**BOROUGH OF WOODCLIFF LAKE**

**THIS MEETING WAS HELD IN THE TICE CENTER**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**JANUARY 27, 2014**

 **MINUTES**

**Call to order:**

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. at the Borough Hall by the Chairman.

**Adequate Notice Statement:**

The Chairman announced that the Meeting, in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Law, P.L. 1975, Chapter 231, was announced at the Reorganization Meeting held on January 13, 2014 in the Municipal Building. Notice of this meeting was posted and two newspapers, The Record and The Ridgewood News, were notified. Notice was also provided, in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Law, of the Planning Board’s intention to conduct formal business at this Meeting.

**The public was advised of the Planning Board’s rule that the meetings will be concluded by 11:00 p.m.**

**Flag Salute**

**2014 Roll Call:**

George Fry, Chairman Present

Willford Morrison, Vice Chairman Present

Al Dattoli Present

Carlos Rendo, Council Present (9:00 p.m.)

Bertram Siegel, Alt. 1 Present

Reuben Twersky, Alt. 2 Present

David Ciaudelli Present

Robert Nathin Present

Joseph Langschultz Present

Josephine Higgins Present

Robert Friedberg Present

Mark Follender, Attorney Present

Sal Cambria, Neglia Engineering Present

John Madden, Maser Cons. Present

John Pavlovich, Jacobs Engineering Not Requested

Kathy Rizza, Secretary Present

Tonya Tardibuono, 2014 Secretary Present

**Minutes:**

The **minutes** of January 13, 2014 will be approved at the next meeting.

**PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE OVERLAY ZONING ORDINANCE**

**BLOCK 303, LOTS 1 AND 2**

**BLOCK 303.01, LOTS 3 AND 4**

**BLOCK 401, LOTS 1.01, 1.02, AND 1.03**

John Madden of Maser Consulting was present to give a presentation on this subject entitled:

**Master Plan and Zoning Analysis for area west of Harriet Way and North of County Road**

This report, dated January 13, 2014 will be kept in the file as part of the permanent record and is available to the public upon request. The report consists of an introduction, subject area, existing land use setting, rezoning options, comparable developments, decisions required by the Board, Reexamination Report Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Amendment Recommendation and an Appendix depicting the existing land use, recommended zoning standards, and an illustrative concept plan. The scenario recommended by Mr. Madden recommends 5.3 townhouses per acre.

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Friedberg questioned the buffer facing County Road at a minimum of 50’. Zoning criteria in the R30 zone was referred to when using an example.

Mr. Twersky questioned the footprint and feels that the units including garages will be narrow.

Mr. Langschultz questioned the roof line and asked if it is consistent with our ordinances. He was told yes and that the roofline is adequate. Setbacks and variances were discussed. Mrs. Higgins questioned the rear setback measurement.

Mr. Morrison thanked Mr. Madden for his efforts. Mr. Morrison spoke regarding wall measurements and the space between buildings. He likes the lower density but asked what prevents the applicant from asking for more. Mr. Madden stated that the Council is the ultimate decision maker and that he does not see any legal problems.

Mr. Dattoli had no questions and was pleased with the report. He feels this is a concept plan with the ability to rearrange.

Mr. Nathin is concerned with the ratio. He questioned the parking and disagrees with the calculations presented. Mr. Nathin also disputes the retail figures. He also feels that the density could be far greater than proposed. Setbacks were discussed. Mr. Madden feels he can defend 5.3 units per acre on this property.

Chairman Fry brought up the density of Stonewall Court and stated that zoning is a Mayor and Council issue. The Planning Board acts as an advisor to the Mayor and Council on this issue. Mr. Ciaudelli is impressed with the plan and would like to hear from the public.

Mr. Siegel asked if MDK and Mr. D’Arminio saw the report before tonight. He was told yes.

Saddle River Grand was referred to and the fact that the square footage proposed in the report does not include the garages.

**A motion to open the meeting to the public** was made by Mrs. Higgins, seconded by Mr. Nathan and carried by all.

Lou D’Arminio – Price, Meese, Shulman and D’Arminio – Mr. D’Arminio is representing MDK. He showed the lots that are under the control of MDK to all present. Mr. D’Arminio agrees with the track size but not the minimum lot size. He feels that the lots on the west side of Pickwick can be developed separately. Regarding density Mr. D’Arminio stated that the old report recommend 8 units per acre, now 5.3 units per acre – the same as Stonewall Court which is a single family zone. He referred to the first Maser report on density. Mr. D’Arminio asked the Board to consider 6.5 or 7 units per acre not adding a lot of units but making it a viable project. Regarding the FAR (floor area ratio), Mr. D’Arminio would like to see a .5 FAR at the least. He also would like a larger coverage percentage than 17%, he would like 30%. Chairman Fry stated that the older Maser reports were rejected. Mr. D’Arminio would also like to see 6 units in a row. Mr. Madden stated that this is a product in the making but believes that this proposal is good. The coverage percentage was discussed in detail. Mr. Dattoli feels that 30% is not very attractive for Woodcliff Lake. The possibility of the developer paying the town for the street was discussed.

Lisa Yakomin – 50 Stonewall Court – Asked about the traffic impact. Asked why this was not in the plan. Mr. Madden stated that there was no reason for it. Ms. Yakomin asked who had input into the plan. Mr. Madden stated that a designer in his firm drew up the plan. Ms. Yakomin asked if MDK had any input, directly or indirectly, in the report. She spoke regarding emails between MDK and Mr. Madden and stated that she will OPRA these emails. Mrs. Yakomin spoke regarding the surrounding area and Saddle River Grand and the huge buffer on the Saddle River side. She does not feel that is it normal to have residential homes facing a townhouse development.

Sue Menze – 11 Pickwick Lane –Feels that the development should include all the homes involved or none. She does not want to be the orphan property in the middle of this proposed development.

Mr. Zarrella – 40 County Road – Wants to stay in Woodcliff Lake. Mr. Zarrella stated that he is hearing of financial issues in Woodcliff Lake and he asked if this plan would help the town. Chairman Fry stated that he has no opinion on that and added that is not the role of the Planning Board. –revenue has never been considered on this Board. The cost of an education for a child in Woodcliff Lake was discussed.

Rich Yakomin – 50 Stonewall Court – He is concerned with internal roads that will lead to County Road. Mr. Yakomin was told that County Road is a county road and that the Planning Board has no jurisdiction on this. He is also concerned with rush hour traffic through the development. Mr. Madden suggested speed humps. Mr. Yakomin asked what defines luxury. Bigger unit? He was told that more first floor space is desirable.

Tom Panso – 31 Stonewall Court - Asked if the Board looked at leaving the zone as it is. He was told yes - then the underlying zone would remain the same. Recent home sales were discussed.

Mr. Panso asked if there really is a need for this zone. Chairman Fry stated that this is a Mayor and Council question.

Rich Jigarjia – 34 Stonewall Court – Feels there is a lot of turnover with townhouses and that some people buy them to rent them out. He feels the town should keep the single family zoning. Stated that this could be a flip project so that the developer could make money. Mr. Jigarjia does not want to lose trees in this area.

Darlene Schnure – 34 County Road – Stated that she has the largest County Road property at 1.71 acres. Spoke regarding traffic and sees no problem with townhouses.

Joseph LaPaglia – 17 Hillcrest Road - Gave his Woodcliff Lake history to all present. Stated he would like to see more open space between townhomes and would like to see a 10% reduction in density with a larger square footage in the units. Added that there should be supplemental parking. Mr. LaPaglia spoke regarding other areas in town with a potential for attached housing.

Donna Abene – 124 Woodcliff Avenue – Spoke regarding the comments previously made about children in town and added that we need and want children in town – we have one of the best schools in the state. Ms. Abene said that children are the lifeblood of a town.

Corrado Belgiovine – 11 Hillcrest Road – Commented on the width of the proposed units, adding that is what he sells in Hudson County. Mr. Belgiovine feels that the width should start at 28-30’

The meeting was **closed to the public** on a motion from Mr. Morrison, seconded by Mrs. Higgins, and carried.

Chairman Fry stated that issues as the following:

Units per acre

All or none?

Coverage

FAR excluding garage

6 units per building vs. a maximum of 4

Footprint

Mr. Siegel – Feels that 6 units is not acceptable, hopes that this discussion helps the developer, does not support 5.3 per acre and feels the plan is too limited. He is ok with 42 or 43 units.

Mr. Ciaudelli -17% coverage is limited, concerned with traffic, and prefers 6 units per building.

Mr. Nathin – Would like to see 6 units per acre, coverage at 23.5%, 4 units in a row, and the Far is fine.

Mr. Dattoli – 5.3 units per acre, 39.75 to 40 units, allow 23.5 % maximum building coverage, no more than 4 units per building, minimum of 3 per building, FAR is fine.

Mr. Morrison – 5.3 units per acre is fine, agrees with Mr. Dattoli regarding building coverage, 4 units in a row – minimum of 3, and the FAR is acceptable.

Mrs. Higgins – 6 units per acre, 23.5% coverage, keep streets as shown. Concerned with volunteers in town – they cannot afford to live here now. FAR is good.

Mr. Langschultz – In favor of the overlay zone, 5.3 units per acre, 17% or higher in coverage, 25% is good, and 4 units per building.

Mr. Friedberg – Needs time to think about the points discussed, but is in favor of separating the project.

Mr. Twersky – FAR is good but would like it to be reviewed again. In favor of bifurcating as long as Pickwick Lane stays.

Wants maximum of 4 units.

Councilman Carlos Rendo – Will study this at the Mayor and Council level, has a problem with the overlay concept. Wants to look at the entire project, density is a major issue – we value open space. Needs to look at ratables, wants to hear more regarding units per building and wants more testimony on all.

Chairman George Fry – The majority are in favor of 4 units per building with a minimum of 3. Asked if Mr. Madden could go over the building coverage percentage at 23.5% to see how it works. Mr. Madden will do this for the next meeting. All members are ok with the FAR. There are 2 scenarios for density – 5.3% and 6%. He would like to see guest parking.

--

**The meeting was closed on a motion** from Mr. Langschultz, seconded by Mrs. Higgins, and carried by all. Time being 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Rizza, Secretary