

Borough of River Edge/ Zoning Board

Meeting Minutes

April 12, 2017

PRESENT:

Chair	Eileen Chusid
Vice-Chair	Gary Esposito
Attorney	Victoria Pekerman
Board Member	Robert Nyman
Alt. Board Member	Ronald Black
Alt. Board Member	Mark Gioffre
Zoning Official	Mark Skerbetz

ABSENT:

Secretary	Avo Derbalian
Board Member	Valerie Costa
Board Member	Al Ruhlmann

Opening

The regular meeting of the Borough of River Edge/ Zoning Board was called to order at 8:00PM on April 12, 2017 by Chair Eileen Chusid.

Salute to Flag

Sunshine Law (Open Public Meetings Act)

Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by sending notices on December 23, 2016 to The Record and The Ridgewood News, by posting on the bulletin board in the lobby of the Borough Hall, and filing a notice of the same with the Municipal Clerk.

Roll Call by Vice Chair Gary Esposito

New Business

ER Homes-Application #2017-02

886 Park Avenue

213/2-2 Bulk Variances needed for:

a. Height of 32'7"

b. Front yard setback

Chair Eileen Chusid asked Attorney Colin Quinn to step forward and asked him if he wanted to move forward with the Application for a C Variance. Attorney Colin Quinn said yes. Chair Chusid read from the letter of denial and then Attorney Quinn introduced himself and those sitting with him. They are Sean McClellam from Lantelem, Kuren & Associates, the Engineer; Raymond Hartwick from Raymond Hartwick Architects and Roody Razeendran & Kevin Matos from ER Homes, the principals of the home. Attorney Quinn then pre-marked the exhibits. Exhibit A1 - Proof of Service & Proof of Publication; Exhibit A2 - Filed Application; Exhibit A3 - Engineer's Site Plan & Survey; Exhibit A4 - Architectural Plans; Exhibit A5 - Colorized Elevation of Property; A6 – Miscellaneous Photos.

Attorney Quinn stated this was an application for the renovations of an existing home, and that this is a C1D Variance that the applicant is seeking. Specifically under the NJ State statute, by reason of exceptional topographical conditions, you are entitled to seek a hardship application from the Board that the impingement upon the Zoning Ordinance, that is caused by an application such as this, should be relaxed because of the extreme topographical conditions that affects this property. He further stated that this is a hardship in the property itself and not a hardship that is personal to the applicants themselves. It falls within B1C under NJSA40:70D. Attorney Quinn then introduced Sean McClellam, the Engineer for said property, as an expert witness. Mr. McClellam was sworn in. Mr. McClellam gave his credentials and described some of his experiences testifying as an expert witness, as an Engineer, at various Zoning Boards throughout Bergen County. Attorney Quinn asked to accept Mr. McClellam as an expert witness.

Motion by Gary Esposito.

All in favor 5-0

Mr. McClellam described the property as a 2 ½ story dwelling with a detached garage. He further stated that there is a curb cut, but there is no paving leading to the garage. He said that the rear of the property backs up to the railroad tracks and is quite steep. From across the street line down to where there is a walk out at the rear of the property there is an almost 8' drop. The property from the street drops to the rear of the property, almost

like a hole, and then it comes back up again and then it drops down again to the railroad tracks, and because of this the house is non-conforming as far as the height. Mr. McClellam stated that the height requirement is 30' where the existing is 33.7' and the house is also nonconforming as far as front yard setback which is 10.9', where 30' is required. The front of the house which infringes on the setback is a 1 story covered entryway. Attorney Quinn circulated Exhibit A6, which is an accurate depiction of the property as it now exists. Also as part of Exhibit A6, a picture of the detached garage was also circulated - Mr. McClellam described it as being covered in brush. Mr. McClellam stated that because of the slope, and where the existing house currently sits, it is better to build in the front of the property because the south end is the flattest area of the property. He also stated that although most of the addition will be within the 30' setback line, they do need to put a portion of the house within the setback space based on how the current house sits to connect to the house without a small portion of the house sticking out. Mr. McClellam's office prepared the topographical survey and they calculated the proposed height of the building. He informed the Board that they reached the calculation by the highest peak of the roof to the average grade of the property. He calculated the existing height to be 33.7', which is in violation of the Borough Zoning Board's Ordinance and that the proposed height of the building to be constructed will be 32.7'. Attorney Quinn showed another photo as part of Exhibit A6 (and circulated it) which was a photo looking at the property from across the street. Attorney Quinn asked Mr. McClellam to describe the property to the immediate south of the existing home. Mr. McClellam described the area as the portion of the lot that is fairly flat in the front of the property. He also stated that it was the area of the property that was the anticipated location for the proposed addition to the home because it is conducive to building an addition. Mr. McClellam stated that the homes to the north and south appear to have similar front setbacks, so they are all about 10-12' off the property line (the front setback on either side). He then stated that the rear of the property is kind of a hole and comes back steep and then as it gets closer to the railroad tracks it drops again severely. The way it was designed, with some minor retaining walls, it can be a very nice home with a fairly flat backyard. Mr. Nyman asked that facing the property, there is something that looks like a sinkhole on the left, and would they be filing that in for the extension of the property. Mr. McClellam stated that they would be filling it, about 92 and then a proposed deck over it so the grade would be at about 97. Mr. Nyman said that would be 5' of fill-in compacted. There were no further questions.

Attorney Quinn called his next witness, Raymond Hartwick. He stated his office is located at 769 Elm Ave., River Edge, NJ. Mr. Hartwick was sworn in, and then gave his credentials as an expert witness. Attorney Quinn asked to accept Mr. Hartwick as an expert witness.

Motion by Mr. Gioffre, second by Mr. Nyman.

All in favor 5-0

Attorney Quinn asked Mr. Hartwick to describe his colorized rendering. This colorized rendering was entered in as Exhibit A7. Mr. Hartwick stated that in the center of this drawing is the existing home, on the left hand side is a two (2) car garage, which is one (1) story, and on the right hand side is two (2) additions, both of which will be two (2) stories. Mr. Hartwick also stated that when they get to the last 11' the addition is lower in height than the rest. So they are starting a foot lower than the existing ridge and then as you step down you step down another 16" below the existing height. Mr. Hartwick stated that the front yard setback which is 10.9' now, at one time was an open porch when it was originally built and at some point was closed in. On the new proposed addition they are going to open it up and create a new porch. So, in fact, the front yard variance will be another 5.6' and you will be able to look thru it. Attorney Quinn showed Mr. Hartwick various pictures as part of Exhibit A6, 3 of these photos show porches from surrounding homes. Attorney Quinn asked Mr. Hartwick to compare these 3 porches to the porch he was proposing. Mr. Hartwick stated that for the most part they are all the same, they are all open porches, but the major difference between these 3 porches and the one he designed is that these 3 porches have 4-5 steps up to the first floor and the one he is proposing will only have 1 step, so it will be much lower to the ground. The scale of it will be much more in keeping with the size of the house. Attorney Quinn asked Mr. Hartwick if these 3 houses impinge on the front yard setback. Mr. Hartwick said he believed they did. Attorney Quinn asked Mr. Hartwick to circulate the photos to the Board members. Mr. Hartwick said that right now there is no sidewalk in front of this property, but there is a curb cut that was there for the existing garage in the rear. He also said that the front of the existing home is pretty much in line with the houses on that side of Park Avenue. Attorney Quinn asked, if approved and constructed what, if any, invasion of sight lines would be presented to someone leaving the driveway of the proposed home. Mr. Hartwick said that there would be no issue at all, if anything, because of the proposed open porch, someone pulling out of the driveway would be able to look South on Park Avenue. Attorney Quinn asked Mr. Hartwick how he accommodated the grade change in the terrane. Mr. Hartwick said that on the left hand side they will be filling in the sinkhole and putting in a one (1) story two (2) car garage, and then on the right side, which is the flattest part of the property, that is where the major part of the addition will be. Based on the layout they tried to keep the addition to the rear as minimal as possible because that is where the severe part of the slope is. Attorney Quinn showed photos, Mr. Hartwick described them as similar to the proposed project. The first one shown is similar to theirs because there is one (1) parking space in the driveway. All the homes provide for one (1) car in the driveway so the front setback is similar. Right now there is a small home on a large piece of property, once they put the addition to the right side of the property it will complete the streetscape. Attorney Quinn asked by improving this property will it be keeping with the single family nature

of this particular home owned zone. He asked if Mr. Hartwick sees any impairment in his experience to the Masterplan or Zoning Ordinance by the approval of this application. Mr. Hartwick said no not at all, because they are taking a situation from the front of the home and making it better, and increasing the front yard setback, even though the number will remain the same, visually they are increasing it by 5 ½'. On the right hand side evaluation, there is plenty of space in between the homes, and they are stepping the home down as it gets closer to the neighbor on the south side of the property, so there should be no shades/shadows cast on the neighbors; therefore, this project should have little, if any, impact on the neighbors. Attorney Quinn asked Mr. Hartwick if he felt this would be an esthetic, as well as, a safety improvement to the neighborhood. Mr. Hartwick said yes. Attorney Quinn asked if there was anything else Mr. Hartwick wanted to add. Mr. Hartwick said no, but on the positive side they are taking a structure that is in disrepair and bringing it up to current standards and eliminating the garage that needs to be raised. Attorney Quinn asked Mr. Hartwick if he was mitigating the existing violation of the Zoning Ordinance thru construction of this project. Mr. Hartwick answered yes.

Attorney Quinn asked if the Board would like to ask any questions.

Chair Chusid asked Mr. Black if he had any questions. Mr. Black asked about the run off of water, since the property is bias back toward the railroad tracks, how do they plan on mitigating that. Mr. Hartwick said on the site plan there is a seepage pit, and they did a full drainage study and submitted the calculations, so the roof run off will be collected and brought to the seepage pit (1000 gallon pit), which will be located at the rear of the property by the proposed deck.

Chair Chusid said for the record, she noticed that this is a very large piece of property, almost 10,745 square feet and the only 2 things they are looking at are an existing front yard setback violation (and that in the older sections of town they run into this quite a bit), side yard setbacks far exceed, double the minimum required by the ordinance. As far as the height is there any wiggle room on the 32.7' at the highest point. Attorney Quinn asked if there is a specific concern Mr. Hartwick could address. Chair Chusid said yes, she thinks they need to have the conversation because this was a large bone of contention in town about 3 or 4 years ago and the ordinance was changed to 30' for the height recognizing the average height is 28', so she would like to hear if there is a hardship in the property requiring the extra foot and a half. Chair Chusid also said that she does applaud them for lowering as they move towards the neighbor and recessing. She also said visually it does create a much more open feel. Mr. Hartwick stated that the first issue is esthetically looking at it from the front trying to match it to the main slope of the roof, and they are still not at the same pitch as the main roof, he lowered it as much as he could. The biggest part of it is how the dormers connect to a steeper sloped roof. They tried to step down because of the impact on the neighbors and by the time the house

gets to the neighbors they are at 31.4', very close, and that is with 11'. He also stated that he doubts anyone standing at the curb would be able to pick up on it as they are stepping down at these two (2) additions. They are dealing with a very steep slope and with the average grade being 6' away from the building. Attorney Quinn said that rather than knocking the whole building down and doing a complete rebuild and perhaps changing the character of the neighborhood and the character of the structure, they are trying to use, as best as they can, what is available in the building envelope, like everyone else in the neighborhood. Mr. Hartwick stated that there are no drainage issues, it is more of an esthetic issue. They could probably take a foot off the height and still be okay. Mr. Hartwick said that they are at the end of the street, so it's not like they are in the middle of the street and you're driving down and one (1) house is sticking high above the others.

Vice-Chair Gary Esposito asked if they had to worry about ice buildup, would it be a danger if they lowered it. Mr. Hartwick said a little bit, not terribly. There could be a little bit of ice damaging issues they wouldn't have with a steeper slope.

Mr. Nyman asked if they are altering the roof structure of the original part of the building or are they relying on 100 year old rafters. Mr. Hartwick said that once they start demolition they will reinforce whatever rafters they have to, but they won't be changing the slope of the original part of the home. They plan on keeping the original roof structure there. They are keeping as much of the exterior walls as they can, and once they get inside they will put some structural beams up. Mr. Nyman said he noticed on the plans that there is a staircase going up, it looks like it's a full staircase that leads up to the attic, is that still the case, it's not a pulldown. Mr. Hartwick said that the original staircase will stay and that for the most part that section of the house will remain. Mr. Nyman asked how big that space was up there, and are there any plans for it, might it be a third floor. Mr. Hartwick said he was unsure as to how big the space was, but that there was a section up there that was walkable space in the center because you have a steep slope on the roof and it's dormered out on the left hand side. Mr. Nyman stated he is unsure as to what constitutes a third floor, but the town is 2 ½ stories. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz said a whole story is when more than half of the floor area above the second floor ceiling has a clear space of 7'6" and that he has seen the plans and it remains a half story. Mr. Nyman also asked if the roof was being touched, are they leaving the structure in place, and how do you lower the roof by a foot. Mr. Hartwick stated that the original structure will stay in place, but where the new ridge meets the old it will be lowered there, the existing ridge won't change. Mr. Nyman said on one of the application forms it states that the zoning requirements is 32' for building height, is it 32' or is it 30'. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz said it is 30', and that he does not review the zoning applications. Attorney Colin Quinn said that it might have been a mistake but that they advertised for 30', and it is 30'. Mr. Nyman asked Mr. Hartwick to describe for him again the porch coming out that was once enclosed, that's going to be taken away and the

front façade will go back to the original line. Mr. Hartwick said that 10'9" is the original of where the wall is now, but when they make the porch, the front wall of the house will be another 5'6.5" back. Mr. Nyman said when he looks at the title box it shows a scale of 1/4" is 1 foot, but when he goes over to the side on each page it shows 1/8" is 1 foot. He just wanted to point out that what was submitted is confusing. It should be proper before Zoning Board receives them. Mr. Nyman had no more questions at this time.

Mr. Gioffre asked about the property in the back that dips, goes up and then dips again – the first dip is that going to be caught by the reinforced wall, and can they can get a proper slope if they keep the drainage going toward the root of the property if they have that wall there to help build it up. Mr. Gioffre asked what the wall was on the right corner of the property, Mr. McClellam said that it was just to help get a flat backyard and they didn't go all the way to the rear. They didn't want to get to close to the tracks. Mr. Gioffre asked how they will fill in the area. Mr. McClellam said they are going to reuse the same filing wherever possible.

Chair Chusid asked if the house was being built to be sold or are the people building it going to reside there. Attorney Quinn said the builders will be building to sell and that he believes that there are two or three house on the same side of Park Avenue that are doing the same thing. Attorney Quinn said they are builders so they are there to build. Mr. Chusid said she just wanted it on the record.

Mr. Black stated that going back to what Mr. Nyman asked, and what is on the piece of paper, that the present layout existing is 33.7' and the proposed layout is 32.7', but it was stated that part of the building will remain at 33.7'. So proposed will still be at 33.7' because that will be the max peek. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz said No the subject of the variance is the new construction and what is already there is preexisting and is not the subject of the variance.

Chair Chusid opened the meeting to the public and asked if anyone from the public wanted to be heard on this application. For the record no one stepped forward. Chair Chusid closed the questioning to the public and went around one more time to the Board Members. No one had any more questions. Chair Chusid asked if they would lower the height a little bit on the addition, she said she thinks it would show tremendous goodwill. Attorney Quinn asked for a minute. Attorney Quinn then said that the applicant would like to amend the application to reduce the height variance aspect of the application from 32.7' to 31.7'. Chair Chusid asked for a motion.

Motion to approve as amended to 31.7' by Mark Gioffre second by Mr. Black.

Approve 5-0

Chair Chusid asked Attorney Quinn to inform his clients about the memorialization next month and that construction shouldn't start until then. Attorney Quinn stated that he understood, but he knows that past practices the Board has allowed contractors to sign a letter of indemnity to the Borough in anticipation of commencing construction in advance of the memorization of the resolution. He asked the current Board to allow this applicant to sign a letter of indemnity in order to start construction prior to the memorialization. Chair Chusid asked Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz stated that they would have to take that up with the Building Department.

Clancy-Application #2017-03

733 7th Avenue

308/5- 1 Bulk Variance needed for:

a. Lot coverage by impervious surfaces

Chair Chusid asked each of the applicants to state their names and address. Michael Clancy, 733 7th Avenue, River Edge; Sylvia Clancy, 733 7th Avenue, River Edge. Both were sworn in and Chair Chusid read from the letter of denial.

Chair Chusid asked them to explain to the Board about their pool.

Michael Clancy stated that they moved into River Edge about 8 years ago and it has been a long term plan for them and they have a nice size property and are fortunate enough to be able to do it at this time. This is something they want to do to create memories for their family and have wanted to do it for a long time.

Chair Chusid asked if their pool contractor was here. Michael Clancy said yes.

Mr. Black said he had no questions, he did state that he was surprised that since the property was so big they didn't have enough room to put the pool in without affecting the impervious surface.

Chair Chusid asked them to state for the record the height and location of the fence around the pool for safety reasons.

Michael Clancy stated that they went with the NJ Code for fencing around pools, and that the fencing would be going around the entire property and the size would be a 4' fence with a locking mechanism that goes up to 54" on both gates on both sides of the property.

Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz informed Mr. & Mrs. Clancy that they would have to comply with Zoning regulations which will incorporate the State regarding fences around an in-ground pool, which will also be subject to his approval. Anything in the front of the house has to be 3' and anything from the front wall to the back of the house can be up to 6' and that would satisfy the state regulations for in-ground pools.

Chair Chusid said that looking at the plans it shows a 4' fence from the side of the house backwards. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz said that he did review the plans a few weeks ago.

Mr. Gary Esposito had no questions.

Mr. Nyman stated that they have a large deck, a large existing paper patio in the back, and they are going to put a fairly large walkway around the pool; if they put a seepage system in that is not going to be cheap and perhaps if they reduce some of those other components down it might bring them closer to alignment.

Mr. Mark Gioffre asked about the pool equipment such as the pump and the control valves. The Clancy's expert witness, their pool contractor stepped forward and stated his name and address. John Gorman, with Olympic Pools in Saddle Brook, NJ. Mr. Gorman stated that the pool equipment would be in the back in the right hand corner, 5' from the property line, behind the pool.

Mr. Black asked about the deck and if it has open slats so when it rains the water goes below it. Mr. Clancy said yes.

Mr. Nyman asked about the fact that the plans, the application, and the paperwork are interchanging between 7th Avenue and 7th Street. He stated that both the drawings and the plans both show 7th Avenue and not 7th Street. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz said that when he sees something minor like that he is not going to have the applicant spend another \$1000 to have it corrected, and what they do downstairs is they redline it, if they feel it's necessary. If things were missing or a lot was incorrect that would be different.

Chair Chusid asked if there were any members of the public who wished to be heard on this application, and no one stepped forward. Meeting was then closed to the public and Chair Chusid asked one more time if any of the Board members had any other questions or comments.

Mr. Nyman said we don't have the engineer here, but he assumes that the design for the seepage pit is what is necessary to handle the additional runoff from the pool area and the paving. Mr. Gorman stepped forward and stated that they had the calculations done and that the 500 gallon seepage pit was enough and that there is another seepage pit that he doesn't believe is shown on the plans. Mr. Clancy said that they actually have two (2) seepage pits on the property and that they are in front of the proposed seepage pit. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz asked what the existing coverage is, and Sylvia Clancy stated that it is 35.1.

Motion by Ron Black, to approve the application as proposed, second by Gary Esposito.

Chair Chusid informed the Clancy's not to start construction until after the memorialization. Sylvia Clancy asked if they would be able to take out the permits prior to the memorialization. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz told them to call down to Nicole in the Building Department and ask her.

All in favor 5-0

Meehan-Monopoli – Application #2017-01

700 Millbrook Road

305/39 – 4 Bulk Variances needed for:

a. 2 front yard setback (corner lot)

b. Rear Yard setback

c. Lot coverage by impervious surfaces

Chair Chusid asked the applicants to state their name and address. Catherine Monopoli who currently resides at 112 Surrey Lane, River Edge, NJ and Thomas Meehan, 700 Millbrook Road, River Edge, NJ and Brian Callahan (licensed architecture in New Jersey), 333 Fairview Avenue, Westwood, NJ. All three were sworn in. Chair Chusid read from the letter of denial.

Brian Callahan stated that they were proposing a couple of additions and the replacement of an existing deck and a rear covered porch to the existing single family home at 700 Millbrook Road. It is a corner lot and is in the R1 Zone and is 7000 square feet in area. Currently, on the site, there is an existing 1 ½ story single family dwelling of a little over 1600 square feet. The site is sloping and the higher side being the west side facing Millbrook Road and the site slopes downward as you travel east on Continental Avenue allowing for a walkout basement on the eastside. There is an existing elevated deck that is flush with the first floor at the rear of the house currently and a small shed that is proposed to be removed as part of this project. There are three existing non-conforming conditions with respect to this property. This lot is 7000 square feet, where the minimum lot area required in an R1 Zone is 7500. The width is 70', where 75' is the minimum width required in an R1 Zone. Currently the way the house is situated there is a side yard setback of 6.2' on the north side, where 7.5' is the minimum required side yard setback. They are proposing a new one (1) story addition at the rear of the east side of the house to accommodate a new kitchen. The addition will be 213.7 square feet and the existing kitchen will be converted to a new accessible bathroom/ laundry room. This kitchen will align with the existing north side of the house and thereby result in a side yard setback of 6.2'. They are also proposing the replacement and slight relocation of the existing elevated deck, this new deck will have stairs. The bump out for the stair along the rear yard will result in a setback of 18.83'. The current deck is less than 21' from the rear

property line. They are also proposing a covered porch at the front of the house, and since it is a corner lot they are required to have two (2) front yard setbacks. The covered porch would result in a front yard setback of 23.7 at Continental and 28.9 at Millbrook, where 30' is required for both. Lastly, because there are two (2) driveways, these two (2) driveways and some of the landscaping that is existing is driving up the impervious improved lot coverage. They are receiving a slight overage of the maximum 35%.

Mr. Callahan said he would walk through the floor plans. Exhibit A1 is the site diagram and zoning information and breakdown of lot coverages. Exhibit A2 is the first floor plan on 1/4" scale - currently when you come in there are stairs in front of you and a family room to the right (at one point this was the garage). They are proposing to raise the floor to make it flush so they can have a bedroom for Mr. Meehan and an accessible bathroom in the back. They are trying with the new addition to create a new kitchen in line with today's standards. There is also a small powder room that would be removed. Exhibit A3 is a second floor plan that shows a slight addition of 185 square feet for the expansion of an existing bedroom and some closet space. Exhibits A4 & A5 depict the exterior elevations. They are trying to give it some esthetic appeal from the street, and give it a covered porch to project from ice and any ice buildup, while at the same time, trying to connect, at the first floor level, a walkway from the front porch to the deck where Mr. Meehan spends a lot of his time. As a note, part of this is to allow Mr. Meehan to stay in his home, and allow Mr. & Mrs. Monopoli to stay in the home as well. Mr. Meehan has been in the house for 48 years and they are hoping that these improvements can allow for him to stay.

Chair Chusid asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Black said that it was mentioned that the deck in the back has no stairway going down so if there was an emergency would they have to go through the house. Mr. Callahan said yes, they would have to go through the house. Mr. Black asked if there was anything in the basement that opens up, and Mr. Callahan said yes there was on the bottom level.

Mr. Nyman asked if they allow parking under the deck – they will need protection so don't take the deck down, that's a support structure. Mr. Nyman also asked with the bumping out of the kitchen does it impinge on the neighbors. Catherine Monopoli said that the neighbor on that side, where the kitchen will be expanded, gave his OK to everything and thinks he may do the same.

Chair Chusid opened meeting to public, there are no members of the public, so meeting was closed.

Chair Chusid asked if any Board Members had any questions or comments. No one did.

Motion by Mr. Nyman as proposed, second by Gary Esposito.

All in favor 5-0

Chair Chusid informed them not to start until after the application was memorialized.

**Re-Memorialization of amended plans - VanderVoort – Application #2016-10
247 Voorhis Avenue
707/8 Bulk variance needed for:
Impervious Coverage and Setback due to in-ground pool.**

Approval of a Re-Memorialization that the attorney has prepared. Zoning Official Mark Skerbetz reviewed the amended plans and approved them. Applicant moved hot tub to be in compliance with the statute.

Motion by Mr. Black, second by Gary Esposito as amended.

All in favor 5-0

Old Business

Approval of Minutes of May 11, 2016 – Motion by Ron Black, second by Gary Esposito

All in favor 5-0

Approval of Minutes February 8, 2017 – Motion by Robert Nyman, second by Gary Esposito

All in favor 3-0 (Mr. Black & Mr. Gioffre were not at this meeting)

Mr. Nyman mentioned he had a draft of Standard Operating Procedures. A year ago Mayor Mignone gave Chair Chusid a copy of Fort Lee's Standard Operating Procedures. Chair Chusid made some revisions and then gave to Mr. Nyman for his revisions. Some are editorial some are not. Chair Chusid said she will pass them around to the entire Board for their review.

Mr. Black asked how much longer do we have.

Chair Chusid said she did not know, but that things are to remain business as usual and that there are certain things that Zoning can't do and she wasn't sure who could do what.

Mr. Black stated that he was at the last Mayor and Council meeting and it came up to a vote and that the first round of voting came up yes. So the only question would be how long before Zoning is debunked and Planning Board takes over the responsibilities of Zoning.

Chair Chusid stated she didn't think that was the intention, it was to combine the Boards. She said she knows there are at least two (2) members who can't vote on D variances. She said business should continue as usual and if and when Zoning is debunked they will all go out for a celebratory drink. She also stated that that's the model they use in Fort Lee where the Mayor works. Mr. Black said a lot of towns use that model.

Motion by Gary Esposito to adjourn the meeting.

All in favor 5-0

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:38 PM by Chair Eileen Chusid.

Motion by Vice Chair Gary Esposito.

All in favor 5-0

Minutes submitted by: Carol Byrne

Approved on: Wednesday, May 10, 2017