

TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK PLANNING BOARD

Following are the minutes of the Saddle Brook Planning Board's Regular Meeting, held on Monday, October 20, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Brown, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Maniscalco, Mayor White and Mr. Vermilyea – PRESENT
Mr. Compitello, Mr. Cook, Councilwoman Mazzer, Mr. Camporeale and Ms. Barrale - ABSENT
Also present were Anthony Cialone, Board attorney and Gary Papparozi, Board planner.

2. CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCES – OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

3. NEW BUSINESS

Review of Proposed Amended Redevelopment Plan

Mr. Cialone – In summer 2024, the Board considered and recommended to the governing body the area in need of rehabilitation. The governing body did make a determination. Then in November of 2024, the redevelopment plan was before the Board. The Board determined it was consistent with the Master Plan and made two recommendations. Presently, there's been an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan, so the governing body has referred it back to the Planning Board to review the amended details. The review is limited to whether or not the plan is consistent with the Master Plan, which is not Site Plan approval. That would come down the road with a typical public hearing, so there is no public participation or comments tonight.

Joseph J. Layton, substituting for Nicholas Dickerson, township planner, came forward.

Mr. Layton – The Redevelopment Plan has been amended. I believe it is still consistent with the Master Plan. The key change is that it's all residential now. There is no commercial component. Mr. Layton reviewed the changes by section. Section A.1. We've added maximum building height. The biggest change is Section B, Permitted Uses. Multi-family housing is now the permitted use. We've dropped stores, banks, offices, restaurants and other commercial uses. Accessory Uses remains the same. Area and bulk requirements have changed. The number of residential units permitted is now 60; previously 12. Maximum building height is now 40'; previously 35'. Three stories are allowed, where previously it was 2.5 stories. The building setback to Market St. is 0'; previously 35'. The setback to Harrison Ave. is 8'; previously 25'. The minimum to adjacent residential use is 6.75'; previously 20'. In effect, they've moved the building toward Market St. to try to keep somewhat of a buffer between the back of the building and Harrison Ave. Also, the lot coverage has changed. It was 85%; now it's 90%. There is a new maximum building coverage of 80%; previously there was no maximum building coverage in the plan. All parking must be in structured parking, which includes 40 spaces for the Police Department. No service parking is allowed. Police parking will be in the lower level, completely separated from the rest of the parking. Affordable Housing, Supplemental Requirements and Off Tract Improvements sections are all unchanged. In the Utilities section, a definition has been added for rooftop utilities. Rooftop utilities shall not be visible from street level. The Building Facades and Signage sections are the same. Business signs (Section 4.b.) were not removed. I suggest that the Planning Board recommend to the governing body that Section 4.b. be deleted. In the Screening and Landscaping Section, there is now no minimum width of the landscape buffer. Previously, it was 15' along Harrison Ave. and 10' to adjacent residential properties. Also, the Lighting section was changed to comply with the new lighting ordinance, adopted June 2025. There are going to be 9 affordable units onsite, plus 3 bonus credits. The township will be credited with 12 units towards their affordable housing obligation.

Mr. Cialone – Does that help the township comply with its obligations to provide affordable housing, as well as the affordable housing element of the Master Plan?

Mr. Layton – Yes. It is consistent with the Affordable Housing Element of the Master Plan.

The main goal is redevelopment that is consistent with providing affordable housing to address the requirement of the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

Mr. Hickey – How much parking will there be per apartment?

Mr. Layton – It's in accordance with Residential Site Improvement Standards. There are 215 - 40 (for SBPD) = 175

Mr. Maniscalco – When it snows in the winter, they can't park on the street. Where will they park?

Mr. Cialcone – They'll have to comply with the R.S.I.S. requirements.

Mr. Paparozzi – They do not have to comply with R.S.I.S. because its redevelopment. All bulk requirements are on the plan and approved by the Mayor and Council and the Planning Board. Whereas the R.S.I.S. requirements are enforced on any other development, for An Area in Need of Redevelopment, R.S.I.S. requirements are not enforced. Whatever is in the plan that is accepted, will be adopted.

Mr. Hickey – So they've got at least 2 spots for each apartment.

Mr. Maniscalco – You've got electric spots as well?

Mr. Cialcone – They'll get credits for those as per state statute.

Mayor White – The developer's planner is here. He may be able to answer some of these questions with Mr. Layton.

Mr. Cialcone – We can ask him general questions that don't get into site plan review/approval.

Mr. LaGuardia – We don't have a plan showing the numbers the planner went over?

Mr. Cialcone - That's for site plan. He reviewed the numbers in the Redevelopment Plan. The Redevelopment Plan lists the permitted uses and bulk regulations for the Area In Need of Rehabilitation. That's what we're hearing tonight. The developers are going to create plans using these parameters and come to the Planning Board with a Site Plan application.

Mr. Layton – I'd like to clarify the parking requirements. Your planner was correct. R.S.I.S. does not apply. This site is consistent with the off-street parking requirements for apartments.

Mr. Paparozzi – With 175 spaces, they're actually over the R.S.I.S. number, which requires 1.8 spaces for a one-bedroom apartment; 2 spaces for two-bedroom and 2.1 for three- bedroom. Those numbers include visitor parking.

Mr. Maniscalco – I don't agree with the (40') height.

Mayor White – I believe the developer said 37'.

Mr. Cialcone – We set the maximums and minimums, but they don't have to build to that.

Mr. Ambrogio – You said that this Redevelopment Plan is consistent with the Master Plan because of the affordable housing component. Is there another part of the Master Plan where it speaks to fully residential being more beneficial than mixed use?

Mr. Layton – I don't know that there's a differentiation, but multi-family housing is encouraged in the Master Plan.

Mr. Paparozzi – It's also a revitalization of an area that's already designated as redevelopment. So, it goes along with providing housing and affordable housing and revitalizing the area that is obviously redevelopment and that redevelopment has been met by several different criteria.

Mr. Ambrogio – So our Master Plan would promote this?

Mr. Paparozzi – It promotes the revitalization.

Mr. Maniscalco to Mr. Ambrogio – What is the height of the building across the street?

Mr. Ambrogio – It's very similar.

Mr. Paparozzi – But you also have to take into consideration, to provide all of the underground parking, you can only go so deep because of drainage and for ingress and egress. That height is really not detrimental.

Mr. Hickey – Are the 40 parking spots for the police department like a gift?

Mr. Cialcone – It's part of the requirement in the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Maniscalco – We're okay with 40 spaces?

Mayor White – Yes. I believe so.

Mr. Ambrogio – You said that you were making the front setback on Market St. 0' in an effort to move the building away from Harrison Ave., correct?

Mr. Layton – Yes. It's 8 feet to Harrison Ave.

Mr. Ambrogio – What was the setback on Harrison on the original plan?

Mr. Layton – It was 25 feet.

Mr. Ambrogio – So you really didn't move it forward.

Mr. Layton – We have 60 residential units, as opposed to 12.

Mr. Maniscalco – Do we have to have 60 units?

Mr. Layton – I think that's what the redeveloper needs to make it economically viable because he has to make a certain percentage affordable. He has to absorb the cost of the lower cost units.

Mr. Hickey – What will be in the 8 foot buffer, pavement?

Mr. Layton – It will be landscaped with trees.

Mr. Cialone – That will be on the site plan.

Mr. Maniscalco – This redevelopment plan is locking us into 60 units.

Mr. Cialone – Up to 60 units, correct.

Mr. Maniscalco – If we have to adjust the number of units to make things work better for the setbacks...

Mr. Cialone – That's not something this board is able to do.

Mr. Cialone – The board can make recommendations to the governing body. We are not here to edit this. This is sent to us pursuant to the redevelopment law, specifically for the board to determine whether or not it is consistent with the Master Plan. Any recommendations are non-binding.

Mr. Hickey made a motion, seconded by Mr. Browne to find the Amended Redevelopment Plan consistent with the Master Plan and recommend its adoption. Also, the Board has the following recommendations: 1.) In Subsection 4b, article M (Signage) should be deleted, as it refers to commercial tenants, which this plan does not allow; and 2.) the maximum number of residential units should be reduced to reduce the size of the building. Also, the board authorizes Mr. Cialone to send a letter with the board's decision and recommendation in lieu of a formal report to Mayor and Council.

VOTE: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Brown, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Maniscalco, Mayor White and Mr. Vermilyea - YES

4. MINUTES

Mr. Browne made a motion; seconded by Mr. Ambrogio to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2025 meeting. All in Favor - YES

5. VOUCHERS

Mr. Browne made a motion; seconded by Mr. Ambrogio to pay the following voucher, provided funds are available:

Neglia Engineering Associates, 10/06/25, Bridge Asset Management, \$205

VOTE: All in Favor – YES

6. OPEN AND CLOSE THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Browne made a motion; seconded by Mayor White to open the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

Mohammed Hanify, 32 Harrison Ave. – I'm not sure why this Master Plan is adopting 60 units. It seems like we're just stuck with this as a better option because of the affordable housing where we have to take this opportunity or it's just going to get worse. It's not fair to us. It seems like

we don't have a choice. Last Thursday, when we were here, we heard that the building is going to be 37 feet. What a lot of people don't know is that it is 37 feet above the grade level where the police station is. I am almost 8 feet below that. There is a hill from my yard to the police station. If you do 40 feet, you'll be almost 50 feet, hovering over my back yard. We keep comparing to the building across the street, which isn't fair because we have people from that street walk on our block and they like our street better because it's much quieter. They say they had issues in the beginning when that development happened. They got parking passes to help with parking on the street. They had issues with the garbage. It keeps getting worse and that's a much smaller development. It's only 12 units. We keep hearing 60 units. Why can't we just have less units, like 40?

Steve Mariconda, 24 Harrison Ave. - I just hope we could maybe lower it down to 40 units. I'm wondering if in the Master Plan there is something about the number of units that can be in such a development.

Timothy Staunton, 35 Harrison Ave. – I don't know how you people would like it if you opened your front door and you're looking at a 40 foot building right outside your door. I don't think Market St. is the place for 60 residential units. It's more traffic.

Mr. Browne made a motion; seconded by Mr. LaGuardia to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor - YES

7. ADJOURN

Mr. Browne made a motion; seconded by Mr. Ambrogio to adjourn the meeting.

All in Favor - YES

Meeting adjourned 7:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jayne Kapner
Planning Board Secretary