

**TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK
PLANNING BOARD**

Following are the minutes of the Saddle Brook Planning Board's Regular Meeting, held on Monday, January 21, 2026 at 7:13 p.m.

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

2. CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCES – OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

3. NEW BUSINESS

A.) Minor Subdivision

RGSI LLC, 26 William Street, Block 613, Lot 9

Carmine Alampi, attorney for the applicant came forward.

Mr. Cialone – The applicant did provide Proof of Service and the Board does have jurisdiction to hear this matter.

Mr. Alampi – The property presently has a one family home with a very large garage on the side, along the street front. We plan to demolish that existing home and garage and construct 2 one-family homes. The houses were designed to be modern, but not McMansions. The main variances are the lot sizes. When divided, there will be two 50' x 100' lots, where 6,500 square feet is required. The property is smaller in scale, but so are the homes.

Steven Koestner, engineer for applicant, was sworn in.

Plans, including Existing Conditions Survey, Topographical and Boundaries Survey (dated 06/30/25) and a Minor Subdivision Plan were marked Exhibit A-1.

Mr. Koestner – The Topographical Survey shows the property as it is. The house is a two-story structure; the garage a one-story masonry structure. The property is somewhat level. There is approximately two feet of slope between the rear property line and the front. There is a hedgerow along the front of the property, two trees in the rear and fencing surrounding property along the sides and the rear. The structures would be removed and replaced with two new homes, if approved. The property is currently 100' x 100'. We are proposing to divide the property equally into two 50' x 100' lots. The proposed homes will have the proper front yard, rear yard and side yard setbacks. (see Minor Subdivision Plan, Lot 9, Block 614, sheet 6, dated June 30, 2025, revised November 12, 2025) Proposed setbacks are: 27' front yard, 10.25' each side yard and 26' rear yard. They will be two story homes, with one at 26.99' in height, and the other at 27', which is one foot lower than the 28' permitted. The two-car garage would be included in the structure itself. There will be accommodations for two cars in the garage and two cars on the driveway. Presently, the garage is located to the rear of the property and is 33' x 20'. We will be relocating the existing curb cut and adding a curb cut. Drainage Calculations for each lot were marked Exhibit A-2. We mentioned a hot tub in our drainage calculations that is not being proposed. Currently, the rainwater goes into the street. The seepage pits were designed in such a way that they would capture the runoff from the roof and direct it into a seepage pit beneath the driveway in the front yard (shown on Site Plan). We sized the seepage pit at 6 x 6 or 1,000 gallons, as well as surrounding stone (18") to have the water slowly drain into the surrounding soil, subject to a soil log sample and percolation test. There will be less runoff than there is now.

Mr. Hickey – Are all gutters going to the seepage pit?

Mr. Koestner – Yes.

Mr. Hickey – Will the homes be at the same grade as existing homes? Will property slope towards neighbors' property?

Mr. Koestner – They will be slightly higher (4"). A swale will be created adjacent to the house and there will be a drain to direct the water towards William Street and the pit.

Mr. Maniscalco – Is it a wood deck?

Mr. Koestner – Yes.

Mr. Maniscalco – There's no room for a pool, a shed or pavers. How much coverage do you have?

Mr. Koestner – 26.84%, where 26% is the maximum allowed.

Mr. Alampi – To add anything else, we would have to come back for a variance.

Mr. Ambrogio – What is the elevation of the deck?

Mr. Koestner – 1'8" above ground.

Mr. Maniscalco – What about trees?

Mr. Koestner – The trees will remain.

Mr. Kurus – Will the new sidewalk connect to the sidewalk on the north side?

Mr. Koestner – There is no sidewalk presently on William St. We will install a sidewalk.

Mr. Kurus – There is a utility pole in front of the existing driveway. Will you reshape the driveway apron?

Mr. Koestner – The pole will be relocated.

Mr. Compitello – How many houses does the pole serve?

Mr. Koestner – I don't know.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for Mr. Koestner only. All in Favor - YES

Steve Miraconda, chairman of the Saddle Brook Green Team – We have a lighting ordinance in our town, so any development must be compliant.

David Griep, 21 Woodward St. – One of the trees is 50' tall, bare and leaning toward the neighbor's house. Why are you leaving it?

Mr. Alampi – We will inspect it and maybe take it down.

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

Jacob Solomon, architect for the applicant, was sworn in.

Mr. Solomon – The original design has been cut back. Also, we have decided to have an unfinished basement at this time. We wanted to design a home that would fit within all of the required setbacks. Side yard setback required is 10', we're at 10.35'. Where 25' front yard setback is required, we're at 27' and the existing house is at 12.25'. We have a 26' rear setback, where 20' is required. The houses are identical in size. The dwelling itself has a footprint of 1,342 square feet per floor. No bulk variances are proposed, except building coverage. We are seeking a variance for 1% building coverage, which is approximately 42 square feet over the permitted amount. Our accessory coverage is 15.48%, which is under the required 18%. Our total lot coverage is 42.32%, where 44% is required, so we're still under. Height will be 27', where 28' is permitted. Architectural Plans (4 sheets) were marked Exhibit A-3. Sheet ZB1 shows Site Plan by Koestner, ZB2 shows the 1st Floor Plan. Basement is unfinished. First floor will have a two-car garage in front, a double height entry foyer, powder room, living room, dining room kitchen and mud room. There will be a 150 square foot wood deck in the rear, less than two feet above the ground. ZB3 shows the second floor plan where there are 4 bedrooms and 3 bathrooms. The front bedroom will have an ensuite. There will be two bedrooms that share a hallway bathroom. The primary suite will have a larger closet and a primary bathroom. Page ZB4 is the elevations. It is a two-story dwelling with a two-car garage in the front. We're proposing horizontal siding and stone on the first floor and a hard coat stucco on the second floor. Exhibit A-4, a color rendering was distributed to the Board.

Mr. Compitello – Does the sump pump drain into the seepage pit?
Mr. Solomon – Yes.

Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for Mr. Solomon only. All in Favor – YES
No public participation.

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

Kathryn Gregory, planner for the applicant, was sworn in.

Ms. Gregory – An 11x14 photo exhibit “Existing Conditions and Surrounding Neighborhood Characteristics” with photos by Ms. Gregory and Google Earth was marked Exhibit A-5.

Ms. Gregory – The top three photographs show the existing house on the property and what’s surrounding it. The house is not centered on the lot. It looks like there’s supposed to be another lot there. The next three photos are the houses across the street, including a cape and a cape with a full second story addition. In this area, most of the lots are 50’ x 100’. This also shows the housing in the area. We are located in the R-A zone, where single-family houses are permitted. We are seeking three variances for each lot: lot size (5,000 sq. ft.), lot width (50’) and building coverage (26.84%). I consider the coverage a de minimus variance. Also, it is balanced by the underage in lot coverage (44% permitted, 42.32% proposed). We meet all of the bulk regulations otherwise. One particular court case guides us in this instance, namely Kaufman v Wharton Township Planning Board. In that case, there was a lot that was larger than the requirement for the zone. The court found that the applicant was allowed to subdivide that lot into two smaller lots even though it didn’t meet all of the setbacks or the frontage that was required because it was in better conformance to the neighborhood and the zone plan. The majority of the lots in the immediate neighborhood are 50 x 100. I do think this is a better plan for the property under the guise of the Kaufman case. I think we promote several of the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law. 1.) Purpose A, which talks about the promotion of the public health, safety and welfare because of Kaufman case and because we are providing drainage improvements where there are none existing on the site. Also, we are eliminating the front yard setback variance (better conformance with the neighborhood). I also believe we promote Purpose C, which talks about adequate light, air and open space. We meet all of the setbacks and the height for the zone. Also, Purpose G, which talks about providing sufficient space and appropriate locations for a variety of uses that includes residential. A Freddie Mac study done in 2019 shows that the U.S. is short 3.8 million housing units. Zillow’s 2023 study says that the U.S. is short 4.3 million housing units. While one house won’t make a big difference, we already have the infrastructure here to provide the extra lot. It’s going to fit in with the neighborhood. I also think we promote Purpose I, which talks about a desirable visual environment. This will complete the streetscape at this location. In terms of the negative criteria, I don’t believe there’s any substantial detriment to the public good. We are eliminating a nonconforming front yard condition and we are making drainage improvements. I also don’t think there’s any substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of your zoning plan and zoning ordinance. One of the issues in your 2014 Master Plan Reexamination was demolition of existing single-family homes and replacement with mcmansions, incompatible with the prevailing character of the existing neighborhood. If we were to knock this house down and keep the 10,000 sq. ft. lot, we could have a much more massive structure than if we subdivide the lot. I do believe we meet the positive and negative criteria under the guise of the C2 variance, where the benefits outweigh the detriments and we promote the purposes of MLUL for this subdivision and the variances associated with it.

Mr. Compitello – Will the houses look identical? Same color?

Mr. Alampi – They will be the same materials, but different colors.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion to open the meeting to the public; seconded by Mr. Browne for questions for Ms. Gregory only. All in favor - YES

No public participation.

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

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion to open the meeting to the public; seconded by Mr. Browne for any comments or questions about this application. All in favor - YES

No public participation.

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

Mr. Cialone – If the board is contemplating an approval, I recommend you make it contingent upon the compliance with report by Neglia and, also, there was a discussion about preventing water from flowing onto neighboring properties.

Mayor White made a motion to approve the application with those conditions; seconded by Councilman Gierek. VOTE: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Brown, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Cook, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Maniscalco, Councilman Gierek and Mayor White – YES

APPLICATION APPROVED

Recess 8:13-8:22 p.m.

B.). Preliminary & Final Site Plan Approval

Manor at Saddle Brook, 93-95 Market Street, Block 613, Lot 9

Thomas Scrivo, attorney for the applicant came forward.

Mr. Scrivo – We have submitted an affidavit of service with the notice.

Mr. Cialone – The applicant did make proper notice. The board does have jurisdiction here.

Mr. Scrivo – This is a preliminary and final site plan approval. This property has been designated by the governing body as An Area In Need Of Rehabilitation. This sets in motion a series of events under the local housing and redevelopment law, which culminates in our application for site plan approval. There was an initial Redevelopment Plan that resulted in activity that was not satisfactory to the governing body. So, the governing body prepared a different Redevelopment Plan, which this board approved on October 22, 2025. It went back to the governing body for approval. This application is for final site plan approval of that plan. This plan fully meets the Redevelopment Plan approved by the governing body. The building is 45,400 square feet. It has 60 units. It exceeds RSIS parking. One of the conditions of the Redevelopment Plan is that we have a Traffic Impact Study. That report has been provided. It is also consistent with the township's obligations under Mount Laurel. This plan carries with it a 15% set aside for affordable housing, which means 9 affordable housing units; 2 one-bedroom, 2 three- bedroom and 5 two-bedroom units, which goes towards the township's compliance with its constitutional obligations in that regard.

Patrick McClellan, engineer for the applicant was sworn in.

Mr. McClellan – The site is where the former municipal building is standing. The application tonight proposes to remove the existing on site improvements and construct one new multi-story residential building. We're planning on a footprint of about 45,400 square feet. We will be providing 60 apartment units with all sheltered parking; 201 parking spaces for the apartments themselves, plus 40 spaces for the exclusive use of the police department. The property is 1.35 acres. There is a significant grade change on the property going from east to west. On the right side is the police station. What we are proposing is a building that's split in two, so it runs with the existing topography. At the bottom of the police department driveway, there will be an entry into

an underground parking area with 40 spaces. . When you come back out onto Market Street, there will be two access points. The one on the right will be at that level. The other, further up Market St. will be elevated 12-14 feet and will feed two levels of parking. There are 60 apartment units proposed. The building is perceived as a three-story building. There were architectural details used to help reduce the scale of the building. The site plan is fully compliant with the ordinance adopted in November. The Site Plan was marked Exhibit A-1. We are largely in agreement and have no objection to the comments in the Neglia Engineering review letter. The engineer asked that we provide testimony for a few of the items. On page 4 of 9 of the letter, regarding item 10 (ADA access), we have ADA parking on site. The areas of the ADA parking are basically level with the elevators. All of the building is handicap accessible. Item 11 (referring to the floor plans), there are some trash areas shown. The applicant has traditionally employed private contractors to do refuse collection. In this case, we are not proposing dumpsters. We are proposing smaller bins that are going to be set aside and marked refuse and recycling. A private hauler will come with a smaller truck and empty them by hand. The frequency usually starts at two pickups a week and then its adjusted, as needed, after the place is fully occupied. Item 12 is asking for commentary about façade signage. There is no signage proposed. If the applicant does want signage eventually, that would be done under a separate zoning application. If a variance was needed, it would require a trip back to the board. Items 18 and 19 are relative to stormwater management. Our plan does depict a stormwater management strategy. We are considered a major development and are required to comply with NJAC 7:8, which are the major stormwater rules. This project does that by reducing the amount of impervious cover and virtually eliminating all of the motor vehicle surfaces that are onsite now. Not only are we reducing peak flow values, but we are also reducing the volume of water because of how the building will be built. Water quality enhancement is being addressed by way of removing all of the sources of water quality detriment on the site by sheltering the parking under the building. Your engineer has asked us to document that in a formal report, which we have no objection to doing. We will prepare any operation manual that is required. Item 22 asks us to provide the roof drain connections, shown on the plan. We will coordinate with the architect where the leader drain connections are going to be and how they connect to a piping system. For item 24, we do show utility connections on Market St. on sheet 6 or 7. Our first intention is to reuse the existing utilities, if they are adequate and in the right location. If not, we will show where proposed connections are going to be and provide the details. Item 28 - our lighting plan is de minimus because site lighting will be building mounted. We will comply with the Green Team criteria for color and intensity. We don't want spillage onto neighboring properties. We will provide the details for review. Item 31, there are no trees being removed. The site has extensive landscape screening from Harrison to the back of our building. We are lined with Norway spruce and Green Giant Arborvitae to breakdown the scale of the building. We are also proposing screening around the utility box that will be placed in the front of the building on Market St. We also have planting opportunities in the pocket park at the intersection, as well as along Market Street. We don't know yet how irrigation is going to be done. Applicant will assure that landscaping will survive, whether by an irrigation system or the onsite management team. With regard to the architecture plans, revised date 12/31/2025, there are three levels of apartments. On the lowest level, there are 10-2 bedroom units; the second floor, 30 units (1-3 bedroom unit, 23- 2 bedroom units, 6-1 bedroom units); and the third level has 20 units (1-3 bedroom, 15 2-bedrooms and 4-1bedroom units). Nine of these units are designated for affordable housing purposes. It's 2-one bedroom units, 5-two bedroom units, 2-three bedroom units, as designated on the plan. It's going to be a red brick building with a concrete block base. It is a mansard style roof, which helps to bring the feel of the building down a bit. It also creates a level area on the roof for the HVAC units, so they're not visible from the street. Regarding comment 39, the lowest area of garage clearance is greater than 8'2", which is the ADA requirement. We are not anticipating the need for trucks or ambulances to get into the parking garage. We have a delivery area in the front of the building

for that purpose. Regarding Mr. Pappozzi's January 12, 2026 review letter, our plan indicates we have 106 parking spaces on one level and 55 on the other. Your planner correctly pointed out that we had taken credit for the accessible aisle between handicap spaces, which is not used for parking. However, we also had a parking space on each level that was not numbered, so that brings us back to the 106 and 55. We also agree with his comments relative to the ADA requirements. We took the number as a whole and complied based on that number. He is telling us that we should look at the number of spaces on each level and comply with ADA spaces based on that. That requires three more ADA spaces. That will cost us 2 spaces, leaving us with a total of 199 spaces, where the requirement is somewhere around 120. We're about 2.65 spaces per unit, plus the 40 parking spaces for the exclusive use of the Police Department. Even though we don't count them, we do get a credit for 12 additional spaces because we are providing EV charging stations. We can take credit for 211 spaces. Under unit specifications, architectural plans show 20 storage units. These units are meant for use by the tenants, not an outside business. Also, we have two bike racks to meet the ordinance requirement of 15 spaces.

Mr. Hickey – Will the police parking entrance be gated?

Mr. McClellan – I'd imagine the Police Department will tell us what their needs are. If they want it gated with some sort of a key fob system, we would have no objection. Their 40 spaces are accessed from their property and not from the street.

Mr. Hickey – Will the police parking be on the security cameras and have decent lighting?

Mr. McClellan – Yes.

Mr. Hickey – If the building is sold, will those 40 spots be guaranteed to belong to the Police Department?

Mr. Scrivo – Yes. There was an agreement negotiated that will perpetuate with the land.

Mr. Cialone – I'm going to recommend, if the board approves the application, the condition that 40 spaces are dedicated solely for police/township needs.

Mr. Hickey – When the tenants come out of the garage area, can they turn in either direction?

Mr. McClellan – That will be subject to county review. No restrictions are proposed at this time.

Mr. Hickey – Will fire trucks be able to make the turn into the delivery area?

Mr. McClellan – They should be able to make the turn, but we can run a simulation to prove it. I would think that the ladder truck would have to be further away from the building because the ladder has to be on an angle.

Mr. Maniscalco – Where will Police Department visitors park?

Mr. McClellan - The police will manage their spaces however they see fit. Visitors will have to go into their current driveway and down the hill. There is parking in the back and under the Police Department building.

Mr. Maniscalco – Who will maintain the Police Department's garage?

Mr. Scrivo – That was all part of the parking agreement with the Township. I don't have those details right now. Most of the obligations fall on the applicant.

Mr. Maniscalco – If the police department chooses to buy electric vehicles who will be responsible for installing the chargers?

Mr. Scrivo – We have not addressed that in the parking agreement, but we will.

Mr. Hickey – Will they restrict commercial parking in the garage? If they have a work vehicle and a personal vehicle, tenants may put their personal vehicles on the street. Are they going to sell visitor spots?

Mr. McClellan – The reason there are 2.65 spaces per unit is to keep people off the street. I think people would want to be park sheltered and near the elevator.

Mayor White – The Township Council has already agreed, if necessary, that we would pass an ordinance to make Harrison Ave. resident only parking, for residents of Harrison Ave.

Mr. McClellan – The existing access from the site to Harrison Ave. is going to be eliminated.

Mr. Maniscalco – How are you handling the high water table?

Mr. McClellan – The biggest concern is for the 40 spaces for the Police Department. The good news is that it's a relatively small footprint, compared to the size of the whole building. It's going to need to be managed. The developer has had experience on other sites and knows how to handle this in accordance with the rules and regulations.

Mr. Hickey – Will there be a backup generator?

Mr. McClellan – Yes.

Mr. Cook – What's the elevation of the driveway for the police parking area? Is it on the same level?

Mr. McClellan. – The parking area will be at the elevation of the bottom of the Police Dept. driveway. It's about 11-12' below the floor above it. It's intended to be a smooth transition.

Mr. Kurus – You'll confirm those elevations and add them to the final plans?

Mr. McClellan – Yes.

Mr. Maniscalco – Where will the Police Department vehicles and personal vehicles be parked during construction?

Mr. McClellan – It will be addressed during the preconstruction meeting.

Mr. Cook – Will there be a full time super onsite?

Mr. McClellan – Yes.

Mr. Cook – Does that person control the allocation of parking spaces? For example, if a repairman comes to fix someone's tv, he can give them a spot?

Mr. McClellan – The management company will assign spots and then the onsite person will facilitate refuse removal, move-ins and all things like that.

Mr. Paparozzi – You need to separate trash and recycling.

Mr. McClellan – The containers will be separated and marked. They will be picked up by a private contractor, who will pull into the garage with a pickup truck.

Mr. Compitello – Is it pet friendly?

Mr. McClellan – No.

Mr. Maniscalco – How will they access the roof to maintain HVAC equipment?

Mr. McClellan – I believe there's a stairwell to get up there.

Mr. Hickey – Will the building also have security cameras?

Mr. McClellan – Yes.

Mr. Kurus – Can you go over the retaining wall/grades on the back east side of the building?

Mr. McClellan – We should be providing you with a few more spot elevations so that it's clear.

Near the property line, we are building a retaining wall to get the soil up higher. Between the retaining wall and the building itself, we are proposing some landscaping. Sheet 9 shows a row of Norway Spruce and Green Giant Arborvitae for screening purposes. The wall will be about 3' and will get the trees up higher to help screen the building quicker. The architect's elevation drawing shows this. The first row of windows will be blocked. The initial height of the plantings will be 10 to 12 feet.

Mr. Kurus – Will you provide a final landscape plan to call out the individual species as shown on the renderings?

Mr. McClellan – We can do that.

Mr. Kurus – Will you submit to Bergen County the street trees on the plan?

Mr. McClellan – Yes.

Mr. Kurus – I think irrigation is a good idea with this many plantings.

Mr. McClellan – With the onsite person, it can be monitored, but if irrigation proves to be the better way, that's what we'll do.

Mr. Cialone – For the triangle area where Market and Harrison meet, I see some landscaping and hardscaping. Will it be maintained by the applicant?

Mr. McClellan – Yes.

Mr. Cialone – Will the flagpole remain? Also, there will be a sign for the Township's use?

Mr. McClellan – Yes. Also, the monument will be relocated.

Mr. Maniscalco – Will there be any seating/benches there?
Mr. McClellan – We can.
Mr. Maniscalco – Will you put up an address sign?
Mr. McClellan – An address sign does not require approval.
Mr. Compitello – How far will the retaining wall in the back be from the property line?
Mr. McClellan – It will be a couple of inches off the property line.
Mr. Compitello – The drawings are missing the 3 bedroom units on the plan.
Mr. McClellan – There are two of them, but we don't have that.
Mr. Cialone – I'd like to see the board engineer and myself get copies of the revised plans. I would suggest that if the board approves this, that the layout of the 3-bedroom unit be placed on a revised architectural plan.
Mr. McClellan – No problem.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for Mr. McClellan. All in Favor - YES
Barbara Doge Ha, 50 Catherine Ave. – If approved, when would demolition start?
Mr. McClellan – Weather dependent, we could start in a couple of months.
Effie Pappas, 35 Harrison Ave. – Referring to the coloring rendering top right photo, what is the height from the ground level to the top?
Mr. McClellan – It is 38.9' from the ground surface to the midpoint of the roof and an additional 5' to the top of the building.
Ms. Pappas – Will all of the apartments have balconies?
Mr. McClellan – They are Juliet balconies. They can't be occupied.
John Manzo, 179 Market St. – Has there been a study done regarding the effect on our infrastructure/sewerage?
Mr. McClellan – For sewer and water, we have to make state applications. Infrastructure comments will be addressed during that process.
Matthew Staunton, 35 Harrison Ave. – You said the police parking was going to be underground. How deep will it be? What happens if you hit water and our houses flood?
Mr. McClellan – The finish elevation for the garage will be the same as the bottom of the existing Police Station driveway. It's about 20 feet down from the existing grade. If we hit water, there is a dewatering process to be followed.
Mr. Pappas – Who do we turn to get our homes fixed?
Mr. McClellan – That's a question for the developer, but these are projections that haven't happened yet.
Mr. Manzo – The Police Station is on a spring and they have pumps running 24 hours a days to control that water. That could happen to you too.
John Caravello, 57 Harrison Ave. – How long does it take you to approve this? How long does it take, if approved, to start digging?
Mr. Cialone – If the board were to approve this application at the February 18 meeting, the resolution would be approved at the March meeting. Then it's up to the applicant to get permits to raise what is there. Then they have to get Bergen County approvals, Soil approvals and state approvals before they can start construction.
Mr. McClellan – It could be shortly after the resolution approval.
Steve Miraconda, 24 Harrison Ave. – There's already a retaining wall there that's falling apart in my yard. Is that going to be replaced?
Mr. McClellan – I suggest you have a conversation with the developer. He's very neighbor friendly. We don't want you harmed.
Mr. Miraconda – For the landscaping, could you use native plants, with the exception of the Norway Spruce?
Mr. McClellan – I do think that the ordinance does call for some native plantings.

Mr. Miraconda – What about the tree at the triangle?

Mr. McClellan – We plan to keep that.

Mr. Caravello – Will the building go into that triangle?

Mr. McClellan – No. It will be green space/pocket park.

Omar Rodriguez – What happens if the county rejects it and says they have to go out on Harrison Ave., what happens?

Mr. Cialone – If there's a change in their site plan, they have to come back for amended Site Plan approval.

Mr. Rodriguez – If the water table doesn't allow you to continue as planned with the number of parking spaces shown, what happens?

Mr. McClellan – If we have to make a change because field conditions don't permit us to construct what we are asking approval to construct, we would redesign the plan and come back to the board for updated approval.

Mr. Rodriguez – Have you done any hydraulic engineer work to see if it's feasible?

Mr. McClellan – That will be one of the next things that happens. There will need to be subsurface examination for that purpose and also for structural design. It is presumptuous for us to go out and do that before we even have Planning Board approval. If those tests come back unfavorable, we will have to react to it. It may require us to come back to this board.

Mr. Rodriguez – Our pump station, where your sewer is going, is at capacity. You said you were going to contribute. I would like to see it as part of the approval/agreement.

Mr. McClellan – That will come to light during the permitting process for the sanitary sewer.

Typically, we have to file with the local MUA, the regional treatment facility and then eventually, the State of NJ. The process goes through those first two agencies because it's exactly what they are looking for. That would get flagged during that process and then that's where the negotiation occurs. That's when everybody knows how much flow we're contributing, what the problems are and then it gets worked out the way you're describing. That will occur during the Treatment Works Approval application.

Mr. Rodriguez – Is it possible, as far as the agreement, that each unit have not only assigned parking spaces, but they are part of any lease agreement, due to the fact that developers get creative. Eventually they will start charging for parking spaces, which will push a lot of parking into the street. To avoid that problem, each unit should have 2 assigned parking spaces.

Mr. McClellan – We can't make that commitment at this time. The developer is saying they are providing an excess of parking. I think your concern is that it will be withheld from them. It's the opposite. The spaces will only be able to be occupied by tenants and their guests. Even if you assign 2 spaces per unit, you would still have another 40-50 spaces vacant.

Mr. Rodriguez – People won't want to pay for spaces. They'll park in the street.

Ms. Pappas – Would you please consider what Omar just said about parking because it is currently happening on Harrison Ave. from the condos down the street?

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

Joseph Staigar, traffic engineer for the applicant, was sworn in.

Mr. Staiger – I prepared a traffic impact study for this site. It is a comparison between what you had on the site and what is proposed. We had a government office building on the site that is vacant and will be demolished. Proposed is a 60-unit apartment building. I looked at it as a vacant piece of property, as a government building and then as the 60 units. The vacant property generates no traffic at all. To project traffic volumes we use empirical data of other similar land uses. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) has compiled data to establish trip generation rates for many land uses but particularly in multifamily housing units. We've found that ITE rates in northeastern NJ are conservative and typically higher than what we see and experience. The 60 units will generate during morning peak hours (7:00-9:00 am) 18 trips/hour

and evening peak hours (4:00-6:00 pm) 16 trips/hour. When compared to the government office building, based on 11,300 square feet, 38 trips/hour for the morning peak hours and 20 trips/hour for the evening peak hours. That is potentially more than what the 60 units will generate. I analyzed the driveways to determine the level of service of how the driveways operate. Levels of service are rated from A-F. I took all of the traffic at one driveway to analyze it, even though we have two driveways. Left turns into the site would operate at level of service A. Exit movements with a shared left and right operate at service level C. Anything at level E or better is acceptable. That tells me that there are sufficient gaps in traffic on Market Street to allow that volume of traffic to enter and exit at an acceptable delay. I believe the impacts this proposal will have will be minimal. We have about 1,000 vehicle per morning peak hour; 1,200 per evening peak hour. The volume is pretty much split 50/50 eastbound and westbound. This proposal will follow that pattern and add about 1% increase in volume. There will be no significant increase in traffic over what was there before.

Mr. Maniscalco – I think we're going to create a major bottleneck at the Saddle River Road and Market Street intersection. It will be 10 times worse. The county may say no left turn coming out of the property. People will wind up making U-turns in someone's parking lot.

Mr. Staiger – The county will look at drainage and traffic.

Mr. Maniscalco – It's a problem now and the County has not addressed it.

Mr. Staiger – If there are restrictions required, we will certainly comply.

Board members discussed existing and potential traffic issues in this area.

Mr. Pappozzi – The County has jurisdiction. If there's any change, they will have to come back.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Councilman Gierke to open the meeting to the public for questions for Mr. Staiger only. All in Favor – YES

No public participation.

Mr. Browne made a motion, seconded by Mr. Maniscalco to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

Jeffrey Stiles, planner for the applicant was sworn in.

Mr. Stiles – The project complies with the Redevelopment Plan, adopted by the Township. We meet the use requirements, the number of units and the bulk standards.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion, seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for Mr. Stiles only. All in Favor - YES

No public participation.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion, seconded by Mr. Browne to closer the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

Mr. Hickey – (referring to public question about parking) Is each apartment guaranteed 2 parking spots as part of the rent?

Mr. Scrivo – What Mr. Rodriguez was suggesting was a devious plan by property owners to charge them after the fact some exorbitant rate for parking, forcing them to park outside the building. There are 45 extra spots. Only tenants can use the parking in the building. I think it's usually one spot per apartment. If they want a second one, they charge them.

Mr. Compitello – How do the tandem spots work?

Mr. Stiles – There are 28 sets of tandems. They'll be designated to one unit.

Mr. Maniscalco – If the tenant doesn't want to pay for the extra parking space, they will park on the street.

Mr. Scrivo – The lease says they are required to park in the building.

Frank Hall, architect for the applicant was sworn in.

Mr. Pappozzi - What is the purpose of the utility rooms? There are a few on each floor.

Mr. Hall – The MEP is for the building. Mechanical, electrical, plumbing and fire sprinkler systems have not been designed at this point, but we know there is a certain amount of room needed to house the equipment for those utilities.

Mr. Paparozzi – On multiple dwelling buildings, I always ask for an area for recyclables on each floor, so they don't have to walk down.

Mr. Hall – That's a reasonable suggestion.

Mr. Paparazzi - Will you revise the plans?

Mr. Hall – Yes.

Mr. Maniscalco – Where will the generator be located? Is it gas?

Mr. Hall – Rooftop and yes.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion, seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

No public participation.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion, seconded by Mr. LaGuardia to close the building to the public. All in Favor - YES

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion, seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions/comments about this application. All in Favor – YES

Andrew Dziedzic, 337 Eighth St. was sworn in.

Mr. Dziedzic – Will you provide a detailed plan on how you will protect the yards on Harrison Ave. before construction, during, once the building is complete, finalized, sidewalk, landscaping? In terms of Harrison Ave. and streets further down in terms of their financial value, depreciation, property devaluation, inconvenience of noise, a massive building in front of their homes. Is there any compensation going towards that, in terms of new landscaping, new fence, new garage or siding. Just wondering if you guys were interested in property values, protecting their home financial value. In regards to the 2.6 parking spaces/apartment. You're saying they must sign a lease that they must use the parking spaces, but why must they use it? How do you know that in 30, 60, 90 days those cars are not on the public street? Other complexes in other towns rent spots to companies for their commercial vehicles. Who monitors the parking?

Mr. Hickey – They said that each tenant will be required to utilize the spots.

Mr. Cialone – They also said that only tenants and tenants' guest will be permitted to park in the lot.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Councilman Gierek to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor - YES

Mr. Cialone – The conditions mentioned are: 1.) 40 parking spaces will be dedicated for the exclusive use of Saddle Brook Police Department/Township; 2.) Applicant, at their own expense will relocate the police monument to a location designated by the township; 3.) Applicant, at their own expense, will landscape, hardscape and maintain triangle area by Market St. and Harrison Ave.; 4.) Applicant will maintain existing flagpole; 5.) Applicant will install digital sign for the exclusive use of the township; 6.) Applicant will enter into a Developer's Agreement with the Township; 7.) There will be discussions between the applicant and the township concerning the installation of EV charging stations for Saddle Brook Police Department; 8.) Prior to permits being issued, there will be a plan agreed to by the applicant and the Township concerning temporary parking of police vehicles and employee vehicles; 9.) Applicant will provide a final landscaping plan; 10.) Applicant will install an irrigation system; 11.) Applicant will revise architectural plan with a layout of the 3 bedroom unit; 12.) Revised plans to be provided to the township and to the Planning Board professionals; 13.) Applicant will install benches on the landscaped triangle area at the intersection of Market St. and Harrison Ave.; 14.) Applicant will comply with the report submitted by the board engineer; 15.) Applicant will only permit tenants and tenants' guest to park

in the parking lots; 16.) Applicant will look at the possibility of providing areas within the building for recycling and revise plans accordingly; and 17.) Installation of a gate for the 40 parking spaces for the police in coordination with the Police Department.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Mayor White to approve the application with the conditions listed by Mr. Cialone. VOTE: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Browne, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Cook, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Maniscalco, Councilman Gierek and Mayor White – YES

APPLICATION APPROVED

4. MINUTES

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

5. CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to accept and file correspondence. All in Favor - YES

6. VOUCHERS

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

Birchwale Pellino & Cialone LLC, 01/06/26, Fourth Quarter Retainer, \$875

VOTE: All in Favor – YES

7. OPEN AND CLOSE THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

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

No public participation.

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

8. ADJOURN

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion; seconded by Mr. LaGuardia to adjourn the meeting. All in Favor - YES

Meeting adjourned 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jayne Kapner
Planning Board Secretary