

GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD
Minutes of the March 3, 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 and Tim Macdonald. 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.

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. Snieckus began by stating they have prepared a memo, dated March 3, 2016 addressing some of the issues the Board was concerned with. This memo is attached to these minutes.

The first item concerns improved lot coverage. Borough standards are identified as 60%; however the concept plan states 62.5%. Mr. Snieckus suggested this amount should be raised to 65%. The additional 5% would be permitted if the impervious coverage was dedicated to a clubhouse in a separate structure or an outdoor recreational facility.

Another area of concern was the building height and the definition of where the measurement would be taken. Language in this ordinance states the height of the building shall be measured at the average of the grade of each of the four corners. The height of the building shall be measured from the pre-disturbed existing grade. This standard would only apply to the AR-1 zone.

Mr. Ascolese concurred with this analysis that the height should be measured from the pre-disturbed existing grade.

Mr. Snieckus continued stating the only other issue would be the tandem parking, which is not defined in the Borough code. Mr. Snieckus believes it could be permitted provided that the tandem parking is assigned to a specific user. It minimizes the additional aisle width. The size would be 9' x 36', which Mr. Snieckus believes is more than adequate.

Mr. King commented he still has an issue of increasing the impervious coverage, regardless of what the use is, primarily because there are other alternatives. For example, pervious pavers, pervious concrete or pervious asphalt could be used. Cost is not something that the Board needs to concern themselves with; however, this is something we should consider. Secondly, the Board should consider an alternative on the side yard setback restrictions to include provisions for space if there is a tall building adjoining residential property.

GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of March 3, 2016

Page 2 of 4

Mr. Hrasdzira agrees that he would rather see the impervious coverage go to 65% than 60% simply because the majority of town the standard for impervious coverage is 50%. The increase for certain amenities is understandable. The developer must keep in mind that any runoff needs to be controlled and not impairing any neighboring properties.

Mr. VanLangen asked if there were any comments from anyone in the audience.

Mr. Liebman swore in Mike Miller, 27 Pamrapo Court East - Mr. Miller commented it was previously stated that the ordinance needs to be discussed separate from the project; however in every meeting he has attended the ordinance is the project and he doesn't understand why. Mr. Miller cautioned that however Prospect Street is developed it is permanent. Mr. Miller stated there is a developer interested in the Prospect Street property hoping to build a 63 unit complex, which by his estimation could generate as many as 150 vehicles, not including visitors. Mr. Miller believes this is way too much density. Mr. Miller commented to alleviate some of the public's confusion he suggested changing the zone to SH-1 to Senior Housing (60-62+ years of age). Mr. Miller stated he has been told by the Board Attorney that people under the age of 55 could actually be evicted for non-compliance with age restrictions. He would like to see some case law supporting this. Secondly, who will monitor whether a 55+ year old has school aged children. Mr. Miller asked what will this high-density project cost the residents of Glen Rock. This is a high density traffic area, even without the Sikh Temple in session, and to add 150 vehicles will almost certainly require a traffic light. Mr. Miller believes the height is too high and should be the same as residential buildings. Mr. Miller encouraged the Board to do a plethora of studies before any decision is made regarding this property.

Mr. Liebman swore in Rick Harrison, 676 High Mountain Road, Franklin Lakes - Mr. Harrison is the owner of the subject property. Mr. Harrison noted Bergen County has studied the traffic patterns in this area and has determined there isn't any traffic impact. Mr. Harrison stated this hearing is simply creating a zone. Any application that comes in will go through the normal scrutiny and public hearings as any other would.

Mr. VanLangen reiterated we are starting with creating a zone which we believe will work.

Mr. Knapp asked if this zone were approved would it be applicable to any parcel of land, current or future that may be proposed to the town.

Mr. Liebman replied it would not be applicable to any other property at this time as this ordinance is property specific.

Mr. Knapp believes if this zone were approved it should be for any parcel of land which may come up for review.

GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of March 3, 2016

Page 3 of 4

Mr. Liebman noted there is not a parcel in Glen Rock that doesn't have a zone designation.

Mr. VanLangen noted if someone were to approach the town to do age-restricted housing, there is a high probability that this ordinance would be the template.

Mr. Liebman agreed, noting an applicant could also approach the Zoning Board requesting a Use Variance. Additionally, an applicant could approach the Board if they believe they have a property suitable for the AR-1 zoning.

Mr. Knapp clarified that the AR-1 zoning could then, potentially, be used for any piece of property.

Mayor Packer noted that if another piece of property were to come before the Board for AR-1 consideration, approval would not be automatic. Whereas, tonight's discussion for AR-1 zoning is property specific.

Mayor Packer asked for clarification on enhancing the side yard setback.

Mr. Snieckus replied in a scenario where a building is adjacent to a single family dwelling the ratio should be for every 1.5' of building the setback should 2'.

Mr. Hrasdzira commented once parameters are set for the ordinance it is very difficult to deny a developer if no variances are sought, regardless of where the property is located.

Mr. Liebman clarified if a developer came to the town with an A-2 zoned property and requested to build age restricted housing, the first step would be for them to request a zone change, which is essentially what we are doing now.

Mr. Macdonald asked if there had been any more discussion to reduce the impervious coverage from 60% down to 55%.

Mr. Ascolese replied there are numerous ways the impervious coverage could be reduced; for example impervious pavers could be used in the parking lot or walkways.

Mrs. Spiller clarified that the Borough essentially has two impervious calculations. One that is used based on lot coverage and one that is used for drainage purposes.

The Board continued to discuss the side yard setback examining various scenarios and configurations. It was determined to recommend for every foot of building height the sideyard setback would be .75'.

GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Meeting of March 3, 2016

Page 4 of 4

Discussion also ensued regarding the landscaping plan and regulations.

Mr. Harrison commented on the side yard setbacks and proposed ratios. Mr. Harrison stated currently a resident could have a 32' house with a 15' side yard setback. There should be some basis for the ratios that are being proposed.

Mr. VanLangen believes the issue here is a resident could potentially have a 40' high wall that runs the entire length of their property.

Mr. Harrison suggested if the Board is concerned with the height of the building being set at 40', simply reduce the permitted height to a comfortable height.

Mayor Packer asked what do we typically see in other municipalities in structures such as this when they are adjacent to residential properties.

Mr. Snieckus replied in structures such as this the height is typically 38-40'.

Mr. Liebman summarized that the Board would be voting on recommending an ordinance that is consistent with former ordinance 1726, as amended, as described this evening particularly with impervious coverage and a building height of 40'.

Mr. Hrasdzira made a motion to accept the proposed ordinance as stated by Mr. Liebman and recommend this ordinance to the Mayor and Council for adoption. The motion was seconded by Mr. King. The voice vote was as follows:

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

NAYS: None

As there was no further business before the Board a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mayor Packer, seconded by Councilwoman Morieko and passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Spiller
Board Secretary