

**TOWNSHIP OF RIVER VALE  
JOINT PLANNING BOARD  
May 27, 2020  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES**

**FINAL**

**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	
Susan Vaccaro	
Gregory Lowe	
Matthew Ross	
Robert Adamo	
Peter Wayne	
John Donovan	Councilman

**Also Present:**

Marc Leibman	Board Attorney
Christopher Statile	Board Engineer
Maria Haag	Land Use Administrator

<b>Absent:</b>	Glen Jasionowski	Class I-Mayor
	John Puccio	

The meeting was conducted virtually via Go To Meeting.

Mr. Leibman, Board Attorney opened the meeting stating that it is in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, published electronically and in accordance with law.

## **APPLICATION**

### **Coughlin - Block 409 Lot 14 - 328 Alpine Circle - Fence / Corner Lot**

Kevin Coughlin, Applicant was sworn in by Mr. Leibman Board Attorney. Mr. Coughlin thanked the Board for hearing his application this evening.

He previously provided a word document and photographs to the Board explaining that he presently has a 6 ft. solid fence now and he is looking to extend it out to include more side yard property. His current back yard does not have enough space for his children to play.

Mr. Statile commented that this is a corner lot with two front yards; Mr. Coughlin is looking to install a 6 ft. high fence along one of the frontage's and explained how he wants it installed. Councilman Donovan commented that it looks as though the existing fence encroaches into the front yard. Mr. Statile stated that the existing fence is at the building line and that is okay.

Mr. Wayne asked why the fence is up to the middle of the house and not the rear. Mr. Coughlin explained that for aesthetic purposes he moved forward in line with the house; not to affect the trees that are hiding the utilities. Mr. Wayne asked no shrubs removed? Mr. Coughlin responded no, he brought the fence in by 8 ft. so not to interfere with existing trees and shrubs along his property.

Mr. Wayne asked if we are looking at Plan B, or the fence right on the property line. Mr. Coughlin responded that he wanted to offer an alternative. He can bring in the fence 15 ft. instead of 10 ft. from letters J to K from the property line under Plan B. He is asking for more room in the rear because of the shape of the property. If there are concerns about the property line he is willing to go with Plan B.

Mr. Leibman asked about placement of gates. Mr. Coughlin responded that under the current plan he would place a gate between L and M closer to the house in the front.

Mr. Lowe asked about a couple of trees located on the side yard and how far from those trees the fence would be. Mr. Coughlin referred to slide 11 and explained the location of the fence.

Ms. Vaccaro commented that she understands Mr. Coughlin's security concerns but added that there are no fences like the one he is proposing in his neighborhood and the property would look different. Mr. Coughlin responded that every house around him have a six foot PVC white fence; he prefers a solid fence but if the Board feels a one-foot lattice top is better he would comply.

Mr. Adamo commented that some of the photographs show a wood fence rather than a PVC fence and they look more natural than a solid PVC white fence. Mr. Coughlin responded that based on his immediate area the white PVC fence is more conforming. To place a wood fence while the rest of the property has existing white PVC fencing would not look good. Mr. Lowe agreed adding that the neighboring houses have the white PVC fence.

Mr. Wayne prefers Plan B with a 5 ft. white PVC fence and a one-foot lattice top and added shrubs. The remaining Board members agreed. Rather than planning to plant shrubs, it should be requested. Mr. Coughlin would like to get opinions as to what would look best to plant. He would like to install a solid 6 ft. fence along the rear between B and C to be consistent with the rear of the property and have the 5 ft. with a one-foot lattice top starting along the side of the property from letter B to K to L to M. The Board did not have an issue with that request.

Pertaining to landscaping Mr. Statile suggested an evergreen line along the fence. Mr. Leibman suggested conditioning it that landscaping be placed at least 50% of the linear fencing along the roadway.

Mr. Statile recommended the fence be kept back 3 feet from the right of way area and place plantings back a little. His concern was not to have plants on top of utilities that may get damaged. Mr. Coughlin wants the fence to be a straight line and asked if there is a specific distance being requested; from A to B is 12 ft. 5 inches. Mr. Statile responded that the fence does not have to be a straight line. Mr. Coughlin stated under Plan B, from J to K he can come in 13 ft. from the curb and maintain that distance along the entire property line rather than 15 ft.

Mr. Leibman would like to have Plan B resubmitted as discussed and have it scaled for precise setback from the property line and to have planned landscaping. Mr. Coughlin would like to have the fence placed prior to deciding on landscaping which may be difficult. He would re-submit a

new plan but would like to get approval from the Board conditioned as discussed. Mr. Statile stated that permits cannot be issued without a signed resolution from the Board. Mr. Lippert requested a revised plan. Mr. Coughlin agreed to resubmit a revised Plan B with the conditions as suggested and a scaled drawing with precise setback. Mr. Leibman explained what he needs to be shown to determine exactly what the setback is.

Mr. Statile - we need to decide what the setback is to the rear property line between D and C. Mr. Coughlin responded that it is 11 ft. 4 inches from the rear property line to the letter B. All other dimensions were reviewed.

Mr. Leibman was satisfied with the information he received and was reviewed. He would add that the property be flagged to show all utilities. Mr. Statile added that the plantings be a minimum of 2 ft. and not less than 50% of the linear distance of the fence.

The Chairman opened the meeting to the public.

No Public Comment.

The meeting was closed to the public.

A motion by Mr. Lippert, seconded by Mr. Wayne to approve the application as conditioned and that a revised plan be submitted and attached to the adopted resolution; on roll call, Mr. Lippert, Mr. Lowe, Councilman Donovan, Mr. Fortsch, Mr. Wayne, and Mr. Ross voted yes; Mr. Adamo and Ms. Vaccaro voted no; the motion carried.

#### **RESOLUTION**

Manoukian - Block 107 Lot 12 - 611 Antrim Road - Portico Addition

A motion by Mr. Lippert, seconded by Mr. Lowe to adopt the resolution, on voice vote, all those eligible voted yes, the motion carried.

#### **DISCUSSION / Ordinance Review**

Porticos, Bay Windows, Fences in Residential District

Sample, draft ordinance was provided by Mr. Statile's office. Porticos in Residential Districts, Bay Windows in Residential Districts and Fences were covered and

discussed. The language is conceptual approved by the Board would then go to the Mayor and Council for approval and for first reading and then approved by second reading.

Mr. Leibman commented on the idea of the ordinance which is to reduce the number of portico applications that are coming to the Board and referred to bullet point 3 under porticos.

On the variance applications for fencing which must include a boundary survey prepared by a New Jersey Licensed Land Surveyor which survey shall not be more than five years old at the time of the variance application submission, Councilman Donovan requested language that the Board can waive the requirement.

#### Front Yard Setbacks in Residential District

The sample ordinance submitted by Mr. Statile's office was reviewed and commented on, suggestions were made.

The ordinances will be amended to reflect suggestions and re-reviewed at the June meeting of the Board.

Mr. Adamo asked in the last 24 months, how many front yard setback applications unrelated to porticos has the Board heard. Mr. Statile responded that a list has been put together by his office for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 and will be provided for discussion at the June meeting. The Master Plan Reexamination will also be discussed at the meeting.

#### **MINUTES**

April 29, 2020

A motion by Mr. Lippert, seconded by Mr. Lowe to approve the minutes of April 29, 2020; as amended, on roll call vote, all those eligible voted yes, the motion carried.

**PAYMENT OF INVOICES:** None

**NEXT MEETING:** Wednesday, June 24, 2020 7:30 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT:** On motion made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sylvia Kokowski  
Recording Secretary