

TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK
PLANNING BOARD

Following are the minutes of the Saddle Brook Planning Board's regular meeting, held on Tuesday, November 22, 2016.

1. FLAG SALUTE

2. ROLL CALL: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Gierek, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Maniscalco, Mr. Sergio, Mr. Verile, Mr. Parisi and Mr. LaGuardia – PRESENT Councilwoman Mazzer, Mayor White and Mr. Mazzone – ABSENT Also present were Stephen Pellino, attorney, Richard Brown, engineer and Gary Paparozzi, planner.

3. CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCES – OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT: Adequate notice of this meeting has been sent to all members of the Planning Board and to all legal newspapers in Accordance with the Provisions of the OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT, CHAPTER 231, P.L. 1975.

4. MINOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

Salvatore and Antonia Caramanna, 44 Catherine Ave., Block 610, Lot 6
Mr. Pellino – We will hear the matter of the minor subdivision. The original application, heard in July 2015, was denied for two 50' x 100' lots. The applicant filed for an appeal. Judge Lisa Perez Friscia said the Board may want to review the case for amplification of the record or reconsideration. The applicant has renotified the residents and the newspaper. There will be no new evidence tonight. The Board has had a chance to review the transcripts. The applicant's attorney filed the application again. The application is to create two 50' x 100' lots and move the existing house back to conform to the front setback requirement. The other lot will have a new house, 17% small than what is allowed. The applicant will preserve the older home with a 5 year deed restriction. They will get rid of the existing nonconformity (front yard setback). The Board was concerned with drainage. The applicant agreed to put in seepage pits on both lots and to do test pits. The Board was concerned about the rear property level and trees being removed. The requested variances are C variances; C2 variances in my opinion. To grant the application, the applicant would have to satisfy the positive and negative criteria (benefit outweighs detriment). The Board, at the time the application was originally heard, did not think that the application met the criteria. Tonight, you can affirm your decision, amplify (give more reasons to support your choice of denial) or approve the application.

Cliff Rotolo, attorney for the applicant, came forward.

Mr. Rotolo – 86.2% of the lots in the neighborhood are less than 65' wide. Our application seeks to preserve the development plan in that neighborhood. The existing house has been renovated. We're moving it to get rid of the nonconformity. We're removing the garage. Our planner testified that it will be more conforming than the mc mansion that could be built if the lot is not divided. I request the Board give this application reconsideration.

Mr. Sergio – Is your client willing to accept all conditions we previously stated?

Mr. Rotolo – Yes.

Mr. Maniscalco – What was the deed restriction?

Mr. Rotolo – To maintain the existing house for a minimum of five years.

Mr. Lynch – Would your client be willing to shift the house further than five feet from the side lot line.

Mr. Rotolo – I think he would consider it.

Mr. Lynch – If the lot was 65' wide, the combined side yard setback would be 19.5', which would make this a better application. Is the client willing to deed restrict to single family homes?

Mr. Rotolo – Yes. I believe so.

Mr. Maniscalco opened the meeting to the public.

Shirley Tobar, 58 Ackerman Ave. – What are you doing about parking?

Mr. Rotolo – The new house will have a 2 car garage and driveway that accommodates 2 cars. The driveway of the existing house will hold 2 cars.

Barbara Dodge-Ha, 50 Catherine Ave. – Where are the seepage pits located?

Mr. Brown – They are at the rear of the property at about 3-5 feet deep.

Mr. Compitello made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Sergio seconded the motion. All in Favor – YES

Mr. Maniscalco opened the meeting for comments.

Michael Martin, 28 Catherine Ave. was sworn in.

Mr. Martin – I am concerned that the water table is high. I don't know how effective seepage pits are. Also, I am concerned about parking. There are cars all over the street already.

Mr. Pellino – The drainage/seepage pits would have to be done to the engineer's satisfaction. You should be in a better position than you are in now.

Mr. Brown – There is also an overflow tank. Parking meets the Residential Site Improvement Standards. Barbara Dodge-Ha, 50 Catherine Ave. was sworn in.

Ms. Dodge-Ha – The owner does not live at the property, nor does his sister. The Board has denied this application three times. This is not a benefit to the neighborhood. It only benefits the owner.

Shirley Towar, 58 Ackerman Ave. was sworn in.

Ms. Towar – We've been here three or four times. We should keep this property open. It would look silly to move the house and put in another one.

Mr. Compitello made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Verile seconded the motion. All in Favor – YES

Mr. Pellino - The criteria to approve a C2 variance is the positive outweighs the detriments. You also have to be satisfied that there is no detriment to overall zone plan and neighborhood.

Mr. Ambrogio – If more parking is needed, you may be able to add more driveway space and remove the patio.

Mr. Lynch made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions: deed restriction to maintain existing house for minimally 5 years, existing house will be relocated to meet front yard setback requirement and to create side yard setbacks of 10' and 15', provide on site drainage for each lot, deed restriction to single family houses, extend driveway and remove patio on lot with existing house. Mr. Ambrogio seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Maniscalco, Mr. Sergio, Mr. Verile, Mr. Parisi and Mr. LaGuardia - YES

5. MINUTES

Mr. Lynch made a motion to approve both the minutes of the October 18, 2016 meeting. Mr. Compitello the motion. All in Favor – YES

6. CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Compitello made a motion to accept and file the correspondence. Mr. Verile seconded the motion. All in Favor – YES

7. VOUCHERS

Mr. Compitello made a motion to pay the following vouchers provided funds are available:

Basile Birchwale & Pellino, 10/19/16, Russell Kelley, \$625

Carroll Engineering, 10/24/16, Russell Kelley, \$430.05

Carroll Engineering, 10/24/16, Planning Admin., \$1,057.50

Mr. Lynch seconded the motion. All in Favor - YES

8. OPEN AND CLOSE THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Compitello made a motion to open the meeting to the public. All in Favor - YES

No public participation.

Mr. Compitello made a motion to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

9. CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Compitello made a motion to adjourn to closed session. Mr. Gierek seconded the motion. All in Favor – YES

10. ADJOURN

Mr. Compitello made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Gierek seconded the motion. All in Favor – YES

Meeting adjourned 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jayne Kapner
Planning Board Secretary