

RIDGEFIELD PARK PLANNING BOARD
234 Main Street
Ridgefield Park, New Jersey 07660

December 5, 2011

Regular Meeting

Meeting called to order 8:11 p.m.

Mr. Rosen stated that adequate notice of this meeting was provided by advertising in the Record, posting said notice on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building, and notifying the Village Clerk.

Roll Call: Present - Messrs. Rosen, Anlian, Mac Neill, O'Grady,
Cummings, Ms. Kowalchuk, Ms. Perrotta and Ms. Borkowski
Absent - Messrs. Quinn and Landolfi, Garofalow

Mr. Rosen moved the minutes of the November 7 meeting be approved. Seconded by Perrotta.

Roll Call: Rosen, Anlian, Kowalchuk, Perrotta

COMMUNICATION AND BILLS:

- *Memo from Francine Orovitz to Debbie Fehre RE: Planning Board Re-Appointments
- *Zoning Board of Adjustment Application Case #1473 135 Gordon Street Block 27/Lot 9
- *Mayors Advisory – RE: Legislative Recap for November 21
- *Mayors Advisory – RE: The League has launched a new and improved website.
- *Deadline and delivery dates for the Village Newsletter for 2012
- *State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection RE: Remedial Action Soil Permit; United Rentals Inc. 222 Bergen Turnpike November 7, 2011.

Mr. Rosen moved payment of the voucher from Quirk and Gallagher in the amount of \$762.00. Seconded by Borkowski.

Roll Call: MacNeill, Anlian, Rosen, O'Grady, Cummings, Kowalchuk, Borkowski, Perrotta

Mr. Rosen moved payment of the voucher from NJPO for 2012 Annual Dues in the amount of \$360.00. Seconded by Cummings.

Roll Call: MacNeill, Anlian, Rosen, O'Grady, Cummings, Kowalchuk, Borkowski, Perrotta

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES:

**17 SEVENTH STREET, Block 33/Lot 6, R-2 Zone, Mrs. Aida Awad –
Site Plan Application**

Mr. Rosen stated this application was received in September and that proper noticing was served and advertising was done. The hearing was continued to October, November and to December because not enough members were present at the previous meetings.

The following correspondence has been received.

-Letter from the Village Tax Assessor stating Taxes on the property have been paid to date.

-Letter from Mrs. Awad regarding her reasons for the driveway to remain.

This application stems from a March 1, 2006 case in which the Planning Board approved the conversion of a one family to a two family house with the condition that the existing free standing garage and driveway be removed. This is now considered a new application for the driveway to remain, including variances for two curb cuts on the same property and lot coverage. The garage has been removed and now Mrs. Awad is requesting that the driveway be allowed to remain. At the time of the original application, there were no variances required for two curb cuts on the same property and for lot coverage.

Ms. Perrotta asked for clarification of the application. Mr. Rosen explained the original application was to convert a one family to a two family, with a new garage and to remove the existing garage and driveway. The new garage is a two car garage. At that time there were no variances required for lot coverage or a second curb cut. In order to keep the driveway, we will have to grant the applicant variances for the second curb cut and lot coverage, since the driveway has not been removed.

Mrs. Awad was sworn in. Aida Awad, 17 Seventh Street, Ridgefield Park, NJ

Mrs. Awad presented that the design of the new addition is a duplex and the new garage is built in. The entrance of the old unit is away from the new unit. The appraisal lists it as a duplex by design. It is a two family but a duplex. The entrances are separate. The new garage is inconvenient for those visiting to park.

Mr. Rosen stated the plans were approved as is.

Mrs. Awad stated after they received the Certificate of Occupancy she received a letter about 6 months later stating she had to remove the garage as per the site plan. She asked Mr. Landolfi to keep the driveway because it is a duplex. Mr. Landolfi stated if she wanted to keep driveway she had to submit a new application with a statement of why she wanted to keep garage and driveway. This was received in August, 2010. In June, 2011 she received a summons for failure to remove the garage. She went to the Building Dept. and was told she didn't receive her certified mail. She immediately removed the old garage, but not the driveway. She has submitted to the Building Dept. in writing that she removed the garage. She needs the driveway. Seventh Street intersects with Hackensack Ave. and it is very congested by Lincoln School especially in the morning and at 3:00 p.m. It is important to keep driveway. Unit A is rented and they have four cars. The driveway is needed for snow days and for the safety of the children. The town

taxes increased, almost doubled. The existing driveway is there since 1938. There is no other purpose for this area.

Mr. Rosen stated when you were approved for the two family house you provided four off street parking spaces. Two of those spaces were supposed to be for your tenant and two were supposed to be for you. How you and your tenant work out the parking is not a Planning Board issue. The Planning Board allowed you to have two spaces in the garage and two behind the garage. If you do not want to use those spaces and choose to park on the street it is not a Planning Board issue.

Mrs. Awad stated she understands that. If she is parking inside garage and the tenant is outside she is not going to call tenant to move a car. Mrs. Awad has four cars. She has two adult children with their own cars.

Ms. Perrotta asked if she has eight cars at her house. She has four and her tenant has four. Ms. Perrotta asked why would your tenant would have to move their car? The tenant would have one garage spot and you would have one plus the space behind.

Mrs. Awad stated it is two houses with separate entrances.

Ms. Perrotta asked why don't you rent one side to the tenant?

Mrs. Awad takes the garage spots. The tenants are on the driveway the Board wants to remove.

Mr. Anlian asked what is the length of the current driveway?

Mrs. Awad stated it is very long. The garage has been removed.

Mr. Anlian recognizes that you lose a street spot by the second curb cut.

Mr. Rosen asked if anyone has any questions.

Mr. Cummings asked if another curb cut is granted, are we not taking another parking spot away from the block. Yes.

Mr. Rosen and Mr. MacNeill stated that we already took two spots when we granted the new driveway.

Mrs. Awad stated when she went to notice the neighbors asked her to promise that her tenant would not put their truck in front of their house.

Mr. Rosen stated the issue where people park is not a Board issue. If it is a commercial truck it should not be parked on the street.

Meeting opened to anyone within 200' of this application that wishes to be heard. No one from the public appeared.

Anyone outside 200' of this application that wishes to be heard. No one from the public appeared.

Meeting closed to public.

Mr. MacNeill stated the curb cuts were a big point of the original application.

Mr. Rosen stated it was also at the time we were transitioning from 7500 sq ft. to 10000 sq. ft. lot size for a two family home.

Mr. Anlian stated that under the current code this would not be allowed.

Mr. Rosen motioned that the application for the driveway to remain be denied and that it be removed as per the requirement of the original approval. Seconded by Perrotta.

Mr. Anlian asked if anyone wanted to discuss the matter any further. He stated he understands that if it is denied four more cars will be put on the street.

Ms. Kowalchuk stated every property is unique, but we approved the motion in 2007 based on the driveway and garage being removed. The house is twice the size it was. There is no green space on this property.

Mr. Anlian stated there is parking on the side of the property during snow emergencies.

Roll Call:

MacNeill, Anlian, Rosen, O'Grady, Cummings, Kowalchuk, Borkowski, Perrotta

Case has been denied.

Mrs. Awad stated she wants to appeal the decision.. Mrs. Awad was informed that she may appeal in court, and would have 45 days from the date of the Board's Resolution, which will be read at the next meeting in January, 2012, to file the appeal.

Case #1473 - 135 Gordon Street, Block 27/ Lot 9 Variance

This case is going in front of the Zoning Board at the January 17, 2012. The owner is requesting a Variance for a bath on the first floor.

The Planning Board has no objections.

RESOLUTION #2011-12 Village of Ridgefield Park Ordinance No. 2011-12

Mr. Rosen read the Resolution read into the record.

Mr. Rosen motioned it be approved. Seconded by Kowalchuk

Roll Call:

Anlian, Rosen, Kowalchuk, Perrotta

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

Mr. Rosen motioned meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.