

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

October 4, 2021

Regular Meeting

Meeting called to order 7:33 pm.

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. MacNeill, Anlian, Rosen, Quinn, Garofalow, Visioli, Suarez, Ms. Torres and Ms. Schmitt

Absent: Messrs. Landolfi

Mr. Alan Suarez was sworn in as an Alternate Member of the Board.

Mr. Rosen moved to approve the minutes from the September 13, 2021 meeting.  
Seconded by Ms. Torres.

Roll Call: Rosen, Quinn, Garofalow, Torres, Schmitt

**COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** No One appeared.

**COMMUNICATION AND BILLS:**

Mr. Rosen motioned to approve a voucher from Albert Birchwale in the amount of \$500.00 regarding 66 Hazelton Street. Seconded by Mr. Garofalow

Roll Call: MacNeill, Anlian, Rosen, Quinn, Garofalow, Visioli, Torres, Suarez and Schmitt

Mr. Rosen motioned to approve a voucher from Kenneth Ochab Assoc. in the amount of \$6,480.00 regarding 95 Challenger Road. Seconded by Mr. Quinn.

Roll Call: MacNeill, Anlian, Rosen, Quinn, Garofalow, Visioli, Torres, Suarez and Schmitt

**Site Plan**

**95 Challenger Road**

**Block 24.03/Lot 4**

**Continuation from the August 2nd meeting.**

Mr. Reagan addressed the Board.

Mr. Rosen stated everything that has been submitted is what the Board requested at the September 13, 2021 meeting.

Mr. Reagan summarized the application.

No questions from the Board.

Mr. Rosen motioned to deny the application for the following reasons:

The project is too large and too dense. When you consider that there is 28% of the property underwater, using the water area for lot size and density is not appropriate. Some development along the water edge would be acceptable but not 28%. This leads to trying to get the development that should have been planned on 4.6 acres, the overall tract size, to trying to squeeze the development into 3.3 acres.

This results in not having sufficient area to conform to the lot coverage requirement of 30% where 48% is proposed and impervious coverage requirement of 70% where 97% is proposed when considering only the usable area on the size.

There has been no consideration for the conservation easement along the Overpeck Creek as shown on the overall Master Plan for Challenger Road. This easement was to be measured from the existing top of the bank which would require the moving of the rear wall of the proposed building. The intent was to have a pedestrian walkway and passive open space area that is usable and not the bank of the Creek.

Even if there is no specific easement filed, the intent of the Master Plan and the Village was to have this easement established for open space. The intent is clearly shown on the maps and plans filed with the Village. The applicant could have designed the project to provide for the easement area and open space walkway which was intended.

The building should have been moved back and an open space corridor with walkway and sitting areas should have been provided.

The parking design is not sufficient and requires a variance and waiver relief. The tandem spaces are not permitted by our zoning ordinance. Tandem space is a way of getting more parking spaces without conforming to the parking standards of the ordinance. Forty tandem spaces are proposed where twenty spaces would normally be placed. Because tandem spaces are not permitted, a variance is required. This is another example of squeezing too much into the property.

The other non-conformities in the parking design include 9x18 spaces where 9x19 are required, 25 spaces are 8x16 which is not permitted in our zoning ordinance, the parking aisles are 24 feet in width where 25 feet is required. This shows the extent of the over-development.

A project of this size and scope should have the residential parking inside the building. The parking required for the residential units is 310 spaces and only 270 spaces are inside the parking garage. That means that 40 resident vehicles will need to park outside the building. This is unacceptable with a new project and new design particularly along the Overpeck Creek where open space and landscaped areas should prevail over surface parking.

The applicant did not provide a revised plan and did not definitively indicate that the requested fire access lane would be provided to Overpeck Creek. This is directly related to public safety and was stressed by the Board. The Board is concerned that the applicant will let the NJDEP reject the ramp and use that as a means of not constructing it.

Showing it on the plan is a necessary step in the DEP approval process and shows a willingness by the applicant to get the ramp approved and constructed.

The circulation in front of the building does not accommodate two-way traffic. Entering from the north driveway will require circulation through the building in the rear to access the front entrance and retail shops. The Board feels that this design will encourage cheating, where vehicles will go the wrong way along the front of the building. This problem could have been prevented by having a two-way drive in front of the building and moving the building back slightly.

For loading, only one loading space is provided where 3 are required. This may lead to congestion and trucks blocking the access aisles when moving in and out. One loading space provides no space for larger deliveries from UPS or other carriers that cannot be delivered through the front door.

The plan does not provide for a fire lane around the rear of the building. This is essential for public safety and access for fire apparatus. In addition, as presently configured emergency vehicles, fire trucks including ladder trucks would have to back out the full length of the property through the parking lot. The fire lane would also allow circulations for cars around the site without having to maneuver through the garage.

Several of the intersections in the Challenger Road area were determined to be inadequate in terms of levels of service. Yet, no mitigation of the traffic issues was presented by the applicant. No suggested traffic signalization or roadway improvements were provided. This is an impact to the public safety and welfare from the view that the increase in traffic to an already strained roadway system would be addressed. Poor conditions will result at the Challenger Road/Rt. 46 and I95 ramp intersection and the Challenger Road/Emerson Street intersection.

Our attorney has advised the Board that we cannot judge the application based on the impact of school children alone. But the applicant has made no attempt to discuss the impact that the COVID pandemic may have on families staying in place in the rental unit and creating larger families. The issue comes down to providing sufficient on-site facilities for children and the larger issue of getting the children from the isolated location on Challenger Road to the elementary school on Teaneck Road in a safe and efficient manner. We feel it is the applicant's responsibility to address the transportation issues that are the result of this development and not just leave it up to the school board to be burdened by this problem.

No indication was provided as to whether the trash and recycling removal would be by private carrier. It should be so done.

The plans should show where the vehicle electric charging stations will be located.

The proposed trees along the Challenger Road sidewalk should be relocated behind the sidewalk and shown on the plans.

Seconded by Mr. Garofalow.

Roll Call: Anlian – no; Rosen – yes, Quinn – yes; Garofalow – yes; Visioli – yes; Torres – yes; Schmitt – yes.

**Resolution**  
**66 Hazleton Street**  
**Block 25/Lot 10**  
**Renovation and addition to an existing two-family.**

Mr. Rosen polled the members if all have received and read the Resolution. All members have.

Mr. Rosen summarized the Resolution.

Mr. Rosen motioned to approve the Resolution. Seconded by Mr. Garofalow.

Roll Call: Anlian, Rosen, Quinn, Garofalow, Torres, Schmitt.

**OLD BUSINESS** – Ken Ochab’s Report.

Mr. Ochab discussed the Public Arts Plan of the Master Plan. This is the last portion of the Master Plan to be discussed.

**NEW BUSINESS** - None

Mr. Rosen motioned to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Garofalow.

Respectfully submitted,  
Francine Orovitz, Board Clerk