

**TOWNSHIP OF RIVER VALE
JOINT PLANNING BOARD
April 18, 2018
7:30 p.m.
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

APPROVED

ADEQUATE NOTICE STATEMENT:

In accordance with the provisions set forth in the Open Public Meetings Law, notification of this meeting has been sent to all officially appointed Township newspapers and notice is posted at the River Vale Municipal Office.

The Planning Board saluted the flag.

=====

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:

Scott Lippert	Chairman
Robert Adamo	Vice-Chairman
Robert Fortsch	Secretary
John Donovan	Councilman (8:00 pm)
Michael Beukas	
Craig Plescia	

Also Present:

Marc E. Leibman, Esq.	Board Attorney
Christopher Statile	Board Engineer
Joanne Allgor	Land Use Administrator

Absent:	Glen Jasionowski	Class I-Mayor
	Peter Wayne	
	John Puccio	
	Susan Vaccaro	(Alt. #1)
	Dr. Kedar Gokhale	(Alt. #2)

MINUTES: 2/21/18 & 3/29/18 - Carried to the next meeting.

APPLICATIONS:

1. **Sita, 371 Rivervale Road, Block 1301, Lot 31 - Amendment to Previously Approved Site Plan** - Robert Maloof, Esq. represented the applicant in an application for amendment to a previously approved site plan. Mr. Maloof gave an overview and had submitted the previous Resolution

of Approval in the application. They wish to eliminate the conditions 3 & 4 requiring them to install an 8" water main and a fire hydrant near the house. The current developer felt to install two fire requirements affected the health and safety of the surrounding area, and the house could be served by less than what was required by the Board in 2007. They would install a pipe to service the water line and a fire sprinkler system. He requested the amendment be accepted.

Mr. Statile commented he had not recently inspected the property and his concern was if the water line ruptured, and no one is home. That would affect and jeopardize the main water line system. He did not see the need for an 8" water main. Chairman Lippert asked why they required a fire suppression system, which was not usual. Mr. Statile said it was a way to insure water was at the premises. How would you suggest amending the language he asked. Mr. Statile said just to remove that condition, along with a fire hose cabinet. Mr. Leibman asked if it was requested by the Fire Department, and it was not. A new Resolution would be prepared striking condition 3. Mr. Leibman read letter dated 2/28/18 by the engineer stating the water system is adequate, and letter from Suez Water to the property owner indicating a flow test was performed 5/2017. Also a document was submitted by Mr. Sita with a fire suppression report. Mr. Statile was satisfied with the reports. Board discussion followed. Mr. Adamo commented he was in favor of the sprinkler system. He suggested a connection to a central station monitoring to contact the Fire Department in case of an electrical outage and fire emergency.

The matter was opened to the public. There were no questions or comments.

A motion to approve was made by Robert Adamo with requirements for central station monitoring system for the sprinkler system, yearly inspection for fire suppression system and reduction from previously Resolution of items 3 & 4 and removal of existing fire hydrant already installed. The motion was seconded by Robert Fortsch. On roll call vote, Craig Plescia, Michael Beukas, Robert Adamo, Robert Fortsch, and Scott Lippert voted yes.

Councilman John Donovan arrived at 8:00 pm.

2. Weber, 573 Green Lane, Block 910, Lot 1 - Fence -
Mr. Weber, property owner, 573 Green Lane, was sworn in and

presented his application for a fence in the rear yard for protection from deer and enclosure for his family to enjoy his property. He has two daughters and moved into the house in August. The fence would be a 6' pvc fence, 20' from the curb. A magazine photo was shown. They would want three gates/doors. They have two front yards. Mr. Fortsch expressed concern with police not being able to see over the fence, and he suggested a 4' fence with plantings. Applicant wanted 6' because of deer. Mr. Beukas suggested 4' fence with lattice on top. It would mitigate one of the concerns about the police seeing in. The Oklahoma with lattice on top from the brochure was chosen. Mr. Statile commented it is better for police to see in especially if there is a dog on the premises, and they have to enter. Mr. Fortsch felt he could accomplish his purpose with a 4' fence.

The matter was opened to the public. There were no questions or comments. Board discussion followed. The Board questioned how applicant came up with 20' from curb line. Mr. Weber responded to maximize the property. Mr. Statile stated there is a driveway next to it and 20' for a fence, even a 4' fence, is a little close by way of obstruction. Chairman Lippert commented the Board is struggling with this a bit and is trying to find ways to mitigate it.

A motion for approval was made by Robert Adamo with 4' and lattice of 18", 25' from curb line on Forest, 40' back from the rear property line to the fence that faces Green on the right side, and screening/landscaping from the curb to fence on Forest. The motion was seconded by John Donovan, as amended on discussion. Mr. Leibman clarified on the drawing the length on Forest is 40' facing Forest as Exhibit A1. Applicant did not want to initial it. Mr. Donovan wanted to see the revised plan. Mr. Leibman advised the Board could approve it conditioned upon the plan, to be reviewed and approved by Mr. Statile. Mr. Lippert asked how Mr. Weber felt about the terms. Mr. Weber was not sure about the 40'. He could always do a 5' fence or go 39'. The style would be in the brochure marked A1. There were no further discussions. On roll call vote, Craig Plescia, Michael Beukas, Robert Adamo, Robert Fortsch, John Donovan, and Scott Lippert voted yes.

3. Siegel, 410 Cedar Lane, Block 1501.02, Lot 1 - Fence - Howard & Lisa Siegel, property owners, 410 Cedar Lane, were sworn in. They were seeking a 4' chain link fence vs. a 3' fence required, with shrubs behind the fence. They have many old large trees that have branches

falling on and damaging the existing fence. They also have two dogs that run away every time the fence goes down. They are on the corner of Brook and Cedar and it will not be anywhere near Cedar and will not impact any drivers. It is a 1' variance. The 3' is not sufficient due to the dogs escaping. Mr. Beukas referred to the survey where there is a 6' fence and a 2'x9' chain link fence and requested clarification of the fencing on premises. The fence that is facing Cedar is the one damaged. The other fences will remain. The fence would be black vinyl with a gate on the Brook Avenue side as existing.

The Board reviewed the photos. Mr. Donovan commented if they wanted to do a 3' fence they would not have to be before the Board, but for a 4' chain fence would it be obstructive. The concern is the corner. Applicant stated where it is going to be wrapped around, it will not be. They are stopping it where the porch is. Mr. Donovan stated they will have to be a little clearer on the drawing, like the last applicant. Applicant gave additional details to satisfy the Board's inquiries. Mr. Leibman asked Mr. Statile if he was at the site. He responded he was not, but Mr. Sartori was. Mr. Plescia asked if he could move the fence back more towards the porch, but that was not possible because the dogs could hop over the fence from the porch. Mr. Plescia commented they could always add lattice on that side. The concern is to make sure it doesn't cause an accident, and the more sight line they give the community the better. Mr. Donovan asked if the corner of Brook they could amend it. Mr. Statile noted it was a busy corner, and the road is curved. There is an ordinance for the sight line. Mr. Beukas asked if they could move the fence back to 20' from the curb. Mr. Leibman suggested taking a five minute recess so Mr. Statile can review the plan with the applicant to see if there was anything safe to do.

The Board took a recess from 8:47 pm to 8:59 pm and reconvened with the same members present on roll call.

Mr. Statile reported and suggested placing the fence 20' from edge of pavement with plantings on the inside of the fence. Mr. Donovan commented he wanted to see a survey before voting. It is not clear to him. As part of the Bylaws, a survey within the last 10 years is required. The property is unique and on one of the main roads. Applicants did not get a new survey when they purchased seven years ago. Mr. Donovan wants to see it on paper. Mr. Adamo suggested showing the proposed fence plotted on

the survey. The Chairman stated the Board wants to see a survey with the fence delineated.

The matter was opened to the public. There were no questions or comments.

The matter was carried to the next meeting on 5/16/18 with no further notice. Applicant to bring the survey requested. Mr. Leibman explained to applicant the procedures with the time frames and resolution going forward. If not ready, they can carry to the next meeting. Mr. Beukas and Mr. Plescia will not be present at the next meeting. Mr. Leibman advised he did not see the survey requirement in the Bylaws, and it is probably in the ordinance. It should have been deemed incomplete. The applicants would act quickly to get the survey. The Board explained they have a safety concern and have to make sure it gets done right.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Donovan and Board discussed an amendment to fence application form and checklist to require a survey within past 10 years.

PAYMENT OF INVOICES: None

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 at 7:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT: On motion made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY R. VERDUCCI, PARALEGAL
Recording Secretary