

MINUTES

CRESSKILL PLANNING BOARD

FEBRUARY 13, 2018

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting at 7:30 PM and announced the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been fulfilled.

Members present at roll call: Mayor Romeo, Councilwoman Tsigounis, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Calder, Mr. Durakis, Mr. Mandelbaum, Mr. Ulshoefer, Mr. Malone and Mr. Rummel. Also present were Mr. Paul Azzolina, Borough Engineer, and Mr. Schuster, Planning Board Attorney.

Mr. Ulshoefer made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 23, 2018, meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Calder. All present were in favor of the motion. Motion approved.

Correspondence

Letter of Introduction from Mr. Bob Rusch, Construction Official, dated January 22, 2018, sending Ms. Katie Lee to this Board for approval. Ms. Lee would like to continue the use of the nail salon at 6 Madison Avenue, Suite 3, 4U Nails & Spa. Ms. Lee was present. Ms. Lee stated that she is the new owner and she is going to continue the use. There will be no changes. It is going to remain exactly the same with the same name. Mr. Schuster asked if she is going to expand. Ms. Lee stated that she is not. Mr. Ulshoefer made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mandelbaum. All present were in favor. Motion approved. Approval letter sent to Ms. Lee with copies to Ms. Barbara Nasuto, Mr. Bob Rusch, the Fire Department, Police Department and Health Department.

Letter of Introduction from Mr. Bob Rusch, Construction Official, dated February 8, 2018, sending Mr. Lumaj to this Board for approval. He would like to construct a new single-family dwelling at 340 Lafayette Street. Application #1526 was received February 9, 2018, and is currently under review. Mr. Lumaj stated that it is a big lot and requires no variances.

Letter of Introduction from Mr. Bob Rusch, Construction Official, dated January 30, 2018, sending Mr. Lumaj to this Board for approval. He would like to subdivide 26 Cresskill Avenue and construct three new single-family homes. Each new property will require two variances. Application #1525M was received on February 2, 2018, and is currently under review. Mr. Azzolina stated that he has not had the opportunity to review it and hopes to have his comments on it by the next meeting.

Notice from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Notice of Intent to Settle, Flood Hazard Area Individual Permit. Mr. Azzolina noted that this is for the Frick Estate application which is partly in Alpine and partly in Demarest. File.

Application for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Certification for 273 Jefferson Avenue, 273 Jefferson LLC, Application #1519. File.

Subdivision Committee

Councilwoman Tsigounis had nothing else to report.

Report from the Borough Engineer's Office

Mr. Azzolina had nothing to report other than stating that the two new applications are under review and that he prepared the report for the Public Hearing tonight for the last meeting.

Old Business

Mr. Schuster noted that we will be having a hearing at the next meeting about the Fair Share Housing Component. We should be getting a copy of the report and plan to review for the next meeting at which time testimony will be taken, a report will be made and there will be a presentation from our planner. That is part of our Mt. Laurel settlement. We are going to have to adopt and approve that because it will be at that meeting that we will adopt findings and fact and conclusions of law. He is probably going to have the resolution to be adopted at that meeting. It is important that the members review all the documentation that should be distributed by the end of the week. It will be open to the public and public comments will be taken. Mr. Mandelbaum asked if this was different from COAH. Mr. Schuster noted that this is part of COAH.

Public Hearing – Application #1514M – 18 Kenilworth Drive

Mr. Matthew Capizzi, 11 Hillside Avenue, Tenafly, was present representing the applicants, Vajily Kuzubov and Alexander Chalov. This is a subdivision application at 18 Kenilworth Drive. The site as it stands now is oversized as to width and to area. It is improved only with a cabana of sorts and some walkways. It used to actually be a property that serviced the house on Madison Avenue. His client purchased the property with the intention of redeveloping it. There was a single-family house on the property, but that home was razed around 1996 and it has been in the current state ever since then with basically just the cabana and some walkways.

What they are proposing to do is to subdivide the lot in to almost two equal lots. Both lots will be conforming in all respects with the exception of lot width. One lot will have an approximate width of 78 feet and the other lot will have an approximate width of 75 feet where 100 feet is required. The only variance that they require is the lot width.

As part of the application, they provided the Board with some conceptual drawings that could be constructed on each lot to establish that they can improve both lots. Although they are undersized as to width, they can construct two new single-family homes there without requiring any bulk variances.

He has two witnesses this evening, Mr. Mark Martins, the engineer, that will go over the subdivision plat, and Mr. Joe Donato, who will talk about the conceptual architectural plans.

Mr. Mark Martins, 55 Walnut Street, Norwood, NJ, was sworn in by Mr. Schuster. Mr. Martins is a licensed professional engineer and a licensed land surveyor. He has testified before this Board before. His license number is 35858 and is presently in good standing. He was accepted as an expert in the areas of land surveying and engineering.

Mr. Martins identified the plan on the easel as the Proposed Major Subdivision, 18 Kenilworth Drive. The first sheet is the key map, sheet 1 of 2, last revised December 21, 2017. This was marked as Exhibit A1, sheet 1 of 2, Key Map. This map depicts the site in reference to the location and vicinity of the properties that surround it. It is

located on the easterly side of Kenilworth Drive. The hatched area represents the area of the property. It is right opposite Devonshire Road. It is adjacent to Engle Street and the Borough line. East Madison Avenue is to the north and to the east of the subject property. The property is currently vacant and was formerly used as kind of a rear yard area for the lot on East Madison Avenue. There were some improvements, a fountain, a gazebo, and some landscaping. There had been a house on there formerly, which had been taken down. It was basically for the use of the house on Madison Avenue.

Mr. Schuster asked if the applicants were the contract purchasers or the owners. Mr. Martins stated that they were the owners as far as he knew. Mr. Capizzi noted that they own the parcel and have for some time. Mr. Schuster asked if they own the property on Madison or if someone else owns that. Mr. Capizzi noted that that is owned by a third party.

Mr. Capizzi asked Mr. Martins to take the Board through the property. Mr. Martins noted that the lot size has an area of 20,280 square feet. It is a little bit irregular. They have a frontage of 124.07 feet along the frontage on Kenilworth Drive that is straight and then there is a little bit of a curve that connects to Devonshire Road and there is another 29.92 feet of frontage along that curve, so there is almost a 154 of total frontage. The rest of the dimensions of the property is as follows: the rear property line opposite Kenilworth has a dimension of 150 feet, the southerly line has a dimension of 123.35 feet and the northerly line, has a dimension of 153.42 feet. They are in the R-10 zone. This is a 10,000 square foot zone, requiring a lot width of 100 feet. They have an oversized lot in an R-10 zone.

Mr. Capizzi noted that Kenilworth is kind of a unique block and a short block. Mr. Martins agreed and stated that it is directly adjacent to the larger lots behind it on East Madison and they have some smaller lots along Kenilworth and Devonshire, and additionally they have lots on Engle Street which also are a mix with smaller lots and larger lots as well. They did an analysis, not counting the lots on East Madison, but just the lots that were basically fronting on Kenilworth, Devonshire and Engle Street, within the 500-foot radius and not including anything, of course, in Tenaflly, and they counted 25 total lots within that 500-foot radius. Out of those 25 total lots, 15 of them have frontages that are less than 100 feet. Out of those 25 lots, 10 of those lots have frontages that are less than 75 feet. There is already a substantial proportion of the lots within the 500 feet radius that he mentioned which are less than the 100 feet that the ordinance requires.

Mr. Schuster stated that that is not really true because he is not including the Tenaflly properties or other Cresskill properties within 500 feet. Mr. Martins agreed. Mr. Schuster noted that he was just using the properties he counted, but he didn't include all the properties within 500 feet. Mr. Martins said that he qualified that. Mr. Schuster asked for the overall number. Mr. Martins stated that there are 37 lots within the 500-foot radius in Cresskill. Mr. Schuster asked about the lots in Tenaflly. Mr. Capizzi stated that we are talking about the neighborhood as reflected by the zone in which they are in. Mr. Schuster said that if that is the way they want to define the argument, that is up to them. Mr. Capizzi stated that that is what Mr. Martins is doing. If the Board wants to ask about all the properties, they will answer all questions in relevance to that.

Mr. Martins said that the attempt wasn't to mislead the Board, the attempt was just to compare apples to apples. Tenaflly is not the town they are in and these lots on East Madison are much larger lots in an R-40 zone and obviously they are going to be larger lots and it doesn't seem fair to him to compare what they are proposing to those larger lots that are in a different zone. Not in Tenaflly, but within the 500 feet radius, there will be 37 lots within 500 feet, same number of lots that did not conform would be the 15 lots less than 100 feet in width and 10 lots less than 75 feet. Mr. Schuster stated that that is less than half the lots. Mr. Capizzi asked how many of those lots are within the larger lot zone. Mr. Martins stated that 11 of those are. Mr. Capizzi asked that if they backed those larger lot zones out of the overall 500, how many lots are in the R-10 zone? Mr. Martins said there would be approximately 25, not including Tenaflly, of course, since they are in a different town.

Mr. Capizzi asked Mr. Martins to turn to sheet A2, which was marked as Exhibit A2, Major Subdivision Plat, originally dated July 21, 2017, with revisions of December 21, 2017, and February 7, 2018. This is a colorized rendering. They have indicated the locations of the adjoining structures on this map as well. He distributed additional prints to the Board members without the colorization.

Mr. Martins stated the A2 is the subdivision plot which depicts how they are going to subdivide the property. As he described before, they are basically going to subdivide it into two somewhat equal size parcels. He is saying basically and somewhat because it is somewhat of an irregular shape lot and they can't just put a subdivision line down the middle and come up with equal areas because one side or one depth of the lot is a little smaller than the other. What they have done is situate the property line, the new subdivision line that is, so that the lots are more or less equal. They are creating what they are calling 18.01, being the southerly lot, which will have an area of 10,017 square feet, which would leave the northerly lot, which they are designating as 22.01, with an area of 10,263 square feet. They are both conforming as far as the lot area requirements, 10,000 square feet being the minimum. They exceed those minimum lot areas. The non-conformity is with the lot width. The lot width requirement for the zone is 100 feet. On lot 18.01, they have a lot frontage of 78.4 feet and the right-angle dimension though is 77.5. On 22.01, the lot frontage will be 75.59 feet and the right-angle dimension will be 72.5.

Mr. Martins noted that to give the Board an idea of what they could possibly build on these two lots, they provided some conceptual footprints. These are the brown hatched area that are shown on the plans. These are single-family homes, of course, that comply with the regulations of the ordinances. They are intending to comply fully with all the requirements as far as setbacks, front yard, rear yard, side yard setbacks, building coverages, building height, etc. That is what these footprints represent. If they get approved, they will be before the Board again to provide the Board with the site plan for each one of those lots in the future.

Mr. Capizzi asked, based upon the conceptual footprints, what the offsets are to the side yards as compared to the buildings on the adjacent parcels. Mr. Martins noted that the side yard requirement is 15 feet on each side and 35 feet total. On lot 18.01, they are proposing the side yard on the southerly side of 15.25 feet and on the northerly side of 20.25 feet. On lot 22.01, they are proposing a 15-foot side yard on the southerly side and a 20-foot side yard on the northerly side. Both of those would be conforming setbacks. Directly across the street, they have a house on the corner of Kenilworth and Devonshire which is actually facing Devonshire and that is set back about 35 feet from the front property line. The next house to that which is directly opposite lot 18.01, is set back about 35 feet as well from Kenilworth drive. On the southerly side of the property, that is a newer house and they have a setback of about 20 feet to their side property line. Continuing along on Devonshire Road to the north, there is a lot which has a setback to the street of 26 feet and its side yard is 10 feet, but you can see it is quite a distance away from their proposed structures. There a couple of larger buildings on the larger lots on East Madison, the closest one being about 53 feet to what would be their side property line. To the rear property line, which is the closest structure, that is actually the lot that formerly owned this property.

Mr. Capizzi noted that there are just five lots on the short block of Kenilworth. He asked how many of those lots had homes that front on Kenilworth. Mr. Martins believes there are just two, the one opposite them and the one directly adjacent to the south. Councilwoman Tsigounis asked what the frontages are of the houses on Kenilworth. Mr. Martins noted that the frontage of the house directly across the street is 100 feet, the one to the south of 154 feet and the one directly to the north is about 100 feet but probably a little bit less because of the curve. The subject property that we are talking about is about 154 feet. The house directly across the street has a lot frontage of 75, including the curve. That is the one facing Devonshire.

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting to the public. Mr. Michael S. Shuhala, an attorney representing Ms. Jeanne Lamme, who is the previous owner of the property who sold it to these gentlemen, wished to be heard. She is the current owner of the property on Madison Avenue. Mr. Shuhala noted that Mr. Martins testified that the adjacent properties or the across the street properties on Kenilworth Drive all have frontages over 100 feet. Mr. Martin stated that the adjacent properties, being Lots 4-7 has a frontage of 100, the adjacent property to the south has a frontage of approximately 150 feet and the properties across the street has a width of 75 feet along Kenilworth and 125 feet along Devonshire Road. Mr. Shuhala stated that it is actually the side along Kenilworth. Mr. Martin noted that as he stated before, the house is facing Devonshire Road. Mr. Shuhala stated that the frontages in that area are all over 100 feet—100, 125 and 150 feet. Mr. Martins said that that would be correct. Mr. Shuhala asked if there was any reason why they cannot build only one structure on that property. Mr. Martin said that of course they can build one structure on the property, but you are going to end up with a structure that is going to be larger, occupying more of a footprint than their proposed structures will. In their opinion, given the nature of this neighborhood, and he knows Mr. Shuhala is focusing on just those couple houses, in their opinion, looking at the rest of the neighborhood, these smaller lots actually fit in more with the neighborhood and at the end of the

day they believe they will be a better product and will fit in with the environment much better than a larger single-family home.

Mr. Shuhala stated that he also testified before that there are many smaller lots in that neighborhood. He asked if they were pre-existing construction. Mr. Martin agreed on both points. Mr. Shuhala asked if they were pre-existing before the R-10 was passed by this Board. Mr. Martin didn't know. Mr. Shuhala had no further questions.

Mr. Morgan closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Martin called Mr. Donato as his next witness. Mr. Joseph Donato, 14 Route 4 West, River Edge, NJ, was sworn in by Mr. Schuster. He is an expert architect. He has appeared before this Board a couple times and before many other Boards in the State of New Jersey. His license number is 12280 and is presently in good standing. He was accepted as an expert in the area of architecture for the purposes of today's hearing.

Mr. Donato prepared the plans for today's hearing and has had an opportunity to walk the neighborhood. Mr. Donato has two sheets to his plans. Sheet 1, the conceptual dwelling for Lot 18.01 was marked as Exhibit A3 and Sheet 2, the conceptual dwelling for Lot 22.01, was marked as Exhibit A4. He distributed copies of the colored front elevations that matched the plans. The colored front elevation for Lot 18.01 was marked as Exhibit A5 and the colored front elevation for Lot 22.01 was marked as Exhibit A6. These are considered conceptual plans.

Mr. Donato noted that their objective was for two single-family homes that meet the criteria for all bulk requirements, side yard, rear yard, front yard and height. The idea there was basically, as you are driving down the street, the distance between the homes would follow what's in the neighborhood as far as light and air so that it conforms to the neighborhood as you are walking or driving through. The proposal for lot 18.01 would be a home that is 42 feet wide, 47 ½ feet deep. It has a two-car garage that faces Kenilworth. From there is a foyer, a half bath, laundry room and one large kitchen/breakfast area and a family room looking out the back. Downstairs in the basement there is an open space with an option for a bedroom, bathroom and a utility room. The top floor would be four bedrooms and three bathrooms. Basically, this house conforms to the FAR, height, all setbacks and building coverage.

Mr. Schuster asked if they were seeking site plan approval as well subdivision approval. Mr. Capizzi stated that they were not. He stated that they were just presenting this for illustration purposes.

Mr. Donato went to his second sheet, Exhibit A4, Lot 22.01, which is a structure that is 37'6" by 54'10". It has a two-car garage facing forward with a living room, dining room, kitchen and a great room out the back. A set of stairs that go to the basement, which is an open basement with a bedroom and a bathroom and four bedrooms and bathrooms on the second floor. Again, the objective is to meet all the criteria as far as bulk requirements.

Mr. Capizzi asked Mr. Donato to describe the look of the exterior. Mr. Donato explained that on Lot 18.01, it could be stone, with a roofline coming down to the first floor, kind of smaller in scale. Lot 22.01, same thing, just trying to break it up with some roof lines so it doesn't look like a two-story box. Mr. Capizzi asked about what they are proposing compared to what is already existing in the neighborhood as far as size and scale and architectural design. Mr. Donato noted that based on the lot sizes that are in the R-10 zone, that is why they designed it really not asking for any variances so that the side yards conform to the 15-foot side yards.

Mr. Capizzi asked if they prepared, at some point in time, a plan for one larger home. Mr. Donato stated that this plan was almost a year in the making. Their first objective was one house. The owner was going to build a house for himself and it wound up being almost 124-feet long to get what he wanted, and it didn't fit into the neighborhood as far as a house. So, to keep 15-foot side yards, they can actually build this thing up to the side yards that meet the requirements, it is just out of scale for the neighborhood. Mr. Schuster asked how many feet the original one-family house was. Mr. Donato noted that it was narrow but long. They were trying to get a three or four-car garage. The first house was probably about 5,500 square feet. On Lot 22.01, the living space on the first floor is 1,500 and on the second floor it is 1,800. On Lot 18.01, the living space on the first floor is 1,411 and the second floor is 1,850. Mr. Schuster noted that combined it is slightly larger than what they originally proposed

as a single-family. Mr. Donato explained but they have more open space between each structure, rather than seeing one longer home. You could build a larger home more than 5,500 or 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Capizzi stated that as far as the massing is concerned, what they are proposing here versus one larger dwelling, this fits in more with the neighborhood. Mr. Donato agreed absolutely. With two separate structures and more space between the structures is in keeping more with the neighborhood rather than one longer structure and the same side yards.

Mayor Romeo asked how deep the lots were. Mr. Martins noted that the minimum on Lot 18.01 would be 123.35 and on Lot 22.01 it would be 135.15 and that is at the common line between the two lots. And you only count the first 125 feet for the lot area and impervious coverage.

Councilwoman Tsigounis asked Mr. Donato to make clear to the Board that you don't have to build a house to extend to the side yard. She doesn't want the Board to think that if two homes are not approved, then you have to build one to the side yard. Mr. Donato stated that 15 feet is the minimum but you could have 18 feet or 20 feet. Mr. Capizzi stated that it is important to know that the iteration that Mr. Donato worked on proposed such a development. It is not only plausible, it's possible. Councilwoman Tsigounis stated that that is not in front of the Board right now. Mr. Capizzi stated that the testimony is. The fact that they had a prior plan that they were proposing to build something with 15-foot side yards from tip to tip was what they were planning to do before they came to this concept. He thinks the importance of that is they did talk about an alternate single-family development in concept, they actually put pen to paper. They developed a site plan. Mr. Martins can be recalled to talk about how they almost had a fully engineered site plan as well as architectural plans for a large scale single-family dwelling. Councilwoman Tsigounis noted that it was understood but stated that it should be in their best interest and the Board's best interest to do what's best for the neighborhood and what fits into the context. Mr. Capizzi noted that that is why they are before the Board this evening, precisely.

Mr. Shuhala stated that Mr. Donato testified before that the owner had decided he was going to move in to that one family house. Mr. Donato stated that that was correct. Mr. Shuhala then stated that the owner changed his plans and asked if he was still going to live in one of those houses or if he was going to sell them off. Mr. Donato stated that one of the houses was designed for the owner.

Mr. Shuhala wanted to remind the Board that it certainly appears that they are cutting up these lots now strictly for a financial reason and the owners are not present tonight. The Board cannot give a variance for any economic gain on his part. He thinks the lots in the area are certainly within the scope of the area. The surrounding properties are all 100 feet, 125 feet and the one house on Devonshire, the side yard was short, however, but the front of the house was 150 feet. All those lots in that area, smaller lots, are probably pre-construction of this particular area. He thinks the Board should deny the application. Certainly, on behalf of Mrs. Lamme, who is worried about this, it should be denied because you should not exceed your ordinance. At this particular time, there is no good reason to do that. He thanked the Board for its time.

Mr. Capizzi noted that the two owners, if the subdivision was approved, these homes were going to be occupied by them. That is not pertinent to the application. As far as who the end-users are going to be, the intention is the applicants would construct the homes for their own personal use. He thinks it is important to appreciate Kenilworth Drive. It is a very unique short block. It only has two homes which front on Kenilworth and as the Board member had mentioned, what is the vision for the further development of Kenilworth and how does that development keep it on balance with what already exists on Kenilworth Drive as well as properties within the vicinity. The lots which do front on Kenilworth have a width of about 100 feet, whereas the other lots that are larger, favor the side streets. If they propose one large home and keep the lot as one large parcel, the likelihood is that something, at least with an initial front elevation will be something larger than what they are proposing here, because that is just the nature of things. If you have a large parcel, the tendency is to try to maximize the development of the site. That is why most applications that come before this Board, even for basic site plan approval, the bulk tables are not at the minimums, they are at the maximums, because that is what the tendency of people is to do is to maximize the development potential of the site because, quite candidly, the tax base is the same. Whether he does something that is slightly smaller or to the maximum he doesn't get a significant tax break, so he is going to spend the money on construction. Why not spend a few extra dollars and get the most

out of the site. He thinks the likelihood of somebody building something on a large scale site is highly probable because the Board has seen that before on many occasions.

The proposal here this evening with two smaller homes on albeit slightly smaller lots than those homes that do front on Kenilworth, he thinks will fit in nicely with the neighborhood as compared to what they could do if the lot was kept as is. They are actually trying to create a streetscape here. When you have two homes, you don't really have a streetscape. They are now going to create one by virtue of this subdivision. He thinks it will be an enhancement and actually create a streetscape there. Although it is a small street, now you will have four homes fronting on Kenilworth as opposed to three, one of which will have the probability of dwarfing the other two homes that do front on Kenilworth.

Mr. Capizzi stated that they were sensitive to the fact that, although the sites were undersized as to width, that they would propose homes that are conforming to the bulk requirements. They didn't come in here to try to do anything without crossing all their "Ts" and dotting all their "Is" and that is why they spent the time to put together architectural plans, not just to talk about the concept but to illustrate that the lots can be developed without requiring any bulk variances. If the Board were inclined to grant this application, they will clearly set that as a condition of approval that the fact that it is undersized will not lead to any possibility for a future bulk variance.

Mr. Capizzi continued by saying he thinks this is a betterment to the neighborhood and he asks the Board to vote favorably on the application.

Mr. Azzolina stated that his comments are set forth in his report to the Board dated January 23, 2018. There were certain things that were not specifically discussed. On Page 5, under V, he believes the applicants adequately addressed the proposed lot development as described under Lot 18.01 and Lot 22.01. They were coming up with something slightly different relative to 22.01 but he believes the discrepancy between the applicant's professionals and his office can be resolved so that a conforming dwelling FARwise could be constructed on that property no matter which frontage is used. Stormwater management, on major developments less than one acre of disturbance they would look at subsequent site plan applications from stormwater management proposals at a later date. Proposed tree removal replacement, that was not specifically stated, although tree removals are depicted on the plan. There are approximately 53 trees to be removed from the property. A majority of them are the evergreen buffer currently along Kenilworth Drive that of necessity needs to be removed in order to develop these properties, construct driveways, etc. As part of any site plan approval, they would be required to provide some replacement tree plantings, assuming our tree removal ordinance comes into effect shortly. With respect to the subdivision application, three shade trees along Kenilworth Drive would be required for planting.

There may be an existing building sewer connection that the applicant would be able to utilize for one of these properties. He would recommend that the existing connection be video inspected to confirm its integrity at this time. It is a major subdivision under the Residential Site Improvement Standard. Underground wiring will be required to service these two properties if the subdivision were to be granted. The applicant will need to discuss that with Rockland Electric. Kenilworth Drive was resurfaced approximately eight years ago. The pavement is still in relatively good condition. He recommends that if the Board were to approve the application that any road openings be restored with infrared pavement techniques. As with any other application, there are outside approvals that will be required. The applicant needs to apply to the County Planning Board, as well as the Soil Conservation District and local approvals as well.

Councilwoman Tsigounis stated that she thinks the analysis presented by the applicant is successful only if you take zones, "per se," in to account. But, if you do not and you also do not draw lines between Tenafly and Cresskill but actually look at the context of the neighborhood, that is, the adjacent houses on the street and their existing frontage, what the applicant is proposing is a tight squeeze. Mr. Mandelbaum asked Councilwoman Tsigounis to explain her point a little more. Councilwoman Tsigounis said that basically, the way their analysis is presented by just doing the R-10 zone, hypothetically on paper, it makes sense, but when you look at the context of the neighborhood and what is there, you are not talking about what is west of Engle Street, you are talking about what is east and going forward so the gradation of the homes and the lots is increasing, getting bigger, not subdividing it. It would be standing out like a sore thumb if they tried to do what they are doing. A tight squeeze.

Mayor Romeo stated that two houses here is really shoehorning this in. It is really, really crowded with Mrs. Lamme's property, and the other property on East Madison behind it and next to it. It is unfortunate that it is on the curve and he thinks that is what does it besides Madison Avenue behind it. It is really, really pushing it trying to get a second house in there.

Councilwoman Tsigounis made a motion to deny the application. Mr. Morgan seconded the motion. Mr. Schuster explained that if you vote yes, you are denying the application, if you vote no, you are in favor of the application. On Roll Call: Mayor Romeo, Councilwoman Tsigounis, and Mr. Morgan voted yes. Mr. Calder voted no. Mr. Durakis voted yes. Mr. Mandelbaum voted no. Mr. Ulshoefer voted yes. Mr. Malone voted no. Mr. Rummel voted yes. Motion to deny approved.

New Business

None.

Other Business

None.

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting to the public. No public wished to be heard.

Motion was made by Mr. Durakis to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 PM, seconded by Mr. Mandelbaum. All present were in favor. Motion approved.

The next four regular Planning Board meetings are scheduled for February 27, March 13, March 27, and April 10, 2018, at 7:30 PM in the Borough Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn M. Petillo
Recording Secretary