

**BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE
ZONING BOARD
JUNE 18, 2024 – 8:00 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

The Public Meeting of the Zoning Board of the Borough of Park Ridge was held on the above date.

Chairman Pantaleo stated that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act, P.L. 1975, Chapter 231.

Chairman Pantaleo asked everyone to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL BOARD:

Chairman Frank Pantaleo	Present
Vice Chairman Jake Flaherty	Present
Mr. Michael Brickman	Absent
Mr. Mike Curran	Present
Ms. Lynda Nettleship-Carraher	Present
Dr. Gregory Perez	Present
Mr. Jeff Rutowski	Present
Mr. Kevin Swift	Present

Also Present:

Mr. Robert Ferraro – Board Attorney	Present
Ms. Tonya Janeiro – Board Secretary	Present
Mr. John Dunlea – Board Engineer	Present
Mr. Nicholas Dickerson – Board Planner	Present

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There was no public wishing to speak.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of May 21, 2024 were approved on a motion from Chairman Flaherty, seconded by Dr. Perez, and carried by all members eligible to vote.

RESOLUTION #2024-4

ZB24-2
Alfred Louis & Alyssa Sanzari
41 Randolph St.
Block 1102 / Lot 7
Single Family Home Addition

A motion was made by Dr. Perez to approve the memorializing resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rutowski, and carried by a roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairman Flaherty	Yes
Mr. Michael Curran	Yes
Dr. Gregory Perez	Yes
Mr. Rutowski	Yes
Chairman Frank Pantaleo	Yes

NEW APPLICATION

ZB24-1

Hemant Desai

20 Second Street

Block 806 / Lot 1

Single Family Home Addition & Patio

The following people were sworn in by Mr. Ferraro to offer testimony:

Joseph Bruno

29 Pascack Road

Park Ridge, NJ 07656

Applicant's Architect

The following Exhibits were marked:

Exhibit A-1 Plans dated December 28, 2023 and last revised April 29, 2024.

Exhibit A-2 Eight photographs

Mr. Bruno spoke about the application. The applicant is proposing to construct a one-and-two-story addition along the rear façade of the existing dwelling. The proposed improvements will also consist of a rear stone patio and a stormwater management system.

The applicant is seeking the following variances:

Side yard setback and Floor Area Ratio

The following pre-existing non-conforming conditions exist:

Lot area, lot width, front yard setback and side yard setback

Mr. Bruno went over Exhibit A-2 in detail.

Mr. Bruno said one of the needs for the addition is that Mr. and Mrs. Desai have several family members that come from India and stay for long periods of time. The new proposed kitchen will be available to them to cook traditional Indian foods. The new second-floor closet will be used to house Mrs. Desai's traditional clothing.

It was discussed that years ago, the side yard setback was 20 ft. in the R-20 zone.

Mr. Rutowski said the additional room on the second floor is not permitted to be a bedroom. Mr. Bruno said it is not the intent of this project, nor would he ever design such a thing.

Mr. Bruno spoke about the distance to the neighbor's house. The existing next-door residence is 50.46'.

Vice Chairman Flaherty asked about the FAR calculations. Mr. Bruno said permitted is 40%; they are currently at 20%, and they are proposing 21.64%. The roof terrace does not get counted in the square footage.

All runoff will be captured underground.

Mr. Curran asked when the home was built. Mr. Bruno said in the 1980's.

Mr. Pantaleo asked about the distance from the new patio to the existing retaining wall. Mr. Bruno was not sure.

Mr. Bruno commented that the impervious coverage and building coverage are way under what is permitted in the zone.

Mr. Dunlea explained how the proposed chambers would work. He said if this application is approved, a soil moving permit will be required. Mr. Bruno said at this time only a site plan was submitted. If this project moves forward, the application to the building department will have fully engineered plans designed with drainage and topography.

Ms. Nettleship-Carraher asked what the proposed patio would be constructed of? Mr. Bruno said slab stone.

Chairman Pantaleo asked about the existing retaining wall and any repairs it may need. Mr. Bruno said if needed, the wall will be repaired.

Mr. Dickerson asked if the application has any impact on the Master Plan. Mr. Bruno said no.

Mr. Dickerson asked if the applicant was going to try for any FAR bonuses. Mr. Bruno said no.

Mr. Dickerson asked who the vegetation on the northern property belonged to. Mr. Bruno said he was unsure.

Chairman Pantaleo asked about the proposed lighting. Mr. Bruno said all standard residential lighting will be installed.

There will be no egress from the upper patio to the downstairs.

The rhododendrons will not be impacted.

The meeting was open to the public to ask questions or give comments on the application. No members of the public were present.

Vice Chairman Flaherty visited the property. He believes the variances are de-minimis and looks favorably on this application.

Dr. Perez agrees with Vice Chairman Flaherty and doesn't believe the proposed application is a detriment in any way.

Mt. Rutowski is concerned about the added closet being a bedroom. Mr. Bruno said you can only access this closet through the master bedroom walk-in closet. The only

reason why windows will be installed in the new proposed closet, is for esthetics on the outside of the home.

A motion was made by Mr. Rutowski to grant the requested variances. The motion was seconded by Dr. Perez, and carried by a roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairman Flaherty	Yes
Mr. Curran	Yes
Ms. Nettleship-Carraher	Yes
Dr. Perez	Yes
Mr. Rutowski	Yes
Mr. Swift	Yes
Chairman Pantaleo	Yes

Mr. Ferraro will draft a resolution that will be voted on at the July 16, 2024 Board of Adjustment meeting.

NEW APPLICATION

ZB24-3

LC Developers

260 Prospect Avenue

Block 2507 / Lot 5

Subdivision

Attorney, Mr. Bruce Dexter from the law firm of Dexter & Kilcoyne was present as the attorney for the applicant.

The applicants' engineer, Mr. Richard Eichenlaub, whose office is located in Park Ridge, was sworn in and accepted as an expert witness.

The plans were prepared by Engineer Mr. Tom Skrable. Mr. Skrable had was not able to testify at tonight's hearing.

Mr. Eichenlaub said that 12-15 years ago, he prepared plans for the past owner of the property. One set of plans was designed with a flag lot, and the other set of plans was designed with a cul-de-sac. He is unsure if Mr. Doxey ever went to the board with the application.

Mr. Eichenlaub spoke about the application. The existing site is occupied by a two-story, two-family dwelling. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the existing lot to construct a new dwelling. The existing two-story, two-family dwelling will remain.

A discussion regarding drainage and the location of the seepage pits was had by Mr. Dunlea and Mr. Eichenlaub. The water drains the southern direction on the site. The proposed installation of a berm will help with drainage.

A total of 28 trees will be removed to accommodate the new home. Lot 5.01 has the existing dwelling. No trees will be removed on 5.01.

Additional proposed parking will be at the front of the site.

Currently, there is an encroachment of the existing driveway onto the neighbor's property. This will be rectified.

Chairman Pantaleo asked what prevents drainage to the Hillsdale properties. Mr. Eichenlaub said he doesn't believe there is any impact at all on the Hillsdale properties.

Proposed Lot 5.01 is over on impervious coverage. 35% is permitted and 36.56% is proposed.

Mr. Rutowski asked about where the residents of lot 5.01 will be parking. Mr. Eichenlaub answered the question and showed the proposed parking on the plans.

Vice Chairman Flaherty asked if the Fire Department had any issues with this application. The Park Ridge Fire Marshall, Mr. John Hansen, issued a review that said there were no objections to this application.

Mr. Eichenlaub spoke about the paving of the driveway and eliminating the impervious coverage variance.

The water table was discussed. The drainage system will have to be designed for the water table in that location.

The contract purchaser, Mr. Louis Chiellini from 22 Ruth Place, was sworn in by Mr. Ferraro. The owner of the property is Ms. Janet Leach.

It was asked how many bedrooms are in the present two-family home. Mr. Chiellini said there are two bedrooms downstairs and one tenant upstairs. He said there is plenty of parking for the tenant.

Mr. Chiellini spoke about the water flow.

Mr. Chiellini said he is a builder with over 35 years' experience. The new proposed home is not yet designed. He is considering building the new home for himself.

No variances will be required for the new proposed home.

The existing driveway goes right to the garage.

Lot 5.01 will continue to be a pre-existing, non-conforming two-family home. The application is before this board because they are increasing a non-conforming use.

Ms. Nettleship-Carraher inquired about why this board did not receive information regarding the previous application. The attorney prepared the application and he was not aware of the previous application.

Mr. Dunlea said that looking at the tax map, it's showing an existing cul-de-sac. He asked Mr. Eichenlaub to look into this matter, as it will need to be vacated.

Mr. Eichenlaub said this application will need to be filed with the county. He believes the county will require an easement. Even with the required easement, the applicant will still be conforming with frontage.

Mr. Dunlea said that if this application is approved, a soil moving permit will be required. Also, the proposed seepage pits on the plans are undersized. Mr. Skrable will need to update the plans.

A conversation was had pertaining to the low point on the south westerly corner. Mr. Dunlea suggested that the applicant should consider both lots having their own stormwater plan. Mr. Chiellini said there is a standing water issue. He can put in a seepage pit on lot 5.01. If the water table is an issue, he can install a Cultec system. The applicant is going to reevaluate this matter.

The utilities for the proposed dwelling will be run off of Prospect Avenue.

There will be a total of 28 trees that will need to be removed. The trees will be replaced with the required amount of shade trees.

Mr. Dunlea said a metes and bounds description will need to be submitted.

Any proposed lighting on the home will not negatively impact the neighbors.

The dimensions of the front driveway were discussed. All dimensions are subject to change after county approval is received.

Mr. Dickerson said most items in his review letter were addressed. He asked about the FAR calculations for the current house. The applicant could not answer as the calculations were not done.

There are no sidewalks proposed for this home. It was recommended that sidewalks be provided. Mr. Chiellini agreed.

Mr. Chiellini agreed to replace street trees. No Oak trees.

The meeting was open to the public to ask questions of Mr.

Mr. Frank Schneider – 268 Prospect Avenue

Spoke about the driveway location.

Mr. Schneider said he has some severe flooding on his site.

Mr. Schneider asked if the utilities needed to be relocated, would you have to go under the driveway with the utilities? Mr. Eichenlaub said possibly.

Mr. Schneider asked what type of landscaping would be used as a screen because the amount of deer on the property is a concern. Mr. Chiellini said he would plant Green Giants.

A conversation was had pertaining to exactly where the flooding was coming from. Mr. Schneider spoke about the ejector in his basement.

Mr. Schneider said he has no issue with the new home. His issue is with the existing home and the drainage.

A conversation was had pertaining to the easements required by the county.

Mr. Schneider's fence is way off his property line. Giving more property to the applicant.

A discussion was had pertaining to the ponding water.

Mr. Dunlea suggested the engineer shade in the driveway area on the plans and show elevations and grading.

Mr. Schneider said that the tenant of the house parks on their property and asked if that was an issue. This is not a Board of Adjustment issue.

The applicants' planner, Mr. Alexander McClean, gave his background experience and was sworn in and accepted as an expert witness.

The engineering plans dated March 11, 2024, from Mr. Thomas Skrable were marked as Exhibit A-1.

The five photographs submitted were marked as Exhibit A-2.

Mr. McClean went over the application. A D2 variance is required.

No variances are needed for proposed Lot 5.02.

Lot width, street frontage, dwelling width and impervious coverage were identified by Mr. Nickerson.

The existing home was built in the 1880s.

Mr. McClean went over the positive criteria for the application. Mr. McClean spoke about the negative criteria for the application. He believes relief can be granted without any substantial detriments.

McClean believes all criteria for this application have been met.

Vice Chairman Flaherty asked if there was any way to create the lots, as they are regular in size.

Chairman Pantaleo said the existing lot, as it stands today, is conforming.

The variance for impervious coverage has now been eliminated.

Mr. Dickerson asked if there was any detriment to the public good. McClean doesn't believe so.

Mr. Dickerson asked that the FAR calculations on the existing home be submitted.

Mr. Dickerson asked for the height of the proposed home. The proposed home will be 27 ft.

The board asked the applicant to come back in July with updated plans, drainage and proposed landscape plans.

A motion was made by Mr. Rutowski to move this application to the July 16, 2024 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Perez, and carried by a roll call vote as follows:

Vice Chairman Flaherty	Yes
Mr. Curran	Yes
Ms. Nettleship-Carraher	Yes
Dr. Perez	Yes
Mr. Rutowski	Yes
Mr. Swift	Yes
Chairman Pantaleo	Yes

This application has been moved to the July 16, 2024 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. No further notice will be required.

No board discussion took place.

The meeting was adjourned on a motion from Vice Chairman Flaherty, seconded by Mr. Rutowski and carried by all.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tonya Janeiro

Resolution #2024-4
Application # ZB24-2
6-18-2024

BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, ALFRED LOUIS SANZARI AND ALYSSA LOUISE SANZARI (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant"), being the owner of premises known as 41 Randolph Street, in the Borough of Park Ridge, County of Bergen and State of New Jersey, said premises also being known as Lot 7 in Block 1102 on the Tax Assessment Map for the Borough of Park Ridge. Commonly known as 41 Randolph Street, applied to the ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE (hereinafter referred to as "BOARD"), seeking variances in order to construct an addition to the existing house. The property is non-confirming in several respects, as follows:

Building Coverage	Proposed	Required
Minimum Front Yard Setback On Randolph	27.8 feet (roof over stoop on Randolph, 22 feet on Midland)	25 feet
Minimum Lot Depth	100 feet (pre-existing non conformity)	120 feet
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	28.9 feet (pre-existing non conformity)	35 feet
Maximum building coverage	20.45%	20 %
Maximum Floor Area Ratio	33.2%	30%

WHEREAS, the premises are located in the R-10 Residential Zoning District as same is defined by the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge; and

WHEREAS, the BOARD has received the exhibits and documents with respect to this application as more particularly set forth on the list attached hereto and made part hereof; and

WHEREAS, the BOARD held a hearing in connection with the application, upon due notice as required by law, on May 21, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the BOARD has carefully considered the application and all evidence and testimony submitted in connection therewith; and

WHEREAS, the BOARD voted to approve the aforesaid application following the close of the public hearing thereon on May 21, 2024, and the within resolution is a memorialization of said approval pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10g (2).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE that the BOARD hereby makes the following findings of fact:

1. Applicant is the owner of premises located at 41 Randolph Street in the Borough of Park Ridge, also known and designated as Lot 7 in Block 1102 on the Tax Map of the Borough of Park Ridge, a non-conforming lot containing 10,000 square feet. (10,000 square feet required) with a lot width of 100 feet (85 feet required) and a lot depth of 100 feet (120 feet required) and currently improved with an existing single family residential structure.
2. The existing property and structure also contain several pre-existing non-conformities including lot depth (120 feet required, 100 feet provided), and minimum rear yard setback (27.8 feet provided, 35 feet required) and
3. The Applicant, Alfred Louis Sanzari was sworn and testified that he is proposing the addition because his family is expanding and they need more room, including more storage room. He further testified that there is a fair amount of construction in the neighborhood with expansions of homes and that he believes that the proposal is in keeping with the

neighborhood.

4. The applicant then called his architect and planner, Linda DeNobile Menze, as a witness and she was qualified and testified as an expert in architecture and planning on behalf of the applicants.

5. The witness testified that the existing dwelling is a corner property with an existing 2 story bi-level home. The property has 100 feet of frontage. She has designed a two-story addition and a two car garage. There will be a master bedroom and bath, storage areas, and other improvements. The addition is approximately 9.4 feet by 33 feet along the left side of the property toward the side adjacent to Midland Avenue.

6. The witness further testified that there were site constraints such as the location of the house on the site and the short rear yard.

7. The witness further stated that the proposed addition will add two (2) bathrooms to the second floor as well as provide a washer and dryer which are currently located in the basement.

8. The witness testified that, if the proposal is approved, the house will contain approximately eighteen hundred (1,800) square feet.

9. The witness also testified that any air conditioning equipment which is added will comply with the Ordinances regarding required screening and location.

10. The applicant has agreed to comply with the terms of the review letter from Neglia Engineering dated April 22, 2024.

11. The witness testified that the encroachment on Midland Avenue will be consistent with the encroachment of other homes along Midland Avenue. The BOARD finds that by reason of the location of the existing house on the lot, the non-conforming size of the lot, and

the setbacks in the neighborhood, that the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the Applicant pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c) (1).

5. The BOARD further finds that construction of the addition will enhance the aesthetics of the appearance of the building and will promote a desirable visual environment. The BOARD finds and concludes that the benefits from the granting of the variances for the proposed addition outweigh any detriment pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70 (c) (2).

6. Moreover, the BOARD finds that:

- (a) the proposed improvements are aesthetically pleasing and further the zoning purpose of maintaining the housing stock.
- (b) the variances are not substantial and can be granted under N.J.S.A. 40A:55D-70(c)(2).
- (c) The variances are consistent with the master plan and will not be detrimental to the zone plan.
- (d) The variance for floor area ration is de minimus and is partially the result of the covered porch.

By reason of the foregoing, the BOARD finds that a decision to grant the variances required to allow the construction of the addition will not result in any substantial detriment to the public good nor will same impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan or Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE, by virtue of the foregoing, and pursuant to the authority of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(1) and (2), the BOARD does hereby grant the Applicant's requested variances so

EXHIBIT LIST
BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE ZONING BOARD

APPLICANT: ZB 24-2
ADDRESS: 41 Randolph Street
BLOCK: 1102 LOT 4
ZONE: R-10

EXHIBIT:	ITEM NO.	DATE:
Site Plan	1	12/11/2023
Colorized site plan	2	12/11/2023
7 photographs submitted by applicant	3	No date

as to permit the addition, as more particularly set forth in this resolution and as shown on the plans submitted to the BOARD. The applicant will obtain all other governmental approvals required.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Dated: June 18, 2024

Introduced by: *Gregory Perez*

Seconded by: ~~*Gregory Perez*~~
Jeff Rutowski

Approved

Frank Pantaleo
Z. N. L.