

**GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD**  
**Minutes of the February 4, 2016 Meeting**

The regular meeting was called to order by Chairman Bob VanLangen at 7:30 p.m.

In attendance were Mr. Knapp, Mayor Packer, Kristine Morieko, Robert Tirserio, Ken Hrasdzira, Scott King, Tim Macdonald and Kristen Bond. Also in attendance was Borough Attorney, Stuart Liebman, Borough Planer Ed Snieckus and Borough Engineer Gary Ascolese. The Secretary called the roll and read the Sunshine Statement from the Open Public Meetings Act.

At this time, Mayor Packer swore in new Planning Board member Kristen Bond as well as Environmental Commission member R. Scott King.

**Reorganizational Meeting:**

As Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Mr. Hrasdzira stated it is the Committee's recommendation to nominate Mr. VanLangen as Chairman for 2016 and Mr. Knapp as Vice-Chairman for 2016. Mr. Hrasdzira made this motion with Mayor Packer seconding the motion. The voice vote was as follows:

Mr. VanLangen asked if there were any additional nominations. There were none.

AYES: Mr. Knapp, Mayor Packer, Councilwoman Morieko, Mr. Tirserio, Mr. Hrasdzira,  
Mr. King, Mr. VanLangen  
NAYS: None

A motion was made by Mr. Hrasdzira and seconded by Mr. Knapp to appoint Stuart Liebman, Esq. as Board Attorney. The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Mr. Knapp, Mayor Packer, Councilwoman Morieko, Mr. Tirserio, Mr. Hrasdzira,  
Mr. King, Mr. VanLangen  
NAYS: None

A motion was made by Mr. Hrasdzira and seconded by Mr. Knapp to appoint Mrs. Nancy Spiller as Board Secretary. The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Mr. Knapp, Mayor Packer, Councilwoman Morieko, Mr. Tirserio, Mr. Hrasdzira,  
Mr. King, Mr. VanLangen  
NAYS: None

A motion was made by Mr. Hrasdzira and seconded by Mr. VanLangen for the ratification of Mr. Gary Ascolese, Boswell Engineering as Borough Engineer. The voice vote was as follows:

## GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of February 4, 2016

Page 2 of 7

AYES: Mr. Knapp, Mayor Packer, Councilwoman Morieko, Mr. Tirserio, Mr. Hrasdzira,  
Mr. King, Mr. VanLangen

NAYS: None

A motion was made by Mr. Hrasdzira and seconded by Mayor Packer for the ratification of Mr. Ed Snieckus, Burgis Associates as Borough Planner. The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Mr. Knapp, Mayor Packer, Councilwoman Morieko, Mr. Tirserio, Mr. Hrasdzira,  
Mr. King, Mr. VanLangen

NAYS: None

A motion was made by Mr. Knapp and seconded by Mr. VanLangen for the ratification of the By-Laws. The voice vote was as follows:

AYES: Mr. Knapp, Mayor Packer, Councilwoman Morieko, Mr. Tirserio, Mr. Hrasdzira,  
Mr. King, Mr. VanLangen

NAYS: None

The Board reviewed the minutes of the November 30, 2015 work session and December 3, 2015 regular meeting. A motion to accept the minutes was made by Mr. Knapp seconded by Mr. King and passed unanimously with Mr. Hrasdzira abstaining from the regular meeting.

AYES: Mr. Knapp, Mr. Tirserio, Mr. Hrasdzira, Mr. King, Mr. Macdonald, Mr.  
VanLangen

NAYS: None

### **Old Business:**

Discussion of bulk requirements included in proposed AR-1 Age Restricted Housing District Zone for Block 127, Lots 2, 3 and 4.

Mr. VanLangen began by stating the purpose of this discussion is not to bring the AR-1 District to a vote, but rather an understanding. The best place to start would be to ask our professionals to translate the key points in this proposal.

Mr. Snieckus began by stating he has reviewed early documentation as well as Ordinance 1726, which was introduced November 9, 2015. This ordinance is looking to create a new zone. This will further enhance the Borough's Master Plan objective in meeting the needs of this population.

## GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of February 4, 2016

Page 3 of 7

Mr. Snieckus summarized some of the bulk requirements that are proposed for this zone:

- ✓ A minimum lot area of two acres with a minimum permitted density is 30 units per acre.
- ✓ The lot width at the front yard setback is a minimum of 150'
- ✓ The front yard setback from a public street is a distance of 40'
- ✓ Side yard setbacks shall be no less than 15'
- ✓ The combined side yard setbacks shall be no less than 30'
- ✓ The rear yard setback shall be no less than 30'
- ✓ Building coverage shall be no more 35% of the lot area
- ✓ Total impervious coverage shall be no more than 60% of the lot area
- ✓ Open space and passive recreation shall be no less than 40% of the lot area, including features such as benches, picnic tables or shade structures
- ✓ Building height is a maximum of 45'
- ✓ Off street parking will also be available of 1.5 spaces
- ✓ Parking spaces shall be no less than 10' x 10' in size
- ✓ Landscape buffers shall be installed being no less than 10' in width and shall be installed along adjoining properties
- ✓ There are specific architectural standards which will be permitted including patios
- ✓ There are specific safety conditions such as requiring fire protection systems and automatic sprinklers
- ✓ All buildings shall be constructed with fire breaks
- ✓ Garages shall be separated from the residential units by concrete floors

Mr. VanLangen asked Mr. Snieckus to help the Board understand how the issues of setbacks and heights relates to the standards in the town and region and how obtrusive it may or may not be.

Mr. Snieckus stated one of the concerns was the building height. The proposed building height is a maximum of 45'. Currently the building height in the A-2 zone is 32'. This is going to be a multi-family type development. Often times with elevators within buildings there is a need to house enough units within a building to have the elevators be economical. Additionally, when parking is designed underground certain efficiencies need to be included, i.e. elevators. Building heights are based upon the lowest point outside of the garage. Based on the architectural elevations for this project, and from the point of measurement, the height will actually be 35'.

Mr. VanLangen clarified that to the untrained eye, looking at the building from Prospect Street it will appear to only be a height of 35'. Mr. Snieckus replied that is his understanding.

Mr. VanLangen asked if each building is measured separately or is it the average of the buildings.

Mr. Snieckus replied each building is measured separately.

## GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of February 4, 2016

Page 4 of 7

Discussion and clarification of the height of the roof line versus the roof pitch ensued.

Mr. VanLangen asked how this proposed zone compares with other towns that have similar types of use.

Mr. Snieckus replied the 35' roof line is typical. A 40' setback from a public street also seems appropriate and will "lessen" the impact of a higher roof line.

Mr. Knapp asked if this AR-1 zone for the town or for a specific area of the town. If someone were to come along ten years from now and create a new development, will a new ordinance need to be passed?

Mr. Snieckus replied it is possible a new ordinance would need to be passed. This proposal is relating to the property on Prospect Street.

Mr. Knapp commented it seems that if an ordinance is passed it should be for the entire town and not one particular district, simply so we do not have to go through this process again. Additionally, when the Master Plan was updated it stated that the district would be determined first and then a developer would appear. In this instance, it is definitely the other way around.

Mr. VanLangen stated a comment was made earlier about "protections" being put in place. Mr. VanLangen referred to the building height and wondered if wording could be put in the ordinance to protect other areas in town from constructing a 45' high building.

Mr. Snieckus replied even though the ordinance states a height of 45' is permissible, because of the slope of the geography it appears to be 35'. The ordinance could certainly be constructed to take into consideration the slope of the land.

Mrs. Spiller noted that in the future if additional properties were to come forward and request to be in the AR-1 zone, the Mayor and Council could vote to amend the ordinance.

Mr. Snieckus replied that is correct, adding that is also why the Re-examination Report is conducted.

Mr. Knapp commented this is all well and good, except the Master Plan still states the district should be established prior to a developer coming in.

Mrs. Spiller disagreed.

Mr. Knapp clarified that the Master Plan may not specifically state this; however, the intent was to determine the zone first.

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of February 4, 2016

Page 5 of 7

Mr. Hrasdzira questioned how this property could be designated an AR-1 zone when it doesn't meeting the minimum 2 acre requirement.

Mrs. Spiller clarified that Lots 2 and 3 are currently owned by Mr. Harrison, who hopes to purchase Lot 4 from the Village of Ridgewood. Lots 2 and 3 alone do not make up the two acre requirement; however, if he is successful in purchasing Lot 4 he would have the required amount of property.

Mr. Hrasdzira questioned why are we putting the cart before the horse then?

Mr. Snieckus replied we are not talking about ownership of the property. The ordinance pertains to Lots 2, 3 and 4; regardless of who owns them.

Mayor Packer expressed concern if this zone were to become borough-wide and not site specific.

Ms. Bond asked if the developer is looking to purchase the property from the Village of Ridgewood or just looking for an easement.

Mr. Liebman swore in Richard Harrison, Principle of Glen Park Village, 676 High Mountain Road, Franklin Lakes. Mr. Harrison stated he has gone before Ridgewood several times and before they will commit they want to make sure that Glen Rock is committed. Mr. Harrison stated they are currently asking for an access agreement, which is in place. Appraisals have been done for the property and, in principle, agreed upon. Mr. Harrison stated it is his opinion that once Glen Rock agrees to the project, Ridgewood will move forward. Mr. Harrison explained that there is a sliver of property of approximately 3,000 square feet that he has proposed to purchase which "cleans up" the property lines and ultimately gives him almost 95,000 square feet, which is more than enough property to meet the necessary requirements.

Mr. VanLangen asked Mr. Snieckus to explain the COAH requirements and how they should be articulated in this ordinance.

Mr. Snieckus referred to the Master Plan read a provision currently cited. This section requires the developer to cooperate under COAH guidelines. This section in the Master Plan gives the Board(s) enough latitude to apply the appropriate standards. Mr. Snieckus added this would be something that would be recommended during site plan approval.

Mr. Liebman added through the jurisdiction of Affordable Housing in the State of New Jersey there is a process that is in place and no municipality actually knows what their actual obligation is in terms of affordable housing. If this development is approved, at the time of site plan approval it should be communicated to those working on affordable housing to determine how this development would affect Glen Rock's obligation.

## GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of February 4, 2016

Page 6 of 7

Mr. Harrison believes when there is a 55 and over development, and they are rentals, it gives a certain level of multiple toward affordable housing.

Mr. Snieckus replied a certain level of credit is given for rentals that are 55 and over; particularly if rental income limits are taken into consideration. There is some limitation as to what, and how much, can be applied to the affordable housing requirement.

Mayor Packer asked if this development were strictly senior citizen (63+) would the Borough be awarded more credits.

Mr. Snieckus replied no.

Mayor Packer asked if this zone were necessary to address the age restricted housing need.

Mr. Snieckus replied he is not familiar enough with the Borough's zoning to make that determination.

Mr. Ascolese commented under the definition of building height the height of the building is determined by the vertical distance from the lowest point at grade level. Mr. Ascolese believes the grade level needs to be clarified; is it the existing grade level, the proposed grade level or even street level. Mr. Ascolese suggested defining what the grade level is prior to starting any excavation or construction.

Mr. VanLangen asked what the perception is of how this development will fit into the neighborhood. Mr. VanLangen asked if any kind of a 3-D drawing or model been developed so the public/Board can perceive more clearly what this development would look like.

Mr. Harrison commented a board was created and given to the Borough, as well as renderings were distributed in the Board's packets. Mr. Harrison noted that their project is designed to use the existing grade level.

Mr. Harrison commented he has tried to show his view from the westbound side (the residential side) versus from the Temple side.

Mr. Hrasdzira asked if someone were standing on Prospect Street and looking at Building #1, would they be able to see Building #2.

Mr. Harrison replied they would not be able to see Building #2 or #3 adding the elevations of the buildings are all the same.

## GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of February 4, 2016

Page 7 of 7

Mr. Harrison distributed a chart comparing heights of the various zones in town, which was marked as Exhibit A-1, entitled Glen Park Village new bulk requirements comparison chart.

Mr. Harrison explained the chart and the relevance to his project. A copy of the chart is attached to these minutes (the changes being highlighted in yellow). Mr. Harrison's new plan is to eliminate the underground parking as well as reduce the scale of the project.

Mrs. Spiller asked if a new site plan would be submitted.

Mr. Harrison replied the proposed ordinance is much more restrictive than the new plan he has presented. If a new site plan is required, he can do that.

Mr. VanLangen reiterated the purpose of tonight's meeting was to educate the Board and neighbors. The big concern from everyone's perspective was the appearance from the street. Whether the first plan or the second plan is approved, the distance from the street is the same.

Mr. Liebman suggested some time be given to the Borough's professionals to digest the new information received. Once this is done, they can report back to the Board.

As there was no further business before the Board a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Hrasdzira and passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Spiller  
Board Secretary