

**ORADELL PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 3rd, 2021**

Notice of this meeting was published in official newspapers, prominently posted in Town Hall and filed with the Borough Clerk in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act

ROLL CALL

Mr. Larson Present
Mr. Derian Present
Mr. Scalcione Absent
Mr. Carnevale Present
Mrs. Didio Present
Mr. Baumann Present
Mr. Tankard Present
Mr. Dressel Absent
Mr. Plucinski Present
Mr. Cohen Present
Mr. Kang Absent

Also Present:

Mr. Depken, Construction Official
Mr. Atkinson, Board Engineer
Mr. King, Esq., Board Attorney
Ms. Boland, Covering Board Engineer
Mr. Dickerson, Covering Board Planner

Approval of Planning Board Meeting Minutes:

February 2, 2021, Minutes of Regular Meeting

Motion to approve the March minutes was made by Mr. Larson, seconded by Mr. Carnevale
All in favor.

April 6, 2021, Minutes of Regular Meeting

Motion to approve the March minutes was made by Mr. Larson, seconded by Mayor Didio
All in favor.

May 4, 2021, Minutes of Regular Meeting

Minutes required correction and will be reevaluated for approval at the following meeting.

Correspondence:

6/9/2021 – Review letter from Eileen Boland, P.E., Boswell Engineering, fill-in for Borough Engineer regarding Application in connection with Site Plan CAL# 157-21 for 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11.

6/9/2021 – Email sent to Stephen A. Depken, Land Use Administrator from R. Scott King, Board Attorney regarding Site Plan CAL# 157- for 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 6/9/2021 – Letter to Kevin P. Kelly, Esq. from R. Scott King, Esq., Planning Board Attorney,

regarding Site Plan CAL# 157-21 for 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11
6/22/2021 – Signed contract for Darlene A. Green, P.P., AICP, Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc. for 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC – CAL# 157-21
6/28/2021 – Revised letter from Neglia Engineering Associates in connection with CAL# S-18-21 for 906 Lotus Avenue, Block 607, Lot 8
7/7/2021 – Letter prepared by Darlene A. Green, P.P., AICP, of Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc. in connection with 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11
7/14/2021 – Letter from Neglia Engineering Associates regarding Soil Moving CAL# S-121-21 for 946 Amaryllis Avenue, Block 607, Lot 13.01
Plot Plan & Soil Erosion Control Plan prepared by Azzolina & Feury Engineering Inc. last dated March 23, 2021 in connection with Soil Moving CAL# S-121-21 for 946 Amaryllis Avenue, Block 607, Lot 13.01
Architectural Plan prepared by Albert Dattoli Architect last dated March 22, 2021 connection with Soil Moving CAL# S-121-21 for 946 Amaryllis Avenue, Block 607, Lot 13.01
Site Plan prepared by Omland & Osterkorn Consulting Engineers & Surveyors last dated July 21, 2021 in connection with 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11
Architectural drawings prepared by Canzani Architects last dated July 22, 2021 in connection with 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11
7/23/2021 – Response letter prepared by Kiersten Osterkorn, PE, PLS, PP, of Omland & Osterkorn Consulting Engineers & Surveyors in connection with 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11
7/28/2021 – Updated letter prepared by Darlene A. Green, P.P., AICP, of Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc. in connection with 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11
7/29/2021 – Updated letter prepared by Eileen Boland, P.E., Boswell Engineering in connection with 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11
7/30/2021 – Letter prepared by Kevin P. Kelly, Esq. providing property survey in connection with 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC, Block 406, Lot 11

Committee Reports:

Subdivision, Site Drainage & Soil Moving

Resolutions:

CAL# S120–21 – Soil Moving – Roger Tashjian 545 Birchtree Lane, Block 601, Lot 48.01

Mr. Larson motioned to approve CAL# S120–21 which was seconded by Mr. Cohen.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Baumann, Mr. Plucinski, Mr. Derian, Mr. Larson

APPROVED

Applications:

CAL# S121–21 – Soil Moving – Ron Fermano 946 Amaryllis Avenue, Block 607, Lot 13.01

Mr. Fermano was sworn in by Mr. King. Mr. Fermano stated that 946 Amaryllis Avenue will be the second home being built from the subdivision of 939 Amaryllis Avenue done 8 years ago. Mr. Fermano noted that there will be tree removal but ensured that there will be mitigation measures for the removed trees. Mr. Fermano stated that the proposed structure will be a single-family home with a pool at about 4,000 square feet. Mr. Atkinson asked Mr. Fermano if there were any items within the July 14, 2021 review letter from Neglia Engineering that he felt he could not address, Mr. Fermano responded no. Mr. Atkinson stated that the applicant has accounted for the increase

in impervious coverage on the property and the calculations were found to be acceptable. Mr. Atkinson noted that the applicant was proposing to remove 8 trees and planned to replace same. Mr. King asked Mr. Fermano to confirm that he agrees to comply with all of the conditions of the July 14, 2021 letter prepared by Neglia Engineering, to which he confirmed. Mr. Atkinson noted that there is a typographical error in the July 14, 2021 review letter as the total impervious coverage should be 4,668 square feet.

Mr. Carnevale motioned to approve CAL# S121-21 subject to all of the conditions and obligations outlined in the July 14, 2021 review letter from Neglia Engineering which was seconded by Mr. Larson.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Baumann, Mr. Tankard, Mr. Plucinski, Mayor Didio, Mr. Carnevale, Mr. Derian, Mr. Mr. Larson

APPROVED

Business Buildings & Signage

Applications:

CAL# 157-21 – Site Plan – 387-393 Kinderkamack Property LLC – 387-393 Kinderkamack Road, Block 406, Lot 11

Mr. King reminded the Board that Mayor Didio recused herself from the application. Mr. King swore in Mr. Spink of Canzani Associates Architects. Mr. Larson asked that Mr. Kelly provide an overview of the application. Mr. Kelly stated that the site is located in the B1 zone and the building used to house Panico Salon. Mr. Kelly added that the applicant is seeking permission to improve the building and convert the second floor of the building to 5 residential units. Mr. Kelly emphasized that the building is existing and that the client does not intend to significantly alter the building footprint. Mr. Kelly stated that he will call on Mr. Spink to discuss the architectural details of the site and Ms. Osterkorn to discuss the engineering aspects of the site. Mr. Kelly added that he received confirmation indicating that the public notices were in order and marked the newspaper publication and mailings as Exhibit A-1, the architectural drawings prepared by Canzani Architects last dated July 22, 2021 were marked as Exhibit A-2, the Site Plan drawings prepared by Omland & Osterkorn Consulting Engineers & Surveyors last dated July 21, 2021 were marked Exhibit A-3, the architectural renderings provided by Mr. Spink dated July 22, 2021 were marked Exhibit A-4a and A-4b, the property survey was marked as Exhibit A-5, and the deed indicating the driveway easement for the property was marked Exhibit A-6.

Mr. King asked that Mr. Spink provide his professional and educational background. Mr. Spink stated that he is a licensed architect in the state of New Jersey, has worked for Canzani Associates Architects for 26 years, and graduated the New Jersey Institute of Technology with a bachelor's degree of architecture. Mr. King asked Mr. Spink if he had ever appeared before the Planning Board. Mr. Spink replied that he has not appeared before the Planning Board but has appeared multiple times in Oradell. Mr. King asked Mr. Spink to confirm that his license is current to which he confirmed. Mr. Larson stated that Mr. Spink's qualifications are acceptable. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to confirm he was retained by the applicant in connection with the project to which he confirmed. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to describe what he did in anticipation of preparing the plans. Mr. Spink stated that he analyzed the existing building, the surrounding neighborhood, as well as old photographs of the building prior to its renovation. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to confirm that he prepared the architectural drawings last dated July 22, 2021 to which he confirmed. Mr. Spink shared his screen to display the first-floor plans of the architectural drawings. Mr. Spink

described that the applicant is looking to remove walls on the first floor, and open up large windows to create an aesthetically pleasing façade. Mr. Spink added in the northwest corner there will be an entrance to the second-floor residential units, a lobby with a small mail area, elevator access, and a main stairway. Mr. Spink stated that along the front of the building facing Kinderkamack Road there will be a secondary stairway to be used for emergencies and to provide access to the basement. Mr. Spink noted that there is a stairway at the rear of the existing building which provides access to the basement along with an exterior metal stairway that extends to the second floor to a fire escape that will be removed. Mr. Spink moved on to display the second-floor drawing of the architectural plans. He emphasized that the main stairway and elevator access will be found in the northwest corner of the building and that there will be a hallway connecting the northwest corner to the secondary stairway toward the front of the building. Mr. Spink stated that the applicant is looking to install two studio apartments along the back of the building, two 1-bedroom apartments along the front of the building and on the side facing Oradell Avenue, and one 2-bedroom apartment on the corner of the building. Mr. Spink noted that all of the apartments will be handicap adaptable. Mr. Spink moved on to the next page which detailed the front elevation of the building. Mr. Spink discussed some of the proposed design aspects of the façade such as the large windows, awnings, and decorative cornices along the top of the building. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to confirm that the building will remain within the height standards of the Borough. Mr. Spink confirmed that the building will be approximately 31 feet high measured from the lowest grade and the maximum height allowed is 35 feet. Mr. Spink moved on to display the rear elevation and indicated that same was designed to be consistent with the front façade of the building. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink if he believes the applicant is making a significant investment in the building. Mr. Spink replied that it will be a significant investment and Mr. Kelly asked that he present the architectural rendering to confirm same. Mr. Spink displayed the first rendering where the perspective is from standing in Kinderkamack Road looking up Oradell Avenue and emphasized the aesthetically pleasing features of the proposed design. Mr. Spink moved on to display the second rendering from the perspective of looking south on the corner where Oradell Avenue and Kinderkamack Road intersect. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink if there will be any other increases to the measurements of the building other than the updated brick façade. Mr. Spink stated that there would be 818 square feet added to the first floor which does not change the building's existing foot print. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to describe the existing conditions of the rear portion of the building. Mr. Spink stated there is an existing stucco that is not aesthetically pleasing and in poor condition. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to confirm that the rear of the building will be clean and revitalized to which he confirmed. Mr. Kelly asked where the mechanicals of the building will be located, Mr. Spink responded that there will be air handlers installed in each space and utilized screen share to display the architectural drawing of the second floor. Mr. Spink added that for each apartment on the second floor there will be an air handler placed within a utility closet, and for the first-floor air handlers will be installed in the ceiling or in the basement. Mr. Spink noted that on the roof there will be standard size compressors to accommodate the residential units. Mr. Plucinski asked Mr. Spink to clarify which of the units will be for affordable housing. Mr. Kelly replied that the determination has not been made yet but the applicant will coordinate with Fair Share Housing. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to address the questions raised in the July 28, 2021 updated letter prepared by Darlene A. Green, P.P., AICP, of Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc. Mr. Spink stated that he only had the original letter dated July 7, 2021 and addressed the questions and comments raised within same. Mr. Kelly stated that a proposed tenant of the downstairs space is an Urgent Care facility with approximately 10 employees which is a permitted use within the

zone. Mr. King asked if the proposed tenant will be taking the entirety of the first floor to which Mr. Kelly responded no. Mr. King asked if the 10 parking spaces for employees applies for the entirety of the first floor. Mr. Kelly replied that parking is not finalized but the applicant is working to narrow down a proposed tenant. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to go over the conditions of the basement. Mr. Spink stated that there is currently a sprinkler system within the basement and the fire stairs and elevator will extend to the basement. Mr. Spink noted that an area of the basement will function as a tenant storage area. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink if the building will be fully equipped with sprinklers, Mr. Spink responded that based on the size of the building it would need to be fully sprinkled. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Spink to confirm the building will comply with all applicable fire codes to which he confirmed.

Mr. King swore in Ms. Osterkorn of Omland & Osterkorn Consulting Engineers & Surveyors. Mr. Kelly asked that Ms. Osterkorn provide a brief summary of her educational and professional background. Ms. Osterkorn stated that she received her bachelor's degree in engineering from Rutgers University in 2006, license from the State of New Jersey as a professional engineer in 2011, and planning license in 2015 which are all in good standing in the State of New Jersey. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn if her license has ever been revoked to which she responded no. Mr. Kelly offered Ms. Osterkorn as an expert in engineering and planning, Mr. Larson confirmed that her expertise is accepted by the Board. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn what she did in connection with preparing plans for the project. Ms. Osterkorn replied that she coordinated with the building owner and the architect as well as performed a site inspection of the existing building. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn if she feels a topography assessment and drainage calculations are necessary for the site to which she responded no since the building is existing. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn to confirm that she prepared drawings in connection with the project marked Exhibit A-3 to which she confirmed. Mr. Kelly asked that Ms. Osterkorn describe what is being proposed for the Board. Ms. Osterkorn shared her screen to display sheet 2 of 3 of Exhibit A-3 and explained the zoning data table on the page along with the zone requirements. Ms. Osterkorn noted that there is an easement in the rear of the property and that the dumpster in the rear can be accessed from the common access drive. She added that pick up would be arranged for the dumpsters as frequently as necessary. Ms. Osterkorn addressed the question raised by Ms. Boland regarding sewer demand by stating that 1266 gallons per day does not trigger the need for a TWA permit and the drainage will remain the same. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn to go over the current parking conditions and the requirements for the site in the event the application is approved. Ms. Osterkorn replied that a parking analysis was conducted in connection with the residential units together with the retail space and its employees which rendered a requirement of 38 parking spaces. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn if she was familiar with the Borough Ordinance which details the requirements for employees to which she responded yes. Mr. Kelly asked how one would address the one space per employee requirement if the use has not yet been determined. Ms. Osterkorn stated that based on discussions with the owner he provided estimates of how many employees and spaces would be necessary and the higher estimate was utilized in calculations. Ms. Osterkorn added that it will provide substantially more parking for employees than former Panico which also had a high turnover of customers. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn to provide her opinion on the application from a planning perspective. Ms. Osterkorn stated that the proposed mixed use would bring the site closer to conformity which is a goal of the Municipal Land Use Law based on the fact that turn over will decrease and the affordable housing component meets an unmet need in the Borough. Ms. Osterkorn noted that non-conforming conditions are existing and the brick façade will add to overall building coverage for the purposes of aesthetics. Mr. Kelly asked if aesthetics can be

considered positive criteria when analyzing a C2 Variance to which she responded yes. Ms. Osterkorn summarized by stating that the increase in coverage will allow for improved aesthetics, the parking requirement will be reduced, and the addition of affordable housing units outweigh any substantial detriment to the zone or zone plan. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn if it would be fair to say that the variances for the property are existing and the detriment has been adequately addressed on site to which Ms. Osterkorn replied yes. Ms. Osterkorn briefly discussed how she addressed the comments raised in Ms. Boland's and Ms. Green's review letters. Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Osterkorn to confirm that the plans will be reviewed by the Bergen County Planning Board to which she confirmed. Mr. Carnevale asked that Mr. Kelly coordinate with the code official regarding the distribution requirements for affordable housing since there is an ordinance in connection with same. Mr. Kelly stated that he has no further questions for Ms. Osterkorn and Mr. Larson stated that the Board professionals will provide testimony.

Ms. Boland of Boswell Engineering requested clarification regarding the size of the dumpster and if it will meet the needs of the entire building. Ms. Osterkorn replied that the current dumpster area is 6 feet by 8 feet surrounded by a chain link fence. Ms. Osterkorn added a typical 2-yard dumpster is 6 feet long with a 3-foot width and height and stated that 2 dumpsters would be able to fit within the area. Ms. Osterkorn stated that there have not been prior issues with the dumpster even with the turnover of former Panico and imagined the salon would produce more garbage than a residence. Mr. Kelly stated that his client is making a significant investment in this building and they would not diminish the investment by not coordinating for regular garbage pickups. Mr. Kelly added that the applicant would be amenable to removing one of the two existing parking spaces in the rear of the property to provide a larger area for garbage and recycling. Mr. Kelly also confirmed that in the event Urgent Care becomes the tenant on the first floor they will handle their medical waste separately. Ms. Boland stated that she recommends that the chain link fence enclosure be gated so it can be closed off. Ms. Boland asked if the applicant has looked into adding additional street trees as there is only one existing tree. Ms. Osterkorn said this was not considered and Ms. Boland deferred the topic to the Board. Mr. Kelly interjected stating that his client feels that plantings in the front of the building would take away from the façade. Mr. Kelly added that there is no greenspace since the building is along the sidewalk but the Borough has some planters outside. Ms. Boland confirmed that she has no further questions and that the items in her review letter have been addressed adequately.

Mr. Dickerson of Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc. stated he will go through the July 28, 2021 letter and emphasize items that needed clarification. Mr. Dickerson asked if there will be any changes to the existing driveway easement given that the building is changing. Mr. Kelly stated that the applicant is the beneficiary of the easement and is unsure of how any adjustments could be made. Mr. Kelly referenced the language of the driveway easement document and Mr. King interjected stating that the easement goes from the property line nearest Oradell Avenue to the back of the property stretching 91.2 feet. Mr. Dickerson asked how the addition of the brick for the façade will impact the setback measurements for the two street frontages. Mr. Spink stated that along Oradell Avenue and Kinderkamack Road the building will extend an additional 4 inches due to the brick. Mr. Dickerson stated that he believes the front yard setback is based on the prevailing of neighboring buildings and asked if the adjustment to the façade will result in front yard setback variances. Mr. Spink stated that with the existing building everything is measured to the brick façade at street level, but there are projections outward 4 inches as the building height increases. Mr. Spink stated the brick façade is not intended to add square footage or increase the size of the

building; it functions to add an architectural element. Mr. Kelly stated that the inches added to the façade are de minimis and that the existing variance has been advertised. Mr. Dickerson asked what the measurement is for the height of the elevator shaft as it projects out of the building. Mr. Spink responded that he does not have the exact height but it is less than the height of the overall front façade. Mr. Dickerson asked Mr. Spink to confirm what the overall height will be to which he responded 30 feet and 1 and 1 quarter inch measured at the deepest grade where the Borough typically measures to an average grade. Mr. Dickerson asked where future residents will be parking being that they can not park on site. Mr. Kelly responded stating that the parking will be accommodated by availability within the area since there is a public lot behind the building and there is on street parking. Mr. Larson stated that parking will be discussed with further questioning from the Board but acknowledged that the gross number of necessary parking availability will be reduced with the new use. Mr. Kelly stated that the residential use will be small and the municipal lot available for residents at night will not be impacted the way that it was during the day for Panico. Mr. Dickerson asked a question regarding the functionality of the existing parking spaces in the rear of the property at 8.8 feet in width. Ms. Osterkorn stated that a typical space is supposed to be 9 by 18 feet and that she does not feel the 8.8 width dramatically impacts the functionality of the space and added that there will not be a high turnover. Ms. Osterkorn stated that any overhang of the length of the car while in the parking space will fall into the driveway easement area. Mr. Kelly stated that the spaces are existing but noted that the client would be amenable to removing the spaces to allow for more dumpster space. Mr. Dickerson asked for confirmation that the two spaces are not intended for any specific user at this time to which Mr. Kelly and Ms. Osterkorn confirmed. Mr. Dickerson asked if the applicant will comply with the lighting specifications under the ordinance to which Mr. Kelly responded yes.

Mr. Depken asked Mr. Spink what the depth of the building is on the corner of Kinderkamack Road and Oradell Avenue. Mr. Spink stated that the building will be pulled out 4 inches total and the shadow line in the rendering gives a deeper appearance. Mr. Depken asked if the driveway to the spaces in the rear of the property will be blocked or if tenants can utilize same. Mr. Kelly stated the applicant can not block the easement. Mr. King stated that the driveway is owned by the adjoining property owner and the easement gives the applicant the right to access the driveway so they can utilize the two parking spaces and dumpster area. Mr. Kelly remarked that the driveway essentially is not considered part of the property but the applicant has the right to access it.

Mr. Carnevale stated that the Board will have to form an opinion regarding Ms. Boland's earlier comment on the dumpster area. Mr. Larson stated that the decision is whether or not to keep the two spaces or remove the spaces and expand the garbage and recycling capacity. Mr. Derian stated that the removal of the metal staircase at the rear of the property will allow for more space for either expanding the spaces or the dumpster area. Mr. Kelly stated the applicant will be amenable to whatever the Board sees as the best option. Mr. Derian asked for clarification on how the calculation of Panico utilizing 56 parking spaces was conducted. Mr. Kelly stated that the calculations were a result of doubling the square footage of the first floor and the requirement for the new residential units resulted in less necessary spaces since it is dependent on the number of bedrooms rather than square footage. Mr. Larson asked if any members of the Board could speak on the permissibility of tenants parking in the municipal lot directly behind the building overnight. Mr. Depken stated that the residents would have to obtain a parking permit from the police department. Mr. Carnevale stated that Mr. Depken is correct since there are other apartments on

the second floor along Oradell Avenue and those residents apply for a special permit. Mr. Larson asked if the low voltage lighting would be on a timer and have the capability to be dimmed. Ms. Osterkorn said it is possible to have the lighting on a timer. Mr. Kelly agreed with Ms. Osterkorn and confirmed to Mr. Larson that the applicant is willing to cooperate with the suggestions of the Board. Mr. Larson asked Mr. Spink how close the corner of the building is to the corner of the curbing to which Mr. Spink responded 4 inches. Regarding Mr. Carnevale's earlier comment, Mr. Larson stated that it does not appear that there have been any issues with garbage at the existing building and that the Board could allow the applicant to proceed in the manner in which they have been operating with respect to garbage. Mr. Derian asked if it would be the responsibility of the property owner or each individual tenant to obtain their overnight parking permit. Mr. Kelly stated that the requirement of the property owner obtaining permits for others is not under the jurisdiction of the Board and countered by stating that the use is permitted. Mr. Kelly added that it is not guaranteed that all residents will have a vehicle. Mr. Tankard asked what the hours of Urgent Care will be if they become the first-floor tenant. Mr. Kelly responded that the Urgent Care will likely operate from 7:00 A.M to 12:00 A.M. Regarding parking, Mr. Carnevale addressed Mr. Derian and stated applying for an overnight parking permit is a straight forward process as there are other apartments in Oradell that do not provide parking associated with the building. Mr. Baumann asked if there will be a pickup drop off area for Urgent Care. Mr. Kelly stated that he is unaware of any services at this time and that the facility likely does not have the ability to have a drop off location along a county road. Mr. Derian noted there is a striped zone along the southerly end of the building where one could park in an emergency.

Mr. Larson opened the meeting for public comment.

Motion to close the meeting to public comment was made by Mr. Larson and seconded by Mr. Carnevale, all in favor.

Mr. Larson asked that Mr. King read the conditions of approval for the benefit of the Board. Mr. King stated that rooftop mechanicals must not be visible from the street, the applicant will comply with municipal ordinances regarding the use of a residential unit for affordable housing, the applicant will comply with what ever sewer requirements there may be based upon comments from the municipal engineer, the applicant will comply with the ordinance regarding the placement of dumpsters, and the applicant will install a screening gate for the dumpster area. Mr. King stated that 5 waivers have been requested which include the topographic contours on the plans, the existing and proposed drainage calculations, the existing and proposed lighting, landscaping, and an environmental impact statement. Mr. King went on to note the applicable variances which include a variance for parking, a variance for building coverage, and raised the question of if a variance for setbacks would also need to be granted. Mr. King stated that the extension of the façade is de minimis and does not feel a variance would be necessary for that. Mr. Larson motioned to approve site plan CAL# 157-21 with all conditions, waiver requests, and variances previously stated by Mr. King which was seconded by Mr. Carnevale.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Baumann, Mr. Tankard, Mr. Plucinski, Mr. Carnevale, Mr. Derian, Mr. Larson

APPROVED

Signage Review

Auradell Mindfulness Meditation – 625 Oradell Avenue, Block 1201, Lot 2

Mr. Tankard stated that copies of the application were submitted via email but he does not believe other members of the committee have had the chance to review same. Mr. Larson asked if the sign committee will address the approval of the signage in due course to which Mr. Tankard responded yes.

Regional Planning Coordination

Mayor Didio referenced an article in the Bergen County Record which misquoted a neighboring Mayor regarding the rehabilitation of the New Jersey Transit site on Marginal Road. Mayor Didio stated that she had a call last week with New Jersey Transit and received clarification. She stated that the article was really referring to the construction of a new northern bus garage in Ridgefield Park and when that large project is completed New Jersey Transit will work to rehabilitate some of the older garages such as the garage on Marginal Road.

Zoning

None

Master Plan, Open Space, Environmental & Circulation Systems

None

Historical Preservation

None

Old Business

None

New Business

Mr. Larson stated that regular meetings will continue to be remote until further notice.

Open to Public

Motion to close the meeting to public comment was made by Mr. Larson and seconded by Mr. Cohen, all in favor.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Larson and seconded by Mayor Didio, all in favor.