

**TOWNSHIP OF RIVER VALE
JOINT PLANNING BOARD
April 30, 2019
7:30 p.m.
SPECIAL MEETING
MINUTES**

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 Fortsch	Vice-Chairman
Mark Bromberg	Councilman
Michael Beukas	
Peter Wayne	
Gregory Lowe	
John Puccio	
Susan Vaccaro	Secretary (Alt. #1)

Also Present:

Marc E. Leibman, Esq.	Board Attorney
Christopher Statile	Board Engineer
Carolyn Reiter	Board Planner
Maria Haag	Land Use Administrator

Absent: Glen Jasionowski Class I-Mayor
Robert Adamo

APPLICATIONS:

1. **The Fairways at Edgewood, LLC - Block 1201, Lots 5 & 6 - Application for Major Site Plan Approval and Major Subdivision Approval** - Katharine Coffey, Esq. appeared on behalf of Peter Wolfson, Esq. for the applicant in a continued hearing, with Jameson P. Van Eck, Esq., Attorney for the Objector, River Vale at Holiday Farms Condominium also appearing.

The hearing continued from the last meeting with Mr. Van Eck's cross-examination of **applicant's NJ Licensed Landscape Architect, Adam M. Alexander, Spiezle Architectural Group**, 1395 Yardville Hamilton Square Road, Hamilton, NJ, who continued under oath. Updated plans revised to 4/11/19 were submitted. Mr. Van Eck questioned the witness about the changes to the plans. Mr. Alexander, in response, testified there were additional plantings and shrubs reflected on the plans. Other than the large trees on the roadway they will continue to keep the trees. The rendering stays the same. Mr. Van Eck asked if he included a berm in front of the affordable housing. Mr. Alexander stated there is not a lot of room for a berm, but there is landscaping. The fencing is staying in the same location. Is there any landscaping proposed between Piermont and the trash enclosure he was asked, and the response was yes, trees and shrubs.

Mr. Van Eck questioned the witness as to the changes to the lighting plan. Mr. Alexander stated at the recommendation of Mr. Statile the lighting has been reduced while providing a safe and adequate level of light. It will not spill over onto the townhouses. He referred to Sheet L8. Mr. Van Eck asked if lights could be put on timers. It was indicated that Applicant would work with Mr. Statile about a safe dimming of the lights since they will not be using the parking lot very much. Mr. Van Eck cited Ordinance Section 142-224-A1(e)3 regarding 30% landscaping requirements and referred to applicant's exhibit L4. He asked about the mulch and how far out it would extend. Mr. Alexander responded it depends on the size and diameter. A 6' tree would have a 3' diameter. On L4 in your opinion grass counts as landscaping. Mr. Van Eck stated Section 142-224-A1(e)2 provides for a minimum of 10' of landscaping. It treats grass and landscaping as separate items and asked if the witness reviewed this when he put his plan together. Mr. Leibman asked what he was driving at. Mr. Van Eck said there is a 30' landscaping requirement and they included 30' with grass. No tree pocket or strip less than 25' can be counted. It does not comply with the ordinance. Mr. Van Eck asked Mr. Alexander if he agreed there are multiple areas of grass. Mr. Alexander responded, saying grass is landscaping. He sees no difference of landscaping being planted with grass or plants. Mr. Van Eck asked if there were other areas scattered about Sheets 4 and 5 with 25' strips. Yes, there are, Mr. Alexander responded.

Mr. Van Eck had no further questions. There were no further questions by the Board, and the public portion was concluded at the last meeting.

The next witness, **Richard Arzberger, applicant's Licensed NJ Architect**, was sworn in, qualified and accepted. His architectural colored rendering of the townhouses was marked Exhibit A10. The colored rendering of the quadplex building was marked A11. There are three prototypes - townhouse, quadplex & affordable. Sheet A1.0 was referred to on the easel and was the same as submitted with the application. Mr. Arzberger described the rendering. Earth tones of browns and tans were proposed. The square footage of each of the townhouse units varies, but primarily is in the 3,200 to 3,400 sf range, excluding garages. Master bedroom suites would be on the first floor in some units. Secondary bedrooms would be upstairs. Master Bedrooms would be on second floor in some units. From the first floor slab to the highest point, the height was 37'. The second rendering was of the quadplex type, including four flats, with attached garages. The colored rendering A11 was shown. The sizes for a total of 32 units would be from 2,800 sf to 3,200 sf. without garages. The height is approximately 37.5' from the first-floor slab to the ridge line. Exhibit A3 was displayed showing the quads interspersed. The third residential prototype was the affordable housing building. Same materials were used with the same color scheme. They are using the same color palate and materials throughout the entire project for continuity. There are first, second and third floor plans shown. There is one stairwell accessing four units. The elevation showed a drop in the middle of the building and a drop with a horizontal offset. Mr. Lippert asked about the bedroom distribution. Mr. Santolo gave the percentages, which conform with the requirements for the affordable units. Four one-bedroom units = 16.7%; 15 two-bedroom units 62.5%; and five three-bedroom units = 20.8% of the affordable requirements. The height from the first floor, finished floor to highest ridge line is 47.6'. That summarized the three residential prototypes proposed.

Mr. Arzberger continued. There are certain outbuildings primarily used for maintenance, but on Sheet 5.1 there is a small gatehouse added at the entrance to the project 11.8' x 16', serving as the guardhouse. Located on the site plan are the elevations. On sheet A 4.0 is an equipment maintenance building for the golf course, which includes an employee area and lofts. There is a vehicle maintenance area. There is a sort of court yard that

serves as screening. Ms. Vaccaro asked why it was located there instead of near the golf course. Mr. Bromberg asked for the use, and it would be for maintenance equipment. Mr. Santolo also responded that it was where they could easily access the golf course and not bother the residents. It is where it makes the most sense. Mr. Wayne asked if sprinklered, and probably not was the response. Is there a fire wall, he asked. The townhouses will probably have one and the quadplexes will have one down the middle. Ms. Vaccaro asked for the route of the vehicles. Mr. Santolo said they will be on site. They will go up, do their work and come back. Will it interfere with safety she asked. It was shown that it would be on the golf course lot. He referred to A2 to indicate the area.

Mr. Statile stated the roof line has to be broken up. He requested that the architect add a cupola on the top. He asked if applicant would consider additional landscaping to address the concern of the view of the building from the street. A4.2 was referred to, showing the gabled area of the building in the courtyard of the maintenance building courtyard. It is in an unenclosed bin to pump sand and topsoil. Mr. Fortsch asked if it would create noise for the residents. Mr. Leibman advised there is an ordinance 190-5 governing landscaping hour restrictions. Mr. Santolo said they looked at the best locations and time restrictions, and all was designed around making sure they are not bringing a nuisance to a high-end design effort. Based on the design, the way the vehicles access the courts away from the townhouses achieves that. Mr. Fortsch could not see paying \$800+ and coming in by the maintenance area. Ms. Vaccaro commented it did not seem to be a good idea to have a maintenance area just as you come in to the beautiful townhouses. Mr. Santolo said it would be extremely buffered. He would ask their landscape architect to provide a visual of the views and look at it very carefully. The existing buffer definitely had that in mind. He would also ask them to break up the buildings and add a color scheme to make it more interesting. Mr. Leibman asked if on L4 someone could highlight the route the maintenance vehicles would take from the maintenance building Mr. Santolo addressed same. Also, the existing club house fire connection will be modified. All will conform with the Uniform construction Code. Mr. Wayne asked for the heights vs. ordinances as in Section 142, which does not define what a 1.5 story building is, and is that defined elsewhere. Mr. Statile said they are dealing with the ordinance, and it was noted the applicant is requesting a variance on that. Mr. Beukas asked for an artist's

rendering of the COAH building. Mr. Lowe asked what is the pump house pumping. Mr. Santolo said it is as existing now and they pump water from Suez Water as needed. There is no issue with noise or odors. This witness was complete.

The Board took a 10-minute recess from 9:05 pm to 9:15 pm and reconvened with a roll call. All remained present.

The matter as opened to the public for questions of Mr. Arzberger. The following persons came forward:

Florence Morganstein, Piermont Road, questioned Mr. Arzberger as to whether the maintenance building can be moved. Mr. Santolo answered it is located where delivery vehicles can reach it, and it is a one-story building hiding behind landscaping. We do not think anyone will see it. Sheet A1.0 widths vary from 30-32' log driveways, 23' wide, and 18-12' of landscaped area directly in front of the building.

Kira Mckeowen asked the architect how many acres are on the lot and what was the percentage of impervious coverage. He did not testify to that. Are basements proposed. Not in quadplex units, with townhouses having ability for same. Could windows or walk-outs be permitted. He did not believe walk-outs are proposed. There are no walk out basements. No bedrooms are to be located in the basements. Mr. Santolo there are no intentions to have any bedrooms in the basement per the ordinance. They have three bedrooms. On Sheet 48 she asked if Unit 188 encroaches on the setback. These were not questions for the architect, she was informed. She asked about heights, maintenance buildings and accessory units. Mr. Lippert said the board is looking at this project as a permitted use.

Mr. Van Eck questioned Mr. Arzberger. He asked about the design of structure and if there was any office use with regard to the maintenance of the golf course. Mr. Arzberger responded only for the maintenance person. There would be changing rooms and break rooms for the staff and storage for equipment, not paperwork. Mr. Van Eck noted they are basically doubling the size. He also questioned the height of the main building. The response was 31', and they will ask for variance. Mr. Leibman stated height important. Mr. Van Eck questioned the definition of floor in the ordinance, and an explanation given - three floors = 3 stories. Each story must have a floor. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Van Eck rested had no further questions.

At 10:15 pm the Board concluded the hearing for the evening and discussed scheduling. On May 15th the Board Planner was not available. Alternative dates were discussed. Applicant's engineer will return to talk about revised plans. On 5/15/19 they would schedule this after the regular application is heard that night. Mr. Statile should have a report on the revised plans. They were also looking at 5/29 for a Special Meeting. **Accordingly, the matter was carried to 5/15/19 at the Regular Meeting, with no further notice and a time waiver granted.** Thereafter the matter would be heard at a special meeting. May 29th would be the next Special Meeting. **Accordingly, the matter was also carried to 5/29/19, for a Special Meeting, with no further notice and time extensions granted.**

MINUTES: A motion for approval of the Minutes of **3/28/19 Special Meeting** was made by Mr. Fortsch, seconded by Mr. Beukas, and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTIONS: None

PAYMENT OF INVOICES: None

NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

Wednesday, May 15, 2019 at 7:30 p.m. at the Borough Hall

NEXT SPECIAL MEETING:

Wednesday May 29, 2019 at 7:30 p.m. the Community Center

ADJOURNMENT: On motion made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY R. VERDUCCI, PARALEGAL
Recording Secretary