

CALL TO ORDER:

This meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. via Zoom webinar by Chairwoman Robin Malley with the reading of the Open Public Meetings Act.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL:

Robin Malley, Chairwoman	Present
Sanjeev Dhawan, Vice Chairman	Present
John Altadonna, Alt. 1	Present
Gerald Barbara, Alt. 2	Present
Dianna Cereijo	Present
Christina Hembree	Present
Michael Kaufman	Present
Philip Maniscalco	Present
Lynda Picinic	Present
S. Robert Princiotta, Esq.	Present
Anthony Kurus, Engineer	Present
Elizabeth Leheny, Planner	Not requested
Meg Smith, Secretary	Present

SWEARING IN OF NEW APPOINTMENTS

The following members were sworn in by Attorney Princiotta:
Member: Philip Maniscalco (term ending December 31, 2024)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for June 28th, 2022 were approved on a motion from Mr. Kaufman, seconded by Ms. Picinic. All board members were in favor of approval with the exception of Mr. Maniscalco and Ms. Hembree who abstained due to absence from the June meeting.

APPLICATION – CARRIED TO AUGUST 23, 2022

1 Dimino Court

Block: 1704 Lot: 4.01

Scott & Suzanne Alenick

R-22.5

Requesting variances for a patio extension which proposes coverage of 32.28% where 30% is permitted. A variance for 2.28% or 515 sq. ft. would be needed.

The applicant has requested that the application be carried to the next Zoning Board meeting on August 23rd, 2022.

Mr. Princiotta stated that the application would be carried to the August 23rd meeting and that no further notice or publication would be required. Mr. Princiotta stated that revised plans and reports are due at least 10 days prior to the meeting.

REQUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION

**Jehovah Witness Kingdom Hall
45 Woodcliff Avenue**

**Block: 2004 Lot: 4
R-22.5 Zone**

Request for a D-3 Conditional Use Variance for impervious surface coverage of 53% where 30% is allowed. This coverage is being reduced from 56% previously. Amended Site Plan proposes a second ingress/egress and A/C equipment to be placed in the front yard setback.

Ms. Rachael Ornufrak, attorney for the applicant, reviewed the application that was approved by resolution on July 28th 2020, and they came back asking for their first extension on August 24th, 2021 which will expire on August 28th, 2022.

Ms. Ornufrak could not offer the testimony from the Project Manager's because he is unable to speak, but provided the Project Manager's secretary as a witness.

Chairwoman Malley asks Mr. Princiotta for his opinion as to if testimony should be given for the second extension.

Mr. Princiotta states his opinion, the board should hear testimony from Ms. Ornufrak's witness.

Ms. Hembree asks if she is still recused due to her residing within 200 ft. of the applicant, Mr. Princiotta agrees with Ms. Hembree.

Mr. Princiotta swears in Ms. Rachel Dacko, witness for Jehovah's witness.

Ms. Ornufrak questions Ms. Dacko to explain some of the reasons/hardships they have experienced.

Ms. Dacko testifies they had been waiting for permission from Bergen County Planning/Engineering Board for approval, which they just received a week prior to this meeting. She further explains due to COVID they have been pushed back 6-8 months finding contractors as well as the supply chain issues, once they had found a contractor. Ms. Dacko explains the parking lot paving is the first step to their project and they cannot move forward without finishing that portion first. Finally, Ms. Dacko explained, all workers are volunteers and they want to ensure safety for all who will be contributing. A ban was just lifted in the spring, allowing all to gather and mobilize the work to begin.

Ms. Ornufrak questioned Ms. Dacko when Woodcliff Lake's Jehovah's Witness anticipates they will begin work.

Ms. Dacko testifies they should be able to begin in September.

Ms. Ornufrak questions when they can anticipate the job will be finished after starting in September.

Ms. Dacko testified the job will be finished in about 12 weeks as described in the resolution.

Mr. Princiotto questioned if that is a consecutive 12 weeks. Ms. Dacko answered yes, stating they have mobilized the volunteers to get the project done in 12 weeks.

Ms. Cereiyo questions the length of the extension asked for.

Ms. Dacko testifies they have asked for an 18-month extension with hope they will be finished without needing that much time, but to ensure nothing else happens that could delay the project further.

Chairwoman Malley questions Ms. Dacko if she is the project manager and for some background information on herself.

Ms. Dacko testifies that she is the project manager's assistant/expeditor and she is testifying on his behalf. He was absent due to illness. She testifies she has been getting the permits/applications/ checks together for the county and the Borough.

Chairwoman Malley questions if the project manager is a member of the Jehovah's Witness, and if this is his background.

Ms. Dacko stated the project manager is a member of Jehovah's Witness, and they have volunteers of all backgrounds working on this project. She testifies this is her project.

Chairwoman Malley states she is trying to understand time frames with this project and the volunteers and their backgrounds. She opens up to the board asking if there are any other question. Chairwoman Malley calls upon Anthony Kurus, the Borough Engineer if he has any information to add.

Mr. Kurus states he does not have anything to add.

Chairwoman Malley asks upon Mr. Princiotto if he has any last comments to add.

Mr. Princiotto questions Ms. Dacko to about her testimony stating the project can be done in about 4-5 months but they are asking for an extension of 18 months, to assure they will have enough time.

Ms. Dacko testifies they need to begin and finish the parking lot project first and if the board grants the extension, the paving contractor is ready and waiting to begin immediately. She testifies the extension would give them enough time for the county to get their paperwork processed, stating September would be the start of the paving project.

Mr. Princiotto questions what is next after the paving is finished.

Ms. Dacko testifies she is not sure, but she would be happy to provide the timeline her project manager has, to the board at a later date if need be.

Mr. Princiotta states he does not find this necessary. He then asks Ms. Ornufrak if she has anything to add.

Ms. Ornufrak states to Chairwoman Malley they have a big group managing the volunteers, a group of engineers, and contractors to get this project started and keep it on track. She states they are very quick about finishing their projects, once started. She states they are very excited to begin their project and they apologize for the many setbacks they have encountered. She closes her statement asking for the 18- month extension.

Mr. Princiotta states everyone can agree Jehovah's Witness had some hardship with the pandemic and the approvals but it is up to the board's discretion as to what they wish to grant for the extension. He reiterates the project was to move the ac equipment, change the signage, and renovate the interior of the hall.

Chairman Malley questions if anyone or Vice Chairman Dhawan has any questions.

Vice Chairman Dhawan states he can relate to their delays as he is living with the same delays in his projects in work. He states he has no issue with the request.

Mr. Kaufman is asked by Chairman Malley if he has anything to add to Vice Chairman's statement. Mr. Kaufman states Mr. Princiotta gave his professional opinion and agrees with Vice Chairman Dhawan.

Chairman Malley asks if there are any other questions, stating Ms. Hembree had her concerns about the weeds, asking to keep the property clean.

Ms. Ornufrak states they will keep it clean and it was in the resolution as well.

Chairwoman Malley stated she would like to see that the site is kept clean and it is not being delayed.

Public Session

The meeting was opened to the public on a motion from Mr. Maniscalco, seconded by Mr. Kaufman, and carried by all.

The phone number was provided to the public to call in with any questions or concerns. The public was also advised that if they were participating via Zoom that they could raise their hand to ask a question or make a comment.

There were no members of the public calling in or raising their hand on Zoom.

The meeting was closed to the public with a motion by Mr. Kaufman, seconded by Mr. Maniscalco, and carried by all.

A motion was made by Mr. Kaufman and seconded by Mr. Maniscalco to approve the Time Extension requested. On a roll call vote Chairwoman Malley, Vice Chairman Dhawan, Ms. Cereijo, Mr. Kaufman, Mr. Maniscalco, Ms. Picinic, and Mr. Altadonna voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Hembree abstained.

APPLICATION – NEW

75 Carnot Avenue

Block: 1906 Lot: 1

Sascha Kreideweis

R-22.5

Requesting variances to construct a two-story stairway addition and a second story addition over the existing garage which will require two variances for setbacks of 16 ft. and 6.92 ft. where 20 ft. is required. Variances of 4 ft. and 13.08 ft. would be needed.

Chairwoman Malley asks the applicant, Mr. Kreideweis if he is representing himself.

Mr. Kreideweis states he is representing himself.

Mr. Princiotto asks the Board Secretary if we have received proof of proper notice of publication and service to those on the 200 ft list.

Ms. Smith agrees we have proper proof of public notice and service.

Mr. Princiotto swears in Mr. Kreideweis. Mr. Princiotto states there are questions on the Application asking if there have been previous applications to the board before.

Mr. Princiotto asks Mr. Kreideweis if he is aware of any prior variances or appeals that have been submitted by previous owners.

Mr. Kreideweis states he is not aware of any applications coming to the board but he believes from previous work performed on the house in 2006/2007, exceeding into setback lines he would imagine there might have been an application, but he is not aware of any.

Mr. Princiotto makes Mr. Kreideweis aware there are previous applications, a legal appeal and it did go to court and come back to the board with additional hearings and a second application. There is also a letter of objection. Mr. Princiotto states he is telling Mr. Kreideweis this to see if he wishes to obtain an attorney or proceed on his own.

Mr. Kreideweis states he was not informed he needed an attorney. He states he was never told he needed an attorney, and he states his architect informed him he could move forward with the meeting on his own. He states as a resident he was unaware.

Mr. Princiotto states to Mr. Kreideweis he not required to have an attorney, and can move forward representing himself. Mr. Princiotto explains he was just made aware of the previous applications/resolutions and the appeal for 75 Carnot Avenue. He questioned the board secretary when the letter of objection was received.

Board Secretary Meg Smith confirmed the letter of objection was received the day before the meeting. She explained after receiving the letter, that prompted her to look into the files

and see if there were any previous applications associated with 75 Carnot Avenue. She stated she sent the letter of objection to the applicant, Mr. Kreideweis the day of the meeting.

Mr. Kreideweis states he has not seen the letter of objection. He states he will review the letter with his architect. He questions Mr. Princiotta if his advice is to get an attorney. He asks to know what the letter of objection is about.

Mr. Princiotta states to Mr. Kreideweis he is not recommending he get an attorney but it is understandable if Mr. Kreideweis wishes to do so. Mr. Princiotta questions how many witnesses Mr. Kreideweis would have this evening?

Mr. Kreideweis states he has no witnesses, only himself.

Mr. Princiotta questions the applicant if his architect is scheduled to testify at the meeting.

Mr. Kreideweis testifies he had discussed with his architect before the meeting and felt it best that the architect was not needed.

Mr. Princiotta states it is up to the applicant who he wishes to have as a witness.

Mr. Kreideweis states he was unaware he needed a witness.

Mr. Princiotta explains to Mr. Kreideweis it is not up to him to tell the applicant who he should call or have as a witness, but that he is simply making Mr. Kreideweis aware of his rights. Mr. Princiotta states he was questioning who the applicant's witnesses are.

Mr. Kreideweis questions if his witnesses can be the participants already on the call.

Mr. Princiotta states the applicant's witnesses do not have to be in person but present on the call due to the fact the meetings are still virtual and not in person. Mr. Princiotta explains to the applicant, his witnesses would have to be given a link by the board secretary or come in as the public on the zoom call.

Chairwoman Malley explains to the applicant his witness does not need to be present with him but the witnesses can be on the zoom call in another place.

Meg Smith, board secretary explains she believes there is some confusion. She explains she believes Mr. Kreideweis thinks his witnesses need to be present with him. She further explains he does not have to have a witness or an attorney represent him. She receives clarification from Mr. Princiotta.

Mr. Princiotta states the applicant has the right to proceed how he would like, but that there are certain proofs required and if those proofs are not met, then the application can be denied. Mr. Princiotta explains he does not know Mr. Kreideweis' background and what questions the board members have. He states an architect may only be able to answer some of the board's questions. He explains after some applicants represent themselves, and others have witnesses, some have architects, planners and a variety of witnesses. He then asks the applicant how he wishes to proceed with the meeting.

Mr. Kreideweis questions his options for how to proceed.

Ms. Hembree explains there is a history with the applicant's property at 75 Carnot Ave that he is not aware of, and explain the history. She states he needs to be made aware of the history. She explains there were two variances with this property, stating one was denied and one was sent to court. She states it is not a secret, that it is public record.

Mr. Princiotta explains the options for Mr. Kreideweis has for how to proceed. He states the applicant can ask for the application to be carried to the next meeting, in order to prepare with his architect and review the prior variances/appeal, or the applicant may go forward with his testimony tonight and it would be continued to the next meeting. Mr. Princiotta states he believes the planner should review this application as well. Mr. Princiotta leaves the decision to the applicant.

Mr. Kreideweis questions what is the best possible way to move forward. He explains he does not wish to waste anyone time.

Mr. Princiotta states he is the Board's attorney and he is there to guide the board.

Mr. Kreideweis questions the board secretary, Meg as to what is the best option for him to move forward.

Mr. Princiotta states we cannot give him advice as to how to move forward. He states the applicant is not required to have an attorney but he is welcome to have one. Mr. Princiotta recommends to the board that the borough planner review this application as well.

Mr. Kreideweis explains he was told to show up to the meeting himself, but he believes it would be in his best interest to have the application carried to the next meeting in order to prepare himself after reading the letter of objection.

Mr. Princiotta confirms that Mr. Kreideweis wishes to have the application carried to the next meeting.

The applicant has requested that the application be carried to the next Zoning Board meeting on August 23rd, 2022.

Mr. Princiotta asks the board secretary to have the board planner review the application.

Mr. Kreideweis asks if the board planner was the one who he received the first review from.

Anthony Kurus, board engineer stated the review came from his office and there would not be a second review of the application.

Mr. Princiotto stated that the application would be carried to the August 23rd meeting and that no further notice or publication would be required.

Chairwoman Malley asks the board be given the information of the previous variances/ appeal associated with the applicant's property, 75 Carnot Avenue.

Meg Smith, confirmed she will send the information out to the entire board.

Mr. Princiotto and Chairwoman Malley discussed the next meetings schedule.

The meeting was adjourned on a motion from Ms. Hembree, seconded by Mr. Kaufman, and carried by all.

Respectfully submitted,

Clairese Neumann