

MINUTES

CRESSKILL PLANNING BOARD

AUGUST 25, 2015

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting at 7:35 PM and announced the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been fulfilled.

Members present at roll call: Mayor Romeo, Councilwoman Tsigounis, Mr. Calder, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Ulshoefer, Mr. Moss and Mr. Durakis. Also present were Mr. Azzolina, Borough Engineer, and Mr. Borce Martinoski, in for Mr. Steven Schuster, Board Attorney.

Mr. Calder made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 11, 2015, meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Durakis. All present were in favor of the motion. Motion approved.

Correspondence

Voucher from Mr. Steven V. Schuster for services rendered relative to the Cresskill Planning Board for the month of March in the amount of \$1,342.77. Mr. Moss made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Durakis. All present were in favor. Motion approved.

Application for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Certification for 66 East Madison Avenue, Elite Developers, LLC. File

Application for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Certification for 51 Phelps Avenue, Avi Lavon, Application #1467. File.

Letter of Introduction from Mr. Edward M. Rossi, Construction Official, dated August 11, 2015, sending Mr. David Juzmeski, Home Tree Investment Group, representing the owners, to this Board for approval. They would like to construct a new single-family at 16 Westervelt Place. They will require variances. No plans have been received.

Letter of Introduction from Mr. Edward M. Rossi, Construction/Zoning Official, dated August 21, 2015, sending Cem and Diane Arpac, owners of Salon Q2 to this Board for signage approval at 35 Union Avenue. Mr. Moss asked if they were keeping the store in Tenafly. Ms. Arpac stated that Salon Q in Tenafly will be a blow dry bar only and this one in Cresskill will be a full service salon. Ms. Arpac noted that the sign will have backlighting. Mr. Moss asked when it will be ready to move in. Ms. Arpac hoped by the end of the month. They are pouring the cement floor tomorrow.

Councilwoman Tsigounis asked if the rendering of the sign represented white as the background color. She noted that it would be nice if all the signs had the same background color. She doesn't know what the agreement is with Mr. Wolfer as far as signage. Mr. Moss stated that that didn't come up when the gentleman came in for the liquor store. Councilwoman Tsigounis wondered if there should be some kind of continuity just to make the building look better and like there was some sort of plan. She asked if they would be agreeable to that. Ms. Arpac noted that they tried other colors, but with the logo, the white is what made it pop. Mr. Arpac said that it wasn't really white but more of a silvery type thing. Mr. Ulshoefer noted that the whole arch is white. Mr. Arpac stated that it is not pure white.

Mr. Morgan provided a picture of the liquor store signage. Councilwoman Tsigounis feels that it should have been established that the signs would be similar. Mr. Arpac stated that the backlighting is only for the letters. The sign will be lit up after closing. Councilwoman Tsigounis noted that this occupies the entire arch. Mayor Romeo noted that there is no ordinance against it. Councilwoman Tsigounis noted that unless it goes against the square footage computation for signage, the arches are supposed to be for signage.

Councilwoman Tsigounis asked if they could subdue the color so it is not as bright. The background is brick and it is pretty and has a pattern and you are hiding it. The liquor store is just the letters on the brick. This is covering the brick. Mr. Moss asked what color the backlighting was. Mr. Arpac said the lighting is changeable. It can be any color they want it to be. Councilwoman Tsigounis said that the liquor store sign was less obtrusive because the lettering is on top of the brick and this sign is covering the brick.

Councilwoman Tsigounis stated that we understand that they want to advertise, but we are also looking for a more subliminal signage. Mayor Romeo asked about just having the lettering on the brick and backlight it in a similar color. Mr. Arpac stated that if they have to, they have to. Councilwoman Tsigounis suggested having a black letter on a white stencil behind it so that it still has the white background. We want the sign to go within the arch but not to cover the brick. Mayor Romeo agrees. Ms. Arpac confirmed that they want to see more brick. Everybody agreed that that is what they are looking for. Ms. Arpac actually didn't like the arch to work with and thought it would be so much sleeker with just the sign and no arch to work around. Councilwoman Tsigounis said not to incorporate the arch into the sign. Ms. Arpac understands. Mayor Romeo stated that they are going to leave the white out as a background and just put the white behind the letters and backlight each letter with say a green. Ms. Arpac said that is fine. Mayor Romeo asked if they could have the sign redesigned. Ms. Arpac said she could have them by tomorrow.

Plans were submitted with the sign location for 6 and 10 Madison Avenue (Madison Plaza). Mayor Romeo asked Mr. Azzolina if this was going to be a problem and if it was going to obstruct the view. Mr. Azzolina looked at the plan and the line of sight line depicted and the sign is within that triangle and looking at the easterly driveway that should be clear. He doesn't see one at the other driveway depicted, but it appears to be far enough away that it shouldn't be an obstruction. Mayor Romeo doesn't remember if the sidewalk is staying. Mr. Azzolina says that the plan depicts the widening so it would be clear of that. Mr. Calder asked if the easterly lane was going to be right turn only. Mr. Azzolina said yes, but you want to see the traffic approaching from the west and that's why you can't be obstructing that view and the sign is beyond that line of sight. His concern is relative to the other Mariner's Bank sign that the gentleman indicated may or may not be constructed. Mr. Franco noted that they were going to try to propose it initially but they reviewed the code and not more than one existing directional sign was going to be allowed per property so it may have to be corrected.

The sign is going to be illuminated internally where all the names are and on top it is going to be externally illuminated. It is going to have a rigid LED bar. There are no lights in the ground. Everybody was OK with that.

Subdivision Committee

Councilwoman Tsigounis had nothing to report.

Report from the Borough Engineer's Office

Mr. Azzolina has prepared a completeness memorandum for Application #1467, 51 Phelps Avenue, Avi Lavon, dated August 25, 2015. It is a somewhat complicated application and he wanted to go through it point by point with the Board and the applicant just so everybody understands. The existing home on the site is to be demolished and the site is to be redeveloped. Based on Mr. Azzolina's review, the application is incomplete at this time. The deficiencies are as follows: A site plan check off list should be submitted as well as a copy of the survey. The drawing was prepared by Mark Martins, who is a PE and an LS, but the survey for the site was prepared by another surveyor and New Jersey State Law requires a signed and sealed copy of the Survey be submitted as part of the application.

The height of the retaining walls: this is a sloped property so there are multiple retaining walls required in order to level off the property a little bit to create a building plateau and to provide the garage-under design that the applicant is proposing. Along Cedar Street is his proposed driveway location, which will be a garage under. On that side of the property he has a retaining wall with a maximum height of 8'6" at the house and then it works its way down to a 4' basic height at the right-of-way. On the other side of the driveway, there is a lesser height of wall approximately 3-3 ½ feet high. Along the westerly boundary there is a six foot high retaining wall for the majority of its length from the back corner towards Phelps and then it steps down to a four foot height. Our code does not allow six foot high retaining walls in front yards, which is along Cedar Street, nor within the side yard, which is along the westerly boundary. Those are variance conditions.

Mr. Lavon asked about dropping the one wall to four feet. Mr. Azzolina said he could probably do that along the westerly boundary, but he does not know that he could do that along his driveway. Mr. Lavon asked if it could be two walls of four and four. Mr. Azzolina said as long as you have the separation distance so that they are not acting as a single wall, yes. Mr. Lavon asked if otherwise he would have to go to a Public Hearing for these walls. Mr. Azzolina stated that he would because that would be a variance condition to have a six foot high wall. This current design would necessitate a Public Hearing because of the variances. Mr. Lavon asked if it could be part of the foundation of the house. Mr. Azzolina stated that that doesn't really matter. It probably actually makes it worse because now you have the house in the front yard, which you are not allowed to have your house in the front yard, which is why you have the 25 foot setback requirement for the structure. By connecting it to the house, you are, in essence, making it worse. Now you are talking about having the front of your house being ten feet off the setback line as opposed to 25 feet. That is not gaining you anything here. That is Item #3.

Item #4: Floor Area Ratio, as indicated on the architect's plans... Mr. Lavon asked if he could have maximum six feet with the walls or four feet. Mr. Azzolina said four feet. You can go six feet as long as it is within the confines of the building envelope. The walls as currently described are beyond the confines of the building envelope. The way the code reads, it says "the walls six feet have to comply with building codes." The have to be within the confines of the building envelope if you want to have walls six feet, other than along the rear property line, where you are permitted to have six feet walls, which in your case would be along the northerly boundary. Some of that wall is six feet and that is permitted. The balance of the six feet walls are not permitted. Mr. Calder asked if the stability of the slope changed by going from six feet to four feet. Mr. Azzolina stated that it would be, which is one of the following comments that he needs to provide a stability analysis for the walls, but in order to provide that he needs to know if they are doing an 8 ½ foot high wall or something else. Mr. Lavon said he is going to see if he can do two four foot walls or something else. He is going to see what he can do.

Mr. Azzolina noted that another issue is the FAR. The architectural drawings have some conflicting information on sheet A2, which is the numbers that he based his analysis on, would indicate that it would be in excess of the FAR. Either Chris is going to have to play with a few room dimensions... Mayor Romeo mentioned to Mr. Lavon that he doesn't want to have to go the Zoning Board for an FAR variance. Mr. Lavon agreed. When he saw the problem he knew that he was going to fix it.

Item #6 is the building height. Mr. Azzolina noted that the method of calculation is the average of the two front corners, which in this case is the front of the house along Phelps. Past practice of the Board and the

Borough is to use the proposed average ground elevation which is 102 and 100, which averages to 101, which is what the plan needs, but it's speaking of the existing average grade, and it needs to speak of the proposed grade.

Item #7, we spoke about, the schematic provided for the reinforced concrete wall on the architectural drawings, which may change based on whatever the proposal is. Mr. Azzolina's finding is that the way they're presented now that the wall that is indicated for being suitable for a nine foot application, is not going to work here. Basically, your exposed face is about seven feet according to that detail, where according to this plan your exposed face is 8 ½. That detail needs to be modified. Depending on whatever he does here with the retaining walls, once the plan is approved, he'll need to submit a calculation by an engineer and use the factor of safety against overturning, sliding, bearing, etc. That has to be submitted for both types of retaining walls, reinforced concrete as well as for the boulder retaining wall. That is Item #7 and #8.

Item #9 is just a detail requirement for the boulder retaining wall. Item #9 is to indicate the adjoining property owners. Item #11 will come into play if you are seeking variances. You have to include the 200 foot radius property owner listing. Item #12 is the scale on the plan as noted is incorrect. It is a 10 scale drawing as opposed to a 20 scale as indicated.

Item #14, offset dimension to the dwelling and to the overhang at the southwest corner of the dwelling. Item #15 is simply expressing the area of the lot in acres as well as square feet. That is a checklist requirement.

Item #16 – There is an existing drainage easement, which is shown on the drawing. It is not labeled, but there is a five foot wide drainage easement from way back when. He is not sure of the purpose, but it is there on the west side of the property. That needs to be labeled.

Item #17 – There needs to be some calculation to verify that the sizing of the seepage pit system is adequate. Item #18 is to indicate the volume of the proposed seepage pit system. Mr. Azzolina also recommends that they construct an overflow line from that pit to the inlet located at the intersection of Cedar and Phelps. In the event that the pit overflows, it will go right into the storm drain.

Item #20 – This is just some dimensions for the paver terrace in the rear yard and a setback from the property line as well. Item #21 is for the emergency generator. If that is proposed, that should be depicted on the plan.

Item #22 – The window well is shown at the rear of the dwelling. You need to show some railings as well as a drainage system for that. Item #23 – Any waivers requested should be indicated on the plan. It appears that one waiver, minimally, would be required for the location of the driveway, which is less than 50 feet away from the point of tangency along Cedar Street. There is not a whole lot that can be done here given the rear yard setback requirement.

Item #24 – Impervious coverage calculations as indicated on the architect's plan and this plan do not match. They need to be reconciled accordingly. Item #25 – Indicate the underground electric and CATV service locations.

Item #26 pertains to the sanitary sewer. Mr. Azzolina asked Mr. Lavon if he has done any inspection of that yet. Mr. Lavon noted that he has not. Mr. Azzolina recommends that he do that as soon as possible. The Borough is going to be undertaking, very, very shortly, Phelps reconstruction, starting in a couple weeks. He asked if Mr. Lavon was proposing new gas and water. Mr. Lavon noted that they are going to try to use the sewer. The water he is not going to change, it is going to be three-quarters. The gas is up to PSE&G. Mr. Azzolina noted that the condition is not his concern with the gas, it is the size. Is it going to be big enough to support whatever appliances he is proposing. He needs to talk to Public Service so they can tell him the size of it, the pressure in the line and whether it is going to work. Mr. Azzolina noted that the real issue is that if either of the utility companies or Mr. Lavon want to put new services in, that

work needs to be done immediately so that they are not ripping up the newly resurfaced road. Mr. Lavon noted that he will get a camera and check the sewer line. His intention is to leave the sewer line.

Item #27 – Indicate the driveway width as per the Site Plan Check Off List. Item #28 – Indicate what type of walkway and driveway you are proposing, meaning concrete, paver, etc. Item #29 – Indicate what type of curbing along the driveway. Beyond the limits of the retaining wall they are showing some form of curbing, either granite block or concrete, whatever they are proposing.

Item #30 we spoke about, which was the offset dimension from the PT to the driveway. Item #31 we received tonight, the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Certification. Item #32 – On the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Certification, Note 10 should include Mr. Azzolina as well the Superintendent of Public Works.

Item #33 pertains to the tree removals on the site. The tree removals have already been done. If the Board is not aware, the plan does not indicate all the trees that were on this site. Mr. Lavon noted that he will update it. Mr. Azzolina stated that the trees are already down. In keeping with earlier conversations, trees were removed on the site, as well as within the right-of-way. Typically approvals need to be had before, in order to remove trees in the right-of-way and he is not aware of that having taken place. Councilwoman Tsigounis asked him to show where the trees were removed. Mr. Azzolina also asked him to show any proposed plantings to compensate for any trees that were removed.

Mr. Lavon asked if this could be approved at the next meeting. If he is going to adjust it to two four foot walls, can it be discussed and approved, if they address all the other issues. Mr. Azzolina noted that it is going to depend on how fast he gets the plans back to him and the workload he has with his staff. It is difficult to say.

Mr. Calder noted that the application says Phelps Street. It should say Phelps Avenue. Mr. Azzolina agreed that that should be changed as well.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Other Business

Resolution for Application #1466, 322 Concord Street, Lumaj Builders, LLC. Resolution should be corrected to read #1466 not #1466M. Resolution introduced, with correction, by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Calder. On Roll Call: Mayor Romeo, Mr. Calder, Mr. Morgan and Mr. Durakis all voted yes. Ms. Bauer and Mrs. Schultz were absent. Motion approved. The original resolution shall become a permanent part of these minutes.

Motion was made by Mr. Calder to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 PM, seconded by Mr. Durakis. All present were in favor. Motion approved.

The next four regular Planning Board meetings are scheduled for September 8, September 22, October 13, and October 27, 2015, at 7:30 PM in the Borough Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn M. Petillo
Recording Secretary