

**Ridgefield Park Planning Board
234 Main Street
Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660**

February 6, 2012

Regular Meeting

Meeting called to order at 8:05 pm.

Chairman announced that adequate notice of this was provided by advertising in the Record, and posting a copy on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building and notifying the Village Clerk.

Roll Call:

- Present: Mr. Rosen, Mr. Landolfi, Ms. Kowalchuk, Mr. Quinn, Mr. O'Grady, Ms. Perrotta and Commissioner Anlian
Absent: Commissioner MacNeill, Mr. Cummings, Ms. Borkowski, Mr. Garofalow

Acceptance of Minutes: Due to the unexpected illness of the Planning Board Clerk, minutes from last meeting were unavailable to be approved and will be handled at a future meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS AND BILLS:

- The Chairman announced that the following correspondence had been received since the last meeting:
 1. NJ Planner – December 2011 issue
 2. ANJEC brochure re: 2012 Sustainable Land Use Planning Grants
 3. Memo from NJ Department of State, re: 2012 campaign contribution notice
 4. Block 49.01/Lot 1 – 300 Bergen Tpke: Approval by NJ Natural Resources Conservation Program of Skymark Predevelopment Phase
- The Chairman announced that there was one voucher to be approved for payment in the amount of \$775.00, submitted by Board Attorney, N. Patrick Quirk, for services to the Board in January 2012. Motion to approve by Mr. Rosen, seconded by Ms. Perrotta, all in favor.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES:

Site Plan Application – Block 103/Lot 2 – 93 Main Street (Binetti)

- Board attorney confirmed that documentation submitted by applicant showed property owners had been properly served and affidavit was submitted indicating meeting was properly noticed in Record Newspaper. The Board acknowledged receipt of certification of taxes paid, as well.
- Chairman read into the record the Zoning Officer's denial letter.
- The applicant, John Binetti, Esq., came forward. He explained that he, his wife and son recently purchased the subject property, which is a two-family dwelling, and that his son lives there with his wife and child on the second floor. They are seeking a tenant for the first floor. They are seeking approval to be allowed to park a car on the crushed gravel area

highlighted in yellow on the survey attached to the application. Mr. Binetti noted that parking is not allowed on that part of Main Street and this property is very close to a bad intersection. Right now, there is single file parking in the driveway and if the owner were to allow a tenant to park in the driveway as well, there would be a considerable amount of shuffling of cars, backing out into Main Street. The second parking spot on the gravel would be for the tenant and would lessen the danger of cars pulling in and out of the driveway, since there is no traffic light at the intersection and it can be difficult to back out into the constant traffic.

- The Board (Ms. Perrotta) questioned why that area was already gravel. Why was it not grass? Mr. Binetti indicated that after buying the property, they had to replace the water line. That area was dug up, and after the pipe was repaired he elected to put down gravel instead of grass. He pointed out that the stone is a porous surface, like grass, so there is no problem with water runoff. He also pointed out that the property has a pre-existing very wide curb cut that extends across the driveway and in front of this new gravel area.
- The Board (Mr. Landolfi) stated that the applicant should supply a more recent survey, as the one included with the application does not reflect reality. Mr. Landolfi asserted that the supplied survey does not accurately reflect the property's fencing and the amount of paving in the back of the property.
- The Chairman asked Mr. Landolfi why this application was sent to the Planning Board. He indicated that it was due to exceeding the allowable impervious coverage and for increasing the size of the driveway. The Chairman noted that the Clerk to the Board had asked the applicant to fill in the zoning chart on page two of the application, but the applicant did not do it.
- The Board (Ms. Perrotta) expressed her feeling that it changes the character of the neighborhood when cars are allowed to be parked in front of a house. Another parking spot with a vehicle on it, in addition to a driveway, vastly changes the look of the area.
- The case was closed.
- The case was opened to comments from the public in attendance. Within 200' – no one appeared. Outside of 200' – no one appeared.
- The Board discussed the case:
 1. John Anlian had no problem with it, especially since wide curb cut is already there.
 2. Steve Quinn questioned the width of the total parking pad. It was determined to be 14 feet at the curb. It was discussed that if two cars were parked side by side, there was not enough room to open the doors.
 3. Cheryl Perrotta felt that approving this would be a significant precedent, and that other properties in the area would seek approval to do the same thing.
 4. John Anlian suggested a buffer of shrubs to reduce the visual impact of a car parked in front of the structure. In response to this suggestion, Mr. Binetti indicated they would be willing put in any landscaping the Board wanted.
 5. Ms. Perrotta reiterated her feeling that allowing this would increase the urban feeling of the area, and did the Board want to sacrifice trees and grass for added convenience for the tenant.
- A motion to approve the application was made by John Anlian, on condition that shrubbery with a minimum height of 4 feet be required as a buffer to hide the car.
- The motion was seconded by Alan O'grady.
 - In favor: Commissioner Anlian, Mr. Landolfi, Mr. O'Grady
 - Against: Mr. Rosen, Ms. Kowalchuk, Mr. Quinn, Ms. Perrotta
- Application denied.

New Application reviewed for completeness: Block 114/Lot 1.02 – 113 Hobart Street

- Applicant seeks to build a deck and patio.
- Letter from Zoning Officer just says it has to go to the Planning Board because it is a two-family dwelling
- There are no details in the Zoning Officer's letter regarding potential variances needed for coverage or setbacks.
- The Chairman will draft a letter to the applicant advising her that the chart on page two of the application must be completely filled out, and that the architect of the plans must sign the application. If the applicant can get the revised application to the Board by Feb. 13, the case can be heard at the March 5, 2012 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS: – None

OLD BUSINESS: – None

The Chairman made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Anlian – all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Quinn