**BLOOMINGDALE PLANNING BOARD**

**101 Hamburg Turnpike**

**Bloomingdale, NJ 07403**

Minutes

Regular Meeting 7:30pm

September 27, 2023

**CALL TO ORDER @ 7:32pm**

**SALUTE TO FLAG**

**LEGAL**

This is the Regular Meeting of the Bloomingdale Planning Board of September 27, 2023 adequate advance notice of this meeting has been provided by publication in the Herald and News and also posted on the bulletin board at the Council Chamber entrance in the Municipal Hall of the Borough of Bloomingdale, Passaic County, in compliance with the New Jersey Open Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 seq.

**FIRE CODE**

Per State Fire Code, I am required to acknowledge that there are two “Emergency Exits” in this Council Chamber. The main entrance through which you entered and a secondary exit to the right of where you are seated. If there is an emergency, walk orderly to the exits, exit through the door, down the stairs and out of the building. If there are any questions, please raise your hand now.

**ROLL CALL MEMBERS/ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT (\*denotes alternate)**

James W Croop Bill Graf Dominic Catalano

Mark Crum Edward Simoni Mayor D’Amato Brian Guinan\*

Bill Steenstra Craig A Ollenschleger Robert Lippi\* Margaret Covert\*

Bill Graf Barry Greenberg Wayne Hammaker\*

**MEMBERS ABS/EXCUSED**

Robert Lippi – ex

**MINUTES**

8-23-23

A motion is made by Comm. Steenstra, 2nd by Comm. Graf to approve minutes of 8/23/23 meeting. Roll call shows 7-0

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**#715** Gjoni Construction, LLC 120-124 Main Street Block 5059 Lot 12,13,14

Board Attorney, Richard Brigliadoro states that he has reviewed the notice and that it appears in order and the Board has the jurisdiction to hear the application.

Steven Schepis, attorney representing the applicant, states that this is a conditional use, with a site plan and c-variance for a fence.

At this time, Mr. Schepis introduces the applicant’s engineer, Jeffrey Houser of Houser Engineering, 1141 Greenwood Lake Turnpike, Ringwood, NJ.

Mr. Houser is accepted as a qualified engineer.

Mr. Schepis presents a series of photos showing 120, 122 and 124 Main Street. These photos are entered as exhibit A-l.

Mr. Houser describes the lay of the land stating that it consists of 3 lots in the center district zone. There are currently 3 houses, one on each property. He refers to the photos depicting each property and states that there is also a garage on one property, which gives a total of 4 structures on the properties. They wish to consolidate all three properties into one continuous lot. There is a post office to the west of the properties and a church to the east. North are residential structures and a school.

The intent is to construct a 13,252 square foot, 3 story building.

The first story would have 2 retail units. They are proposing 10 units on the 2nd floor and 10 units on the third floor. This complies with the BCD zone.

The nature of the retail units will be determined, but the applicant will stipulate to them being a permitted use.

The applicant is required to put 3 affordable housing units on site. A one bedroom, a two bedroom and a 3 bedroom will be included.

There is a mix of residential and commercial properties in the surrounding area. The lot frontage will be 161.1 ft., the depth is 198.1 ft. and the coverage is at 42.7%.

The height of this building is 33.4’ where 40’ is the maximum permitted height.

The proposed parking garage will provide 24 physical parking spaces (including 3 tandem), 2 ADA and 5 EV spaces.

Mr. Schepis states, from a practical standpoint, they probably would not need 5 EV spaces.

They are proposing 32 physical spaces (2 ADA and a minimum of 2 EV). Plans will be revised

accordingly.

Mr. Houser speaks of the grading and states that the lot slopes severely from North to South. They did a slope analysis and in terms of disturbance and it is as follows:

 0-15% slope the disturbance is 13,887 sq. ft

 15-25% slope the disturbance is 1,745 sq. ft.

 25% & greater slope the disturbance is 5,920 sq. ft.

The site will use public water and sewers. There will be stormwater detention in the parking lot.

Chairman Simoni states that in terms of disturbance it may be better to construct two walls instead of one big one.

Mr. Houser states that if there is ledge rock, it could be stabilized without a wall. This can and will be designed if approved.

Mr. Schepis states the conditions found will determine what kind of wall needs to be constructed.

Mr. Boorady asks if any test bits were done.

Mr. Houser states they have not yet been done.

Mr. Boorady states that he is concerned about water run-off. The plans need to revisit how high water is controlled and mitigated.

Mr. Houser agrees and is open to revisiting the run-off for stormwater management.

Mr. Boorady refers to the wall and asks what material they will be using. He feels highway blocks might not be aesthetically pleasing. The board might want to know what material they plan to use. Some sort of exhibit or explanation might be a good idea.

Chairman Simoni states that a school and residents are above the property, so whatever is used they need to make sure it is engineered properly because we don’t want any issues 10 years down the road.

Mr. Houser and Mr. Schepis and Mr. Boorady all agree that there will be no bin blocks. They will be engineered retaining walls.

Mayor D’Amato asks if there will be fencing on top the wall.

Mr. Boorady states that a 6’ high decorative fence is required.

Mr. Houser states that it will be vinyl coated to make it more attractive.

Mr. Schepis states that the wall length is only 20-25% of the overall frontage, but it will be visible, and they will make it aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Houser states that they will provide adequate lighting and will be more than happy to comply with Mr. Boorady’s report.

The applicant is proposing to plant a row of green giant arborvitae 5-10 in height as screening on the westerly side by the Post Office.

Chairman Simoni states that our ordinance allows for plantings and shrubs for screening instead of fence.

Comm. Greenberg states that green giant arborvitae is a good choice and if planted 5’ on center will do well to provide growth and screening. He agrees no fencing is best.

Mr. Brigliadoro states, for the record, that this will eliminate the requirement for fencing as screening between properties.

Mr. Houser states that this application does have Passaic County Planning Board approval. He said that the county had concerns about maintenance of the stormwater management. Modifications were made to comply with the county.

Mr. Boorady states that he will check on the comment and address it with the county to make sure they agree.

Mr. Houser addresses the traffic circulation and states that there is concern about the garbage truck and the turn radius to the dumpster area that is shown on the plans. There were multiple analysis run and he will submit the findings. Typically, a garbage truck is 10 ½’ high and the garage door opening is proposed to be 11’ft high.

He states that this can be made taller. He did an analysis on delivery trucks and said that standard deliveries like UPS, Fed Ex and Amazon would be fine, but a furniture delivery truck would have to back into the loading area.

Mr. Schepis states that he believes there is room to make the opening bigger.

It is agreed to make the door entrance to the garage 14’ high instead of 11’.

Comm. Croop states that 14’ is more than high enough to fit a fire or emergency vehicle.

Mr. Houser states that they have a 15’ 10” clearance from the garage floor to ceiling so the opening would be a minimum of 14’.

Mr. Boorady states that a turning template would need to be provided.

Mr. Houser also addresses Mr. Boorady’s concern, noted in his report, of the safety of pedestrians walking down the stairs near parking garage. He states that they can add a stop bar or signage. Cuts were also added for visibility.

Comm. Steenstra asks approximately how much of the retaining wall will visible.

Mr. Houser states that the total length of the wall is approx.. 120’, the back of the building is approx.. 95’. Approximately 25% of the wall will be visible. He also states that at the bottom of the wall is the dumpster area which will have fencing and landscaping which breaks up the visibility of the wall as well.

Comm. Greenberg asks how they would get on the sloped section to maintain access to the area.

Mr. Houser states they will be able to navigate that area and stipulates for the record that they will provide gate access to the area for professionals to maintain.

Comm. Ollenschleger asks for clarification on the affordable housing units. States that plan does not show a 3-bedroom unit.

Mr. Schepis states that the plans will be modified to address affordable housing to show one of each. One 1-bedroom, one 2-bedroom and one 3-bedroom will be shown to accommodate the affordable housing obligations.

Comm. Ollenschleger asks for clarification on the slope disturbance.

Mr. Houser refers to page 2 of the plans which shows a color-coded map of the slope disturbance. The white areas are flat, the green is 15-25% and the red area is over 25%.

There is roughly a 20-25% disturbance in the red area. (approx.. 60’).

 At this time Mr. Houser shows the public the disturbance slope map and the building plan.

Mr. Schepis asks what the elevation is at the rear of the property.

Mr. Houser states it is roughly 385’.

Mr. Schepis asks what the elevation is at the edge of the limit of disturbance.

Mr. Houser states that it is 320’.

Mr. Schepis states that it is roughly 60’ lower than the rear property line and will not be visible by rear neighbors.

Mr. Houser states that is correct.

Comm. Graf addresses the dumpster enclosure and states that the ordinance requires 3 sides be masonry.

Mr. Houser states that he will modify that detail on the plans.

Mr. Schepis states that the enclosure will be masonry on three sides with slotted fence/gate.

Comm. Graf asks if they will be providing a phased demo plan so the police will be aware of what, when and where this will be happening.

Chairman Simoni states that this is usually discussed at the pre-construction meeting, and we can keep the police informed for traffic control.

Comm. Graf also asks if the applicant could provide a rendering of the streetscape.

Mr. Schepis states that a rendering will be costly and would rather just provide whatever the town prefers for sidewalks and streetscape.

Mr. Brigliadoro asks Mr. Houser to provide the steep slope disturbance percentages once again for clarification.

Mr. Houser states as follows:

0-15% disturbance is 13,887 sq ft.

15-25% disturbance is 1,745 sq ft.

25% & greater disturbance is 5,920 sq ft.

He states that this table is also shown on sheet 2 of the plans.

Mr. Schepis states for the record that this site would not be able to be developed without steep slope disturbance.

He asks Mr. Houser if he would testify that, post development, the site will be stabilized.

Mr. Houser responds yes; he will testify to that.

Mr. Schepis states that projects are meant to make money and that this developer needs relief. This project is motivating the disturbance, it will not be a cheap undertaking.

At this time Mr. Boorady goes over and highlights the areas that need addressing in his letter dated 9/19/23.

Referring to his report, he states that it is clear that the applicant is replacing the sidewalk along the frontage of the property. A rendering is not necessary, but revised plans are needed to show this.

Mr. Houser agrees to the revisions.

Mr. Boorady states that it is safe to say that the soil stabilization plans will need to be provided.

He also states that the building height has changed from the plans he used for his technical report. He will need to recalculate the building height to make sure no variances are needed.

Mr. Houser agrees.

Mr. Boorady states that the grading plan will need to show ADA compliant curb ramps for the sidewalk.

He also asks if someone could address the garbage/recycling area as to anticipated volume and the frequency and times of refuse pickups.

Mr. Schepis responds that they can have more frequent pick-ups if necessary. The applicant will be able to better gauge what’s needed once they know the retail businesses that will be there. The applicant will agree to whatever is needed. This can also be taken up with the provider as to what might be needed.

Mr. Boorady refers to the lighting and states that the lighting must be dark sky compliant. He asks if there will be timers or motion detection or will lights remain on all night.

Mr. Schepis responds saying they plan to leave the lights on for safety reasons.

Mr. Boorady states that he will need the sewer calculations, and the meter, transformer and utility locations information when available. He also states that the meters should be placed where they will not be seen or in an obtrusive area.

Comm. Croop questions the size of the parking spaces which appear to be 24’.

Mr. Boorady states that 24’ is standard.

Mr. Schepis states that the utility location may be dictated by the utility company.

At this time the board breaks at 9:15pm.

The board reconvenes at 9:26pm.

Mr. Schepis discussed with Mr. Houser that they will defer the parking to another night.

A motion is made by Comm. Greenberg, 2nd by Comm. Crum to open the meeting to the public for questions of Mr. Houser.

Public – Holmes Orrego, 116 Main Street (Centi Church)

Mr. Orrego had questions on the soil disturbance during construction. How drainage will

be addressed during construction so run-off doesn’t go on to his property.

Mr. Houser states that a silt fence will be installed to keep things from washing onto adjacent properties.

Mr. Orrego has concerns about how long the construction process will be and to make sure no debris and water will be going on his property.

Mr. Houser states that good stormwater management will solve these issues.

Mr. Orrego also asks if any more parking spaces could be put in the garage since there is already a lack of parking on Main Street.

Mr. Houser states that they cannot provide any more parking spaces in the garage without disturbing more steep slope.

Mr. Schepis introduces the applicant’s architect, Mr. James P Cutillo, 593 Newark Pompton Tpk, Pompton Plains, NJ.

Mr. Cutillo is accepted as a licensed/qualified architect.

Mr. Cutillo refers to his plans dated 12/1/22 with latest revision date of 8/17/23.

He states that the first page depicts the exterior elevations, the second page shows the ground level plans and the last 2 pages show the 2nd and 3rd floors.

He states that these plans do not reflect the COAH units and the plans will be revised to include these units.

There will be an elevator and stairs in the building. There was discussion of making the garage door opening taller. There is plenty of clearance to do this. We can also lower the half wall in the garage area for visibility purposes.

The plans describe how the space in the units is laid out. The heating and A/C will all be electric. The plans will be revised to show the meters inside the parking area so that they are not visible outside the building.

The entire building will be barrier free with an elevator. This building will comply and may need some mechanical equipment on the roof but most will be contained inside the units.

Any discrepancies will be revised for the next meeting.

The building materials will be listed on the revised drawings.

Mr. Boorady asks if the mechanical on the roof is for common areas and where will the residential mechanicals be located.

Mr. Cutillo states he will show them on the revised plans.

Mr. Boorady asks if the elevator will be visible?

Mr. Cutillo states that they will add a wall to hide it.

Mr. Boorady asks if there will be a fire stairwell above the roof.

Mr. Cutillo states that there will not.

Mr. Boorady asks about an exhaust system in the garage.

Mr. Cutillo states that is a mechanical issue and will be addressed by the mechanical engineer. It may need to go on the roof, or open wall space in the garage.

He stipulates that it will not go on the adjacent properties, and they will make sure it is not seen from the back or on the roof.

Mr. Boorady asks about drainage facilities in the garage.

Mr. Cutillo responds that they have plans for stormwater with a separator.

Mr. Boorady states that because there are columns in the garage to make sure the parking spaces are realistic and that there’s enough space.

Mr. Boorady asks about signage.

Mr. Cutillo states that signage was shown on the 8/23 revision of the plans.

Comm. Graf states that the garage having no door closure could be a security issue.

Mr. Cutillo responds saying that if they were to put a door it would cause other issues.

Comm. Graf suggests that parking spaces be dedicated per unit and suggests they show numbers on the plans.

Comm. Graf states that the units with dens show walk-in closets. He suggests that these units have no wall.

Mr. Cutillo states that they can get rid of the closets and make all den walls wide open.

Comm. Greenberg adds that someone may want there to be a door on the den.

Mr. Cutillo states that they will do there best to design it so it cannot be a bedroom.

Mr. Brigliadoro adds that they could always put a condition in the resolution that clarifies this situation.

Comm. Croop refers to the mechanical units on the roof and states that if they were put closer to the front on the roof, he feels they wouldn’t be seen as much and therefore require less screening.

Chairman Simoni asks what kind of planking will be used on the entrance to the residence.

Mr. Cutillo states that there are a number of high-end planking that are affordable and look nice.

Chairman Simoni asks if there is any way the residential doors can be look different from the commercial doors.

Mr. Cutillo states that they would prefer glass doors, so no one could hide. But they will make sure commercial is different from residential.

Mr. Schepis states one topic we did not cover was the possibility of reversing the site for entrance/exit purposes.

Mr. Graf responds that he feels that should be looked into and that if this were to be done, it would benefit the applicant greatly.

Mayor D’Amato states that it may not be a good idea to have the driveway to the complex next to the church.

Mr. Schepis concludes by saying that no applicant likes a silent board and that all the board’s input will be considered.

Chairman Simoni agrees, it’s a negotiation between the town and the applicant.

Mr. Brigliadoro states for the record that this application be carried to the next regular meeting of the Bloomingdale Planning Board to be held on 10/25/23 at 7:30pm and that the applicant is not required to provide any other public notice.

**RESOLUTION**

* EXTENSION OF MINOR SUBDIVISION/LOT LINE
ADJUSTMENT APPROVAL FOR BLOCK 5105 LOT 14.01

A motion is made by Comm. Steenstra, 2nd by Comm. Graf to grant extension and memorialize Resolution for Minor Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment of Block 5105 Lot 14.01.

Roll call shows 9-0 in favor.

**RESOLUTION**

 - APPOINTING ELIZABETH K. McMANUS, P.P., A.I.C.P., LEED, AP, OF

KYLE McMANUS ASSOCIATES, LLC TO PREPARE A MASTER PLAN

AND TO APPEAR AT A PUBLIC HEARING AND TO COMPLY

WITH ALL OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE

MUNICIPAL LAND USE LAW RELATIVE TO THE ADOPTION OF A MASTER PLAN PURSUANT TO N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28

A motion is made by Comm. Steenstra, 2nd by Comm. Ollenschleger to memorialize resolution, adopted at the 7/26/23 public meeting, to retain Elizabeth McManus to prepare Master Plan. Roll call of members originally seated shows 7-0 in favor.

**PENDING APPLICATIONS**

**#702** Tri Boro Dental (Sluka) 40 Main Street Block 5088 Lot 4

**#704** 8 First Street LLC – 15 Hamburg Tpk Block 3032 Lot 3

**#708** 38 Main Street LLC 38 Main Street Block 5088 Lot 5

**#717** 46 Star Lake Road, LLC 46 Star Lake Road Block 3035 Lot 33

**#718** Lidija & Stojan Kotevska 54 Highland Ave. Block 3017 Lot 4

**#719** Green Paradise Therapy 217A Hamburg Tpk Block 3012 Lot

Board engineer states that applications #718 and #719 are close to completeness.

The Board secretary states that application #704 with be submitting revised plans in the near future and does not wish to withdrawal their application at this time.

**BILLS**

*Darmofalski –* ***App #708 38 Main St LLC $1870, App #717 46 Star Lake Road LLC $260, App #715 Gjoni Construction LLC $2600, App #719 Green Paradise Therapy LLC $130, App #718 Kotevska $1170***

*Brigliadoro-* ***App #715 Gjoni Construction LLC $720, App #688 Two Thirty Seven LLC $128, App #717 46 Star Lake Road LLC $144,*** Area in Need of Redevelopment Study$432, Master Plan Resolution $112 ***(escrow account)***

A motion is made by Comm. Greenberg, 2nd by Comm. Crum to pay bills as listed. Roll call shows 9-0 in favor.

**NEW BUSINESS**

* Distribute revised draft copy of Meer Tract Area in Need of Redevelopment Preliminary Investigation Report dated 9/11/23. Public Hearing Date: Special Meeting at 7:30pm on 10/18/23

A motion is made by Comm. Graf, 2nd by Comm. Croop to authorize a Special Public Meeting on 10/18/23 for the purpose of presenting the draft copy of the Meer Tract Area in Need of Redevelopment Report dated 9/11/23, prepared by the Board Planner, Elizabeth McManus.

Roll call shows 9-0 in favor.

**PUBLIC DISCUSSION**

A motion is made by Comm. Crum, 2nd by Comm. Catalano, to open meeting to public for questions or comments. Voice vote shows all in favor.

Seeing no public,

A motion is made by Comm. Steenstra, 2nd by Comm. Croop to close meeting to public for questions or comments. Voice vote shows all in favor.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion is made by Comm. Crum, 2nd by Comm. Greenberg, to adjourn meeting at 10:42pm. Voice vote shows all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Adubato, Secretary

Bloomingdale Planning Board