

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE:** April 12, 2023

1. **Roll Call**

This is the Regular Meeting of Wednesday, April 12, 2023. Chairman Garip called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll call was taken and the following members were present: Mr. Allegretta, Mayor Labrosse, Ms. Solomon, Vice Chairman Chiusolo, and Chairman Garip.

**ABSENT:** Mr. Dib, Mr. Martucci, Mr. Iyamu, and Deputy Mayor Canestrino

**LATE ARRIVAL:** Mr. Contini (7:24 p.m.)

**EARLY DEPARTURE:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Joseph L. Mecca, Jr., Esq.; Gregory J. Polyniak, P.E., P.P., Neglia Engineering; Bridget McLaughlin, Zoning Officer; Francis A. Reiner, P.P., LLA; and Kim O. Furbacher, Certified Court Reporter.

2. **Payment of Bills**

MOTION BY VICE CHAIRMAN CHIUSOLO TO APPROVE BILLS SUBMITTED. SECOND BY MS. SOLOMON. MOTION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MR. ALLEGRETTA, MAYOR LABROSSE, MS. SOLOMON, VICE CHAIRMAN CHIUSOLO, AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

3. **Approval of Minutes of March 2023**

MOTION MADE BY VICE CHAIRMAN CHIUSOLO TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2023 MEETING. SECOND BY MAYOR LABROSSE. MOTION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, VICE CHAIRMAN CHIUSOLO, AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

DATE: April 12, 2023

4. MEMORIALIZATIONS:

a. Applicant: 295 Main MF 2021-Q LLC

**CARRIED TO MAY 10, 2023**

The Applicant proposes to raze the existing site improvements to construct a six (6) story, mixed-use development consisting of 40 apartments and 1,333 square feet of retail on the first floor. The applicant proposes twelve (12) studio units, twenty-two (22) one-bedroom units, and six (6) two-bedroom units. The applicant proposes fifty (50) triple stacked semiautomated self-parking spaces, 1,333 square feet of retail space, and a residential lobby on the first floor.

The second floor consists of utilities, a mezzanine, residents' storage, and an amenity space.

The third floor consists of an amenity space, six (6) studio units and four (4) one-bedroom units.

The fourth through sixth floors consist of two (2) studio units, six (6) one-bedroom units, and two (2) two-bedroom units.

Additionally, the applicant proposes a first floor connection to the parking garage of 321 Main Street. The proposed building will have an overall building height of approximately 70 feet from above the average top of curb elevation on Main Street.

**b. Applicant: Cornerstone Holdings Group,  
LLC**

**625 Main Street, Block 509, Lot 1  
SP#8-21 V#8-21**

The Applicant seeks to construct a one-story jewelry store. Additional site improvements consist of installing roof drains, a new sanitary connections, planters, sidewalk, fenced refuse area, curbing, and parking spaces on-site and within the Poplar Avenue right-of-way.

MOTION TO MEMORIALIZE MADE BY MAYOR LABROSSE.

SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CHIUSOLO.

MEMORIALIZATION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, VICE CHAIRMAN CHIUSOLO, AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

DATE: April 12, 2023

5. APPLICATIONS:

a. Applicants: John & Elisa Ingallerina  
356 Park Street, Block 321, Lot 16  
SP#14-22 V#14-22

The Applicant proposes to construct a three (3) story, three (3) unit townhouse development with asphalt access driveways onto Park Street and Berry Street and attached garages. Additional site improvements include paver walkways, utilities, landscape improvements, and drainage systems.

A P P E A R A N C E S

THE MECCA LAW FIRM  
BY: JOSEPH L. MECCA, JR., ESQUIRE  
87 S. Farview Avenue  
Box 384  
Paramus, New Jersey 07653  
201-584-7388  
joe@jlmeccalaw.com  
Counsel to the Board

COLE SCHOTZ, P.C.  
BY: AARON S. BROTMAN, ESQUIRE  
1325 Avenue of the Americas  
19th Floor  
New York, New York 10019  
646-532-5321  
abrotman@coleschotz.com  
Counsel to the Applicant

E X H I B I T S

NO.            DESCRIPTION

(None marked)

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

DATE: April 12, 2023

P U B L I C   H E A R I N G

(At this point in the proceeding, Mayor Labrosse steps off the dais and is recused.)

**G R E G O R Y   J .   P O L Y N I A K , P . E . , P . P . ,**  
having been previously sworn/affirmed.

Mr. Brotman stated: For the record, my name is Aaron Brotman. I am with the law firm Cole Schotz.

Mr. Chairman, we've taken your comments into account. We think we have an application that really fits the property and will work very well.

Just as a quick recap, you've already given the property lot and block. We are in the R-4 zoning district. The property is sort of trapezoidal shaped. My engineer will describe it in more detail.

We are seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval, three two-bedroom units. We have dropped a bedroom from each unit. We now have three two-bedroom units. It will still be three stories in height. The proposed use is permitted in the zone.

We have three variances: The frontage, the lot size, and then the parking. This is due to the shape of the lot effectively. And the parking is effectively, as you'll see, due to the RSIS standards, which frankly don't fit how people use a two bedroom townhouse in Hackensack, and we'll at least establish that the parking will be sufficient for the intended use.

We have three witnesses tonight: Jeff Egarian, who's our engineer; Al Dattoli, architect; and Steve Lydon, our professional planner.

John Ingallerina, Jr., the applicant's son, is here as well to answer any questions. I know we spoke last time about the purpose. So he's here if he needs to present testimony.

**J E F F R E Y   E G A R I A N , P . E . ,** c/o DJ Egarian & Associates, Inc., 271 US Highway 46 West, Suite G-208, Fairfield, New Jersey 07004, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Egarian's credentials were accepted by the board.

Mr. Brotman stated: Why don't you walk us through the property itself.

Mr. Egarian testified: So the property itself is located on the southeast corner of Berry Street and Park Street. The lot area is 4,844 square feet, where 6,000 square feet is required. Currently the lot is vacant except for the garage on the eastern portion of the lot. The property is lawned with a

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

small treeline fronting on Berry Street.

To the north of the lot is a multifamily residential development and parking lot.

To the east is a two-family dwelling.

To the south is a single family dwelling.

And to the west is a two-family dwelling.

There's a concrete sidewalk fronting on both streets along the property.

The physical description of the property is the lot frontage is 55.5 feet on Park Street and 110 feet on Berry Street. The lot depth is 103 feet, with a lot width at the rear of 34 feet.

Would you like me to go right to the proposal?

Mr. Brotman responded: Yes, please.

The proposed development of the lot will include the removal of that existing garage and the trees along Berry Street. The large diameter tree on the northwest corner of the lot is to remain.

The existing vinyl fence on the south side of the property is to be relocated, as it currently encroaches on the neighboring lot.

We are proposing to construct three three-story townhouse units with associated walkways and driveways. The building area is 1,958 square feet with 400 square feet of driveway area.

The building structure itself fully conforms to the bulk setbacks per the zone. We are proposing seepage tanks, which have be relocated from the previous plan that we testified before previously. There will also be some minor regrading of the property. And at the conclusion of the property, we will repair and restore the property and its surroundings.

Mr. Brotman asked: Can you talk about the sight lines really quick?

Mr. Egarian responded: Yes.

The sight lines for the proposed -- the two driveways -- maybe I should go up and speak around the exhibit. I'm going to move up.

So the proposed sight lines on Park Street, we demonstrate showing clear sight lines of adequate width distance according to the speed limit for Park Street and Berry Street, these long lines going out in this direction here and through here. And I have some photographs of just the sight lines themselves.

And this is Park Street looking southbound. This is Park Street looking northbound. And this is Berry Street looking west, and Berry Street looking east.

So as you can see, this is the general location of the proposed driveway's sight distances won't be

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

impaired by any features.

This is A-1.

Mr. Mecca stated: For the record it's A-1, four photographs.

Mr. Egarian continued: So parking for the project, we're proposing six legally recognized parking spaces according to the Residential Site Improvement Standards. The RSIS requires 2.3 spaces for residential two bedroom units, which equates to 6.9 or 7 spaces required. We are providing six spaces, one space in the driveway, one space in the garage, so two spaces for each unit.

There is a shared driveway off of Park Street and a singular driveway off of Berry Street.

Moving on to garbage and trash and recycling.

The trash will be handled in a typical manner for residential living. Garbage cans will be brought to the street line for municipal pickup on the designated day. This development is not a large multifamily project which requires a dedicated waste or recycling service.

Moving onto the curb and sidewalk. We are proposing a new curb and sidewalk along the entire frontage of the property. It will include new ADA ramps with matching ramps across Berry Street. We are proposing a pavement replacement for both streets where the new utilities will be run, and that's indicated by the dark hatching on Park Street and Berry Street.

The stormwater management for the property has been changed slightly as well from the previous plan. All of the roof area and driveway area will be routed to a series of dry wells. We are proposing two 1,000-gallon seepage tanks and providing approximately 697 cubic feet or just a little over 5,000 gallons of stored volume. We are required with the calculations to store 585 cubic feet or approximately 4,300 gallons of water, therefore, we are giving a surplus of volume by approximately 838 gallons.

The lot will be re-graded slightly. We are proposing two swales to route water away from the adjacent properties, one swale on the south side of the lot and one swale on the east side of the lot.

The seepage tanks have been located as far away from the city right-of-way as possible, addressing some of the comments from the board and the city engineer from the previous meeting. Our office can work together, if needed, to make any adjustments regarding stormwater, however, we feel

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

that this location is best suited for this application and is as far away from the neighboring property as we can get and also the city right-of-way.

We will perform a permeability test on the property to ensure the soils are suitable for the proposed system and make sure that it will function properly. We will coordinate those results and test pit with the city engineer.

Lastly, ultimately we've designed this property in a manner that complies with the bulk requirements of the zone. We listened and addressed as many comments as we could from the board and the board professionals, and we do feel that this design is a much better proposal.

The project will, however, require variances, which our planner will provide justification for during their testimony, but for sake of clarity I'll just go through them with you real quick.

The first variance is for the minimum lot area of 4,844 square feet, where 6,000 square feet is required; 1,614.7 square feet per unit, where 2,000 square feet is required.

The minimum lot width of 18.5 feet per unit, where 20 feet per unit is required or 55.5 feet in total where 60 feet is required.

And lastly the parking, which RSIS requires 2.3 spaces per unit or seven spaces required, and we are proposing six spaces.

And that concludes my testimony.

**A L B E R T D A T T O L I, RA**, 70 Chestnut Ridge Road, #H, Montvale, New Jersey 07645, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Dattoli's credentials were previously accepted by the board.

Mr. Brotman asked: Mr. Dattoli, why don't you walk us through the floor plans and elevations.

Mr. Dattoli responded: Sure.

Page 1 shows the proposed new floor plans. We have, again, three units. They are varying in size.

Unit number one, which is in the lower left corner, is 1,580 square feet.

Unit number two is 2,095 square feet.

And unit number three is 2,003 square feet.

The building height remains the same as it was previously. It does not require any kind of variance.

Each unit will have two bedrooms. The ground floor has become a family room and powder room, and then the middle floor of each unit is the living

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

area, kitchen, dining, living. And then the upper floor is the two bedrooms with two baths.

And each unit has a unique floor plan, because of the configuration of the property. We worked these so that the footprint now fits into the envelope that's permitted.

We have rooftop units, same as last time. They are on the back side. You can see on the south elevation an enclosure up at the top. The units will be located on the roof screened from view by way of materials that are consistent with the rest of the building. They will be baffled as needed so that the noise does not go onto other properties.

Again, we'll work with your engineer to make sure the baffling is okay.

The meters on the first floor plan in the upper left corner, that's where we had them located last time. That's where they will be located again. Essentially they're out of view. They have some screening in front of it by way of landscaping. And if you bring the landscaping plan up -- oh, let me go through the elevations, page No. 2.

Mr. Brotman responded: Yes.

Mr. Dattoli continued: We have changed the elevations somewhat, but we are proposing the same scale as we previously had in terms of height and appearance. Same materials. I have samples of those materials with me if you want to see them again. Would you like me to pass them around?

Chairman Garip responded: I think we saw them, but you can pass them around.

Mr. Brotman stated: They were previously marked as A-3.

Mr. Dattoli continued: So this is the stone we're proposing around the base of the building. And we have the siding, which is a cementitious board, looks like wood siding but it's cementitious so it's low maintenance. The color is somewhat much more resistive to fading and peeling and so forth. And the trim work is again a composite material, AZEK, so all the trim will be this material.

So the building over time will maintain its new look, so to speak.

The roof shingle is a typical residential roof shingle, fiberglass asphalt.

We do not have new color renderings. I have the previous ones. It looks the same.

Lastly, the landscape plan. We're proposing limited landscaping based on the size of the property. I think the landscaping is proportional to



## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

what we are proposing. We do show three Japanese maples, one in the upper left corner, one down along Berry Street near the bottom of the building as shown on paper, and the third one is off on the right side of the building near the property line.

We will have no problem with visibility from the corner to see traffic coming in either direction. We're not proposing any landscaping in the sight triangle.

Let's see.

We've tried to locate the trees in conjunction with the seepage pits. If they need to be adjusted, the location will be adjusted in the field.

I know there was a question about the Japanese maple, what it will be. It will be a Crimson Queen, which grows to about 8 to 10 feet high and about 10 to 12 feet wide. So they're not huge trees. Again, they fit in with the scale of the buildings and the site development.

And I believe that's pretty much it.

**S T E V E L Y D O N, P.P.**, c/o Burgis Associates, Inc., 25 Westwood Avenue, Westwood, New Jersey 07675, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Lydon's credentials were accepted by the board.

Mr. Lydon testified: It's a narrow lot. One lot line is only 57 feet in length and the other one is 34 feet. So we're talking about a narrow, constrained lot.

Fortunately, it's a level and flat topography. There are no environmental constraints on the property, which is significant.

And then lastly, all the abutting lots are fully developed, which is significant because there's no available property to be acquired by this developer. We are here seeking a couple of bulk variances, so I thought I'd go right to the statutory criteria.

We're here seeking a (c)(1) or a (c)(2) variance, so we have to meet the positive and the negative criteria.

The positive criteria has three components to it by which this board can grant the variance.

1. By reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness or the shape of the property, and I think the shape of the property speaks to itself.

Reason of exceptional topography or topographical or physical conditions. That doesn't apply.

And then third, by reason of extraordinary and exceptional situation uniquely affecting a specific

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

lot or structure lawfully existing thereon, and I think the fact that there's no additional property to be acquired might be one of those factors.

The negative criteria: You can only grant an application if the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and it can be granted without substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the master plan.

Now, earlier you heard some of the goals of the Hackensack master plan. I'm not going to repeat them at length, but three quick ones.

Maintaining enhanced quality of established neighborhoods.

Right now there's sort of an abandoned garage on the property. It doesn't look particularly good. So by removing that garage and building this development, which I do think looks good, we'll be hoping to enhance the status of the neighborhood.

Provide housing opportunities in a variety of housing for various income levels, including mixed income housing.

We believe this is a perfect example of that.

And then the city is in the planning area one, which encourages future growth and development for the state. So we are furthering the state planning goal.

You've heard, as far as the zoning ordinance, we're in the R-4 transitional zone and this kind of a development is permitted.

So the variances we're looking for:

We have a lot size of 4,844 square feet, when 6,000 square feet is required.

We have lot width. Your ordinance requires 20 feet per lot; we have 18.5. I believe that's a rather de minimis deviation.

And then parking. And I think this is also de minimis. It's according to the RSI, Residential Site Improvement Standards. We're required to have seven parking spaces, we have six for two bedroom units. I think that's more than sufficient, and I think there was also testimony about that earlier on this evening.

So I think the board can grant this application.

The square foot per dwelling units -- the square foot per lot area per dwelling units, we are compatible and consistent with the land use arrangements nearby. Four of the lots adjacent to us don't comply. And we're also across from some fairly high and adjacent to some fairly high residential development. Across the street from us, the

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

apartment building is built at 48 dwelling units to an acre. We don't think the three proposed units on this site will have an adverse impact on them, and again there's no additional property to acquire. I think it's significant that we meet all the setback requirements. That's a change, a big change in my opinion, from the earlier application you heard in February. So I believe that indicates we're not overbuilding the particular lot.

So I think looking at the zoning ordinance and looking at the master plan, I think we can say because the proposed development now provides for adequate air, light, and open space by not overbuilding the lot, we are not creating a substantial detriment to the public good.

The architecture design is both attractive and has been designed to last.

There's no substantial intent to the master plan.

We meet several goals and objectives:

Specifically maintaining an enhanced quality of existing neighborhoods; provide housing opportunities for a variety of housing for various income levels; and assist in implementing the state planning act.

So for those reasons I believe the positive and negative criteria are met with this application, and I do believe the board has a basis to grant an approval, if you so desire.

Chairman Garip stated: The materials are good. We saw them last time.

I think Mr. Polyniak is going to have some comments, undoubtedly.

Mr. Polyniak responded: Sure.

Through the Chair.

I guess a couple of comments.

A lot of comments in our review letter are technical in nature, and I think we can work with the applicant's engineer and the applicant's landscape architect to address them. There's just two within our review letter that I'd like to go over.

As it relates to, you have an HVAC is going to be located on the roofs. Are there any generators proposed as part of the property?

Mr. Dattoli responded: No, there are not.

Mr. Polyniak stated: And then my final question as it relates to it, you're proposing a fair amount of landscaping on site. We'd recommend that the applicant provide an irrigation system so that that landscaping is maintained, because it's providing screening for the meters on the side of the building and we want to make sure that that landscaping

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

planting survives.

Mr. Dattoli responded: That's not a problem. That will be done.

Mr. Polyniak stated: And then, I apologize, the other one I should have brought up is, on the two sides that don't front the public right-of-way, they'll be fencing to screen or provide some privacy from the adjoining properties?

Mr. Brotman responded: Yeah, I believe we propose fencing there.

Mr. Ingallerina, if you want to come up and speak.

**J O H N I N G A L L E R I N A**, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Ingallerina testified: Yeah, there's existing vinyl fencing on the, I guess it would be the south side, right in that area where actually if you point to it, six-foot fencing there. The garage to be removed will provide vinyl fencing to prevent anything that goes there.

Mr. Polyniak stated: We would just ask if the fencing on the south side is damaged during construction that it be replaced.

Mr. Ingallerina responded: Sure.

Mr. Mecca stated: Just one final thing.

Number six, there's no covenants, deed restrictions or easements on this property as far as you're aware?

Mr. Brotman responded: Correct.

Ms. Solomon stated: Just out of curiosity, with respect to the landscaping for the upkeep and maintenance, is that on the residents once they move in or who is that on?

Mr. Ingallerina responded: It will be on the owner.

Arrangements will be made on the owner for the tenants.

Vice Chairman Chiusolo asked: Mr. Polyniak, why is there no handicapped parking, is that not necessary for this development? I'm just curious.

Mr. Polyniak responded: If you look at it as a whole, you have the parking within the garage which would be considered ADA accessible to that first level. And then the units themselves, though, are not ADA accessible, you have stairs leading to each of the individual floors. So the parking within the garage will qualify. You have stairs leading to the second and third floor, there's no elevators in the building, and there's none required. Since it is a three-family building, the building

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

will be sprinklered?

Mr. Ingallerina responded: No.

Mr. Dattoli stated: No, this type of building does not require to be sprinklered.

Mr. Polyniak asked: So you won't?

Mr. Dattoli responded: Right. This is multiple single family. If the code required, we would do it. We haven't gotten that far, but having worked on other projects like this, it's not required in this application.

Mr. Allegretta stated: When you get to that level, they'll make them put the fire rated assemblies between each units.

Mr. Dattoli responded: Absolutely. Completely code compliant.

Mr. Brotman stated: We will comply with all building codes.

Mr. Allegretta stated: So my first question with the gas meters, we never like them outside, we like them shedded.

Mr. Polyniak, you had said that they will put irrigation so they can maintain landscaping. So that answers that question.

The stormwater, there was a lot of numbers thrown out there, and it seems like, based on what the applicant said, it's better than the requirement.

Mr. Polyniak stated: It is in excess of the requirement. One of our concerns, though, is being that it's in close proximity to the property lines and the residences located adjacent to it, and if those residences have basements, we would want an analysis, which would be a mounding analysis with respect to the groundwater to ensure that the infiltration of the stormwater runoff isn't raising the groundwater table and affecting the basements next door.

Mr. Brotman stated: We will work with Mr. Neglia, whatever engineering issues are required.

The hearing was open for public comment. No one wished to comment.

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

DATE: April 12, 2023

BOARD DELIBERATION AND VOTE

Chairman Garip stated: Nice presentation. Thank you.

MOTION TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS SPECIFIED.

MOTION BY: J. Chiusolo

SECOND BY: K. Solomon

ROLL CALL: M. Allegretta - aye

R. Contini - aye

K. Solomon - aye

J. Chiusolo - aye

F. Garip - aye

6. **New Business:**

**a. Courtesy Technical Review**

**261 Maple Hill Road,**

**Nellie K. Parker Elementary School**

**Block 350, Lot 1**

The Applicant proposes the construction of a security vestibule which will include an expansion of approximately 660 square feet along the eastern entrance to the property. The Plan includes additional signage along the entrance to the vestibule, down lit by low profile LED lights, and a new landscape wall for additional school signage.

A P P E A R A N C E S

INGLESINO, WEBSTER, WYCISKALA & TAYLOR, LLC

BY: JACLYN D'ARMINIO, ESQUIRE

Counsel for the Hackensack Board of Education

P U B L I C H E A R I N G

**KURT VIERHEILIG, AIA, LEED AP, BD+C, c/o DMR, Heights Plaza, 777 Terrace Avenue, 6th Floor, Suite 607, Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey 07604, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:**

Mr. Vierheilig's credentials were accepted by the board.

Ms. D'Arminio asked: Mr. Vierheilig, will you take me through the plan.

Mr. Vierheilig responded: Sure thing.

So we are proposing a security vestibule at Nellie K. Parker Elementary School. The vestibule is going to be located on the east side of the building.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

The existing building, which is three stories on that side, access will be off of Club Way. The addition is 650 square feet vestibule, as I mentioned, one story. Here we have a rendering basically what it's going to look like approaching from Club Way. It's very small on scale, not overwhelming and not really going to impact any adjacent properties in terms of the size, the scale or the development of the new vestibule.

They'll be signage on it identifying the school proper over the main entrance. They'll also be new landscape located right on Club Way at the beginning of the sidewalk right over here and that will have again the name of the school and the number right closer to the street, because of the configuration one-way on Club Way and it just gives it a little bit more of an identity. And the purpose is to really help protect the school and the students to provide a area where they could be confined before they get allowed into the school.

Ms. D'Arminio stated: Curt, you we got a letter from Neglia.

Mr. Vierheilig responded: Yeah.

Ms. D'Arminio asked: Just really briefly can you just any issues with the drainage?

Mr. Vierheilig responded: No. I had a chance to review the letter, we don't have any issues with it. We would be able to comply and nothing we're going to propose is going to make any issues worse than they are. It will actually be improved. The drainage, there will be no effect to off-site drainage.

Mr. Polyniak stated: Through the Chair we are, it will be ADA accessibility?

Mr. Vierheilig responded: It will be fully ADA compliant.

Mr. Polyniak asked: And then as it relates to I guess the vegetation, any vegetation that's removed you'll work to make it as similar as possible with respect to the re-vegetation?

Mr. Vierheilig responded: Yes, and that would be by the landscape wall, where we've removed the boxwoods by the corner where the landscape wall, we'll add some more vegetation behind it.

Mr. Polyniak stated: We ask that you address any comments you receive from the police and fire department.

Ms. D'Arminio responded: We haven't received any yet. If we do, we'll address them.

Chairman Garip stated: This is a courtesy, there's no vote. We appreciate you being here.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

Mr. Mecca stated: What I would suggest is that I would just send a letter saying they shall comply with the comments that we receive from Neglia, those are our comments, that it if it's acceptable to the board.

**b. Presentation: DMR: 251 Railroad  
Redevelopment Plan, Block 356, Lot 1.**

Mr. Mecca stated: So there is a recommended change, the Mayor and Council recommended a modification to the zoning code with regard to the provision in connection with split zone lots.

So currently the reading of the ordinance is that the applicant would have the ability to choose which zone. If it's a lot that has two different zone designations so it's split, they would have the right currently to choose either one of those zones. It's been changed to require that the applicant comply with each zone. So if the front property is in, let's say an R-3 zone or R-1 zone, they would have to comply with that, and if the back was in a commercial, they would have to comply with that. So it makes it a little bit more difficult for an applicant to just decide which zone. And it's in keeping with our master plan.

The hearing was open for public comment. No one wished to comment.

Mr. Mecca stated: So we could do one motion to approve the recommendation and to approve the resolution.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION AND  
APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

MOTION BY: M. Allegretta

SECOND BY: J. Labrosse

ROLL CALL: M. Allegretta - aye

J. Labrosse - aye

K. Solomon - aye

J. Chiusolo - aye

F. Garip - aye



## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE:** April 12, 2023

**c. Discussion: ORDINANCE NO. 12-2023, AN**  
ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 175 OF THE CODE OF  
THE CITY OF HACKENSACK, "ZONING," IN ORDER TO  
REVISE AND CLARIFY REQUIREMENTS FOR  
DEVELOPMENT IN "SPLIT-ZONE LOTS.

**F R A N C I S A. R E I N E R, L L A, P. P.,** c/o  
DMR Architects, 777 Terrace Avenue, Hasbrouck  
Heights, New Jersey 07604, having been duly  
sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Reiner testified: This evening I'm here to  
present to you the redevelopment plan for 251  
Railroad Avenue. This is a project that was  
previously designated as an area in need of  
redevelopment. It's a municipal lot located along  
Railroad Avenue, Railroad Place, and Clay Street are  
the boundaries of the property.

The property is being considered for development.

The city has been working with its affordable  
housing planner and an affordable housing developer  
to redevelop the site into 24 affordable housing  
residential units. The highlighted areas shows the  
location of the existing parking lot. The only other  
thing located on this lot is a small park adjacent to  
Clay Street, which would be at the top of the page.  
What's being proposed are to remove the existing  
parking lot and to build 24 affordable housing units.  
They would meet the UHAC requirements and we're  
working with the city's affordable housing planner to  
make sure that we're in compliance with the  
settlement agreement that the city has.

The first part of the Step 1 was a resolution  
that designated the property. We presented the plan  
of the investigation study to this board. The board  
determined that it met the criteria and passed it  
along to the Mayor and Council, and it was  
subsequently adopted.

Tonight we're presenting to you the redevelopment  
plan which is Step 2 in the process, that represents  
new zoning. It would supercede the underlying  
zoning, and it would permit long-term financial  
incentives in addition to helping the city with its  
affordable housing obligations.

And then the third step in this would be a  
developer coming forward as a site plan application  
in front of the board, having to meet all the  
requirements in the redevelopment plan.

The permitted uses in the plan are for  
100 percent affordable housing up to 24 units. There  
is a breakdown between 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units  
which is part of the UHAC requirement that the

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: April 12, 2023**

redevelopment plan is adhering to. It allows for accessory uses, including lobby sales, management office, leasing offices as well as on-site superintendent residence.

The minimum requirements for the project are lot size of 20,000-square foot, maximum number of units are 24. All of them have to be affordable. Building setbacks are five feet. Lot coverage 75 percent. Maximum stories would be 3, 35 feet. There are flood mitigation requirements as part of the redevelopment plan. There are also infrastructure requirements, so that in the event that there is not adequate infrastructure to support the project, the developer would have to pay for that infrastructure in order to make the project viable. This simply protects the city from any potential situations that occurred that they might not be aware of.

In addition, West Railroad Park is required to be reconstructed adjacent to Clay Street and it has to have a minimum of new playground equipment, protective surfaces, fences and gates, as well as landscaping, grass areas. And there is a provision in there that the city engineer, Neglia, would have to review and approve the plan for the West Railroad park.

In addition there is a parking requirement of one space per unit plus ten percent for visitor parking. That parking will be located within the public rights-of-way of Railroad Place and Railroad Avenue. And just to show you a blowup of some of the architectural concepts that have been put into place up to this point.

The hearing was open for public comment. No one wished to comment.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE MASTER PLAN AND THAT IT BE ADOPTED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL.

MOTION BY: J. Chiusolo

SECOND BY: M. Allegretta

ROLL CALL: M. Allegretta - aye

J. Labrosse - aye

K. Solomon - aye

J. Chiusolo - aye

F. Garip - aye

7. **Old Business** - None

8. **Public Comment** - None

DATE: April 12, 2023

10. **Adjournment**

MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MR. ALLEGRETTA.  
SECONDED BY MS. SOLOMON. MOTION IS PASSED BY A  
UNANIMOUS VOTE. PLANNING BOARD MEETING ADJOURNED  
AT 8:00 PM.