

**BOROUGH OF WOODCLIFF LAKE
PLANNING BOARD
JULY 27, 2015
MINUTES**

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. at Borough Hall by the Chairman Fry.

Adequate Notice Statement:

The Chairman announced that the Meeting, in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Law, P.L. 1975, Chapter 231, was announced at the Reorganization Meeting held on January 12, 2015 in the Municipal Building. Notice of this meeting was posted and two newspapers, The Record and The Ridgewood News were notified. Notice was also provided, in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Law, of the Planning Board's intention to conduct formal business at this meeting.

The public was advised of the Planning Board's rule that the meetings will be concluded by 11:00 p.m.

Flag Salute

Roll Call:

George Fry, Chairman	Present
Joseph Langschultz, Vice Chairman	Present
Al Dattoli	Present
Thomas Panso, Council	Present
Bertram Siegel	Present
Reuben Twersky, Alt. 1	Present
David Ciaudelli	Present
Robert Nathin	Present
David York, Alt. 2	Absent
Josephine Higgins	Present
Robert Friedberg	Present
Marc Leibman, Attorney	Present
Joe Vuich, Neglia Engineering	Present
Kathleen Thielman, Phillips Preiss Planners	Present
Tonya Tardibuono, Secretary	Present

Minutes:

The minutes of January 12, 2015 were approved, as amended on a motion from Mr. Siegel, seconded by Mr. Fry, and carried by all. The minutes of February 18, 2015 were approved, as amended on a motion from Mr. Dattoli, seconded by Mr. Nathin and carried by all.

Continuing Application:

**Woodcliff Lake Investors I, LLC – The Gables at Woodcliff Lake
County Road and Harriet Drive
Block 303, Lots 1 & 2 – Block 303.01, Lots 3 & 4
Block 401, Lots 1.01 – 1.03
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan**

Attorney Louis D'Arminio of the Price Meese law firm was present on behalf of the applicant Woodcliff Lake Investors I, LLC. He explained how the applicant did some changes and they would submit a revised set of site plans by the next meeting.

The project architect, Mr. David Griffiths an architect for Pulte Homes was previously sworn in. Mr. Griffiths introduced Exhibits A-14A and A-14B. Exhibit A-14A is the revised proposed elevation for one of the quad buildings. It also shows the typical side elevation for the Hawthorne unit. Exhibit A-14B shows the side and rear elevation for the Fairfax unit and then for reference purposes only, it shows the Stanton units side elevation. Mr. Griffiths spoke about the changes that were done. In his last presentation he explained how they were showing a very traditional and classic style of architecture. The whole theme has now been changed to be more of a craftsman style. It then allows you to introduce different roofs, treatments around the windows and doors, and different materials that mix together between masonry and siding. The style of the architecture also allows you to play with different colors. He pointed out that they will be using the same color packages that they presented last time except they will be using one color package per building. So the color changes will change per building, but the main color theme will be used on a per-building basis. As requested last time we tried to clearly define the materials we are using and introduce some different roof pitches into the mix of the style. By being able to go to a craftsman style we can change roof pitches and introduce hip roofs and brackets. So instead of just having a two-foot offset and a four-foot offset at each entry, you are able to introduce different architectural flavor as you go through the building. By emphasizing different treatments, materials and textures we can liven up each facade so they are not the same from one to the other. He pointed out that all the garages are now to the interior. That gives us a 4-foot offset and then, the single plane of the building, the maximum length is 49 feet. Another change made was instead of having a rear extension to the side of the building, we now inset those two feet. So there's a definite break between the building and what would be an optional sun room.

Mr. Griffiths stated that they switched the living area to the end, which allowed us to set up a system of how to place windows. Where we have dining areas that face to the outside we are

proposing bay windows. He was asked how much the windows stick out. Mr. Griffiths answered they project 2 feet and they vary in width from 8 and a half feet on one building to 10 feet in width on another. Mr. Griffiths discussed the placement of bay windows in Unit 24, Unit 40, Unit 13, Unit 29, Unit 26, Unit 25, Unit 1, Unit 4, Unit 5, and Unit 12. Mr. D'Arminio stated that he thinks they can fit most of the bay windows in the desired setback by adjusting the buildings. He said where we can't, we may need some slight variance relief. At this time Mr. Leibman had a board discussion about whether they feel it's an issue or not. He stated its two feet by eight feet wide on one level. He asked the board if they all in favor of allowing this and the board all nodded affirmatively. Mr. Leibman then suggested to the applicant that they should consider their application to include a 10-foot wide bump-out between the buildings so that potentially in some areas you are reduced to 21-feet. Mr. Nathin asked if it's an option or are you going to put the bay windows in. Mr. D'Arminio replied where we think it's a visible situation, they will put them in. Mr. Dattoli stated that they want it in the visible areas from Harriet and County Road.

Mr. Griffiths introduced exhibit A-15, a material sample board. He then explained in detail the materials that would be used. Mr. Nathin asked who chooses the color packages. Mr. Griffiths replied that they will pick the color package before the building is started the homeowner has no choice. Mr. Dattoli asked how many different pallets will be used. Mr. Griffiths replied that they haven't determined that, but he believes a minimum of six.

Mr. Twersky stated that it seems four of the buildings are facing County Road. He asked if similar to putting a bay window on the side elevations, can we make it a requirement that those bay windows on those four buildings are in the rear so it breaks up along County Road and looks like the front of the building? Unless this is a straight facade and it's the option of the potential buyer to have a sunroom. Can we make it a requirement to have a sunroom? Mr. D'Arminio said from a legal perspective, we do meet the code requirements with regard to that and the straightness is just the footprint. The building will go in and out, depending on what the finishes are. Mr. Leibman said it's not a zoning consideration, it's purely aesthetics and if you compel them to have the sunroom, you will get the repetitive feature that you don't want. Mr. D'Arminio replied that to address those concerns they can look at window treatments and maybe wainscot. After various questions from the Board regarding materials Mr. Leibman stated that these are aesthetic concerns and this board would like to weigh in on it. Mr. D'Arminio replied that we understand and they will regroup and take a look over the materials and options.

Mr. Dattoli asked if the Units are pre-sold prior to the start of building. Mr. Griffiths replied that our goal is to pre-sell first. That's the reason why we want the ability to put different units on different individual locations, so the buyer has the ability to choose.

The meeting was open to the public for any questions of the architect or any of the experts that have given testimony tonight or the previous meeting. The meeting was open on a motion from Mr. Nathin, seconded by Mrs. Higgins, and carried to all. With no one wishing to be heard, this public portion of the meeting was closed on a motion from Mrs. Higgins, and seconded by Mr. Langschultz and carried by all.

The project Engineer, Mr. Michael Dipple of L2A Land Design LLC of Englewood, New Jersey was previously sworn in. He spoke about the right-in and right-out where Pickwick is. He agreed with the Board that it has to be changed. He stated that they will make that change as well as some architecture and landscaping and submit the changes before the next meeting.

Mr. D'Arminio asked Mr. Dipple about the submission of the report from the Woodcliff Lake Police Department. The report inquired about a cul-de-sac where Pickwick used to be. Mr. Dipple stated that they do have a ditch there and a utility easement in that direction. However he doesn't believe a cul-de-sac is necessary and according to the Residential Site Improvement Standards, a cul-de-sac is not required. He offered the solution of striping two parking spaces and a small area at the end with "No Parking" signs. That gives the possibility for drivers to make a K-turn. Mr. Dipple stated that they are in compliance with RSIS.

The board then had questions for Mr. Dipple regarding the landscape buffer and stormwater management. This matter was then discussed by all members present.

The meeting was open to the public for any questions of Mr. Dipple on a motion from Mr. Nathin, and seconded by Mr. Siegel, and carried by all.

Darlene Schnure, Woodcliff Lake – Asked if any of the trees on the property will be cut, or will the property be clear cut. Mr. Dipple stated that they will try to save some of the trees if they are on the property line, but the ones in the middle will have to come down. He said they are in the process of surveying the trees now and will know more at the next meeting but they will do their best to save as many trees as possible.

This public portion of the meeting was closed on a motion from Mr. Siegel, and seconded by Ms. Higgins and carried by all.

The project Planner for the applicant is George Wheatle Williams of The Nishuane Group, LLC located in Montclair, New Jersey. Mr. Williams was sworn in by Attorney Marc Leibman. Mr. Williams is licensed by the State Board of Professional Planners and nationally certified. He completed his studies at Rutgers Graduate School for municipal and city regional planning. He has been working in the field of planning with a primary focus on land use, community and economic development planning for 25 years. Mr. Williams was accepted as an expert witness by the Planning Board.

Mr. Williams spoke regarding this proposed project. He explained the reason for this application is for a site plan approval, the setback for the guard house and two minor C variances for height and front yard setback. The two reliefs are for the height, but it's limited to two of the buildings and those are 25-28 and 29-32. He said beginning with the height, Municipal Land use Law allows the Board to consider it in two contexts, the C1, which allows a Board to consider hardships and the other is a C2, which allows the Board to consider a balancing between the benefits and the detriments. He stated that in his opinion the C1 would be appropriate for the height variance, and C2 for the front yard setback. Mr. Williams stated that there is no substantial detriments at

all. He said that Mr. Dipple went to great lengths to create a pattern and design that would allow the two buildings to comport with the development pattern.

Mr. D'Arminio asked if Mr. Williams would speak about the guard house. Mr. Siegel commented that it's not a guardhouse, but an ornamental demarcation. Mr. Williams replied that it is ornamental, it's the entry pavilion. Typically they are used close to private roads or entry roads, so the setback would defeat the purpose and intent of this feature. He stated that the C2 context is proper for the Boards consideration for the deviation from the setback, 50 feet required, and we are at almost 0 for the proposed setback.

The meeting was open to the public for any questions of Mr. Williams on a motion from Ms. Higgins, seconded by Mr. Nathin, and carried by all.

Joseph LaPaglia, Woodcliff Lake – Asked if the guardhouse is not functional, why can't you achieve the same objective with just signage? What's the guardhouse do? Mr. D'Arminio directed the question to architect. The architect, Mr. Griffiths replied that it's a demarcation structure that tells you that you are now entering a private development. Mr. Siegel stated that one of the rationales was that people might be dissuaded from entering the development because it becomes an indication that this is not a through street, but a residential area.

Chairman Fry asked if there will be any issues with sight distance regarding the guardhouse. Mr. Dipple replied its set back significantly from the road. It's 15 to 18 feet back from the travel way.

This public portion of the meeting was closed on a motion from Mrs. Higgins, and seconded by Mr. Friedberg and carried by all.

This matter will return on August 18, 2015 at 8:00 p.m.

This meeting was adjourned on a motion from Mr. Nathin and seconded by Mrs. Higgins and carried by all.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tonya Tardibuono". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tonya Tardibuono, Secretary