be a mistake. The interlocking/stacked townhomes are proposed at 3 ½ stories with a walkout basement. All the townhomes face each other. For the interlocking townhomes, there would be 14 rental units in each building. The COAH units meet all criteria. Buildings 1 & 2 would be built to the heights of 38.3 ft and 34.5 ft, while buildings 3 & 4 would be built to the heights of 63.7ft and 68.9ft. Per the board professionals, accessibility was requested. All flats for the stacked townhomes will be handicapped accessible with ADA compliant lifts. Mr. Appel stated the transformers would be located by the site engineer but would be coordinated with the utility company. Gas utilities would be hidden, like transformers, in either the front or the sides of the property. He stated the water, and sewer would need individual lines for each unit in the luxury townhomes, while the stacked townhomes would have two separate rooms for water/ sewer connection. There would be trash rooms for the stacked townhomes, and the luxury townhomes would be stored in the garage and brought out in containers. Mr. Appel stated the design for the townhomes is black and white, with light colored brick at the base. They will have large windows and fit the current design in the community. He stated their team believes the design provides a balanced lifestyle. They are providing a lot of landscaping in the front of the property to coincide with the existing landscaping. He stated the parking will be screened too. He mentioned a monument sign is proposed, stating it would provide functionality. Mr. Appel agreed with Mr. Leher stating the two single family homes would be a good transition for the townhomes.

Chairman Belgiovine questioned the setback of buildings 3&4 from Broadway.

Mr. Appel stated the front yard set back from Broadway to buildings 3&4 would be 124.5 sq. ft., there would be a new access road from Broadway. He stated all the proposed trees are deciduous, but the board members were worried this would leave the townhomes exposed during the winter months.

Mr. Reiner questioned why the application could not meet the streetscape.

Mr. Leher stated the application was already deemed complete, not making it a requirement for the application but they would do comply with the ordinance.

Mr. Appel stated some of the balconies are balconettes, that open outward. She stated they would be handicapped accessible for both units in the stacked townhomes.

Vice Chairman Dhawan questioned the location of the air handlers.

Mr. Appel stated all air handlers would be in the attics but the condensers would be on the grade, on the sides or the rears of the townhomes. They would be screened by landscaping for all units.

Mr. Princiotto questioned the assumed grade for buildings 1 and 2.

Mr. Appel stated the assumed grade would be 40ft from the rear and 50ft from the front for both buildings.

Public Session

A motion to open to the public for the testimony of Mr. Appel was introduced by Ms. Picinic, seconded by Ms. Hembree. All members were in favor.

Mr. Jameson Van Neck, Esq. stated the finished grade is actually 41ft and 51ft for buildings 1 and 2. He questioned if the applicant would be removing 10ft to make building 3 and 4 2 ½ stories instead of 3 ½ stories. He questioned the calculations for buildings 1 & 2 are to the applicant's benefits. He questioned if the heights are so high because of the calculation of the ordinance. He questioned if there was additional space in the attics and if that extra space would be in buildings 3 & 4. He questioned the locations of the foundations. He questioned if trash locations were on every level of buildings 3 & 4. He questioned if where buildings 3 & 4 go up on an angle, if there would be stairs or a retaining wall. He questioned if the lifts had been used in the architect's practice before, and if the lifts would have coverings or protection from outdoor elements. He questioned if the rendering showed four entrances. He questioned the height of the tiered retaining seen from Broadway. He questioned the height of the windows that would be seen from Broadway. He questioned if the rendering is an accurate depiction of the townhomes from Broadway. He questioned if the architectural design for colors and materials will stay the

same. He questioned if Mr. Appel reviewed any architectural ordinances in Woodcliff Lake for townhomes.

Mr. Appel stated they would not be removing 10 ft from the 3 ½ story townhomes to make them 2 ½ stories. He stated the calculations were based off of the borough's ordinance. Mr. Appel stated the attics would not be a habitable space, or be in buildings 3 & 4. He stated the foundations are below grade and he has used the lifts in other projects before. The lifts would be covered with roofs to protect from outside elements. The rendering only showed three entrances but one of the windows was a fourth door. He stated that where buildings 3 & 4 are angled, is where the retaining walls would be, making the buildings the retaining walls. Mr. Appel stated the walls from Broadway would be tiered and not be seen at a 70ft elevation. He stated the windows would be seen at about 7-8ft. He stated the rendering is a CAD rendering, making it as accurate as possible. Mr. Appel stated the architecture will stay the same but the colors and the materials might change because they may not be available in a year or two.

Mr. Van Neck, Esq. asked he be provide the rendering for the evergreens and the trees.

Mr. Don DeLuca of 16 Edward Place, stated the elevations were confusing.

Mr. Appel stated the engineer would need to explain the elevations.

Mr. Gregory Egli, of 254/264 Broadway questioned why the height to the building is from the gutter line. Secondly how many units in building 3 & 4? He also questioned other towns Mr. Appel had used the gutterline/ midline of the roof to measure the height.

Mr. Appel stated its not just the way the ordinance reads. There will be 14 units in each building for 3 & 4, making it 28 total for the stacked townhomes. Mr. Appel could not recall other towns.

Mr. Michael Chladil of 18 Edward Place asked why there is no transitional plan off of Edward place. He also questioned how loud the compressors would be.

Mr. Appel stated its handled by the existing setback between the outside properties of the proposed project. Mr. Appel stated the condensers would be screened in small groups by landscaping and would not affect the neighbors on Edward.

Mr. Brian DeVito of 12 James Street questioned the transitioning lots. He questioned if a variance was needed for the north and the south of the property. He questioned if the noise ordinance would be affected by the condensers.

Mr. Appel stated the houses if built would provide screening to the residents on Clinton along with landscaping left as is. Mr. Appell stated there is no variance for the North and the south of the property.

Mr. Lehrer stated the noise decibels from the property line would be 50 from 10pm-6am and 60 from 6am- 10pm.

Mr. DeVito questioned the need for transformers and if Mr. Appel had visited the site in question.

Mr. Appel stated the transformers are needed for gas, electricity, and water. He stated he had visited the site three times.

Ms. Picinic questioned the trash alcoves on A-4.

Mr. Appel stated they are located in between the two buildings, on the lower level.

A motion to close to the public on the testimony of Mr. Appel was introduced by Mr. Kaufman, seconded by Ms. Whitchurch- Carluccio.

Mr. Lehrer's second witness, Mr. Trevor Curtis, project engineer is sworn in by Mr. Princiotta. Mr. Curtis stated he had read the transcript from the previous meeting and he was all caught up. Mr. Curtis stated he had changed the plan by shifting site with 5ft for all retaining walls for side lot lines. He stated he incorporated a larger radius for the fire truck to circulate without backing out onto Broadway. He referenced the Borough ordinance for a 30ft. buffer for non-residential but it was not required for this project because its proposed residential use. He stated they will maintain the riparian zone. He stated he did not submit a new grading plan with the updated site plan.

Ms. Whitchurch- Carluccio questioned where he found the 3ft to widen the driveway for the fire truck.

Mr. Curtis stated he shifted the sidewalks, the retaining walls and the building slightly. He stated it was easily attainable to be compliant with the side yard setback.

Ms. DeScherer questioned the category 1 water/ DEP conditions.

Mr. Curtis stated he had spoken with the DEP about the proximate disturbances but it would require multiple conditional approvals. He stated the NJDEP approval would be required for Woodcliff Lake's approval.

Mr. Curtis stated a lot of the questions could be answered at final site plan approval.

Public Session

A motion to open to the public for the testimony of Mr. Curtis was introduced by Ms. Picinic, seconded by Ms. Whitchurch- Carluccio. All members were in favor.

** A motion to extend the meeting to 10:30 was introduced by Ms. Picnic, seconded by Ms. Whitchurch- Carluccio. All members were in favor.

Mr. Gregory Egli of 258/264 Broadway questioned how the water will be runoff of property and if he will be looking at building 3 from his property. He questioned if putting in a berm would counteract runoff.

Mr. Curtis stated the county wants the water to go south of the property. He stated Mr. Egli will see a tiered wall with buffers and landscaping. Mr. Curtis stated the runoff is minimal but they could install inlets.

Mr. Brian DeVito, 12 James Street, questioned if the redesign meets the ordinance 380-111c (5). He asked Mr. Curtis to describe the radius change for the fire truck. He asked if the height from Edward Pl. is compliant with the height requirements. He asked Mr. Curtis to describe the transition between the residences and the townhomes. Lastly he questioned if he hoped the fence from Edward Place, what would he reach?

Mr. Curtis stated the redesign with the side yard setbacks meets the requirements for the ordinance in the R-15 zone. He stated the radius for the truck was too sharp, he was able to widen it by shifting the sidewalks, retaining walls and buildings. He did state the height from Edward Pl. is not compliant with the height requirements. Mr. Curtis stated there would be fencing, and grass in between Edward Place and 240 Broadway, he stated the walls decrease on the western side of the property. He stated if the fence was hopped, that person would land at the retaining wall at 12ft or higher.

Mr. Michael Chladil, 18 Edward Place questioned the relocation of wild animals.

Mr. Curtis stated they would follow all DEP requirements and Building Code requirements but do not plan to relocate any wild life.

A motion to close to the public on the testimony of Mr. Curtis was introduced by Mr. Kaufman, seconded by Ms. Whitchurch- Carluccio. All members were in favor.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was introduced by Ms. Picinic, seconded by Vice Chairman Dhawan. All members were in favor.

Sincerely,

Clairese Neumann
Board Secretary

