

**MINUTES
CLIFTON PLANNING BOARD
MEETING OF JULY 28, 2022**

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Board of the City of Clifton, New Jersey, held at the City Hall, Clifton, New Jersey on July 28, 2022. Pursuant to the “Open Public Meeting Act” all notice requirements were satisfied. The time, place, date, and form of notice was announced as well as advising all applicants that formal action may be taken on the matters on the agenda.

Those present: Comrs Binaso, Lataro, Korbanics, Deghetto, Welsh, Greco, City Manager Villano, Vice Chair Withers, Chairwoman Kolodziej

Those absent: Councilman Eagler, Mayor Anzaldi

Minutes of June 23, 2022, regular meeting was approved.

Resolution:

1. The Islamic Center of Passaic County
259 Pershing Road : Block 47.02; Lot 37.01
Minor site plan approval

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the resolution approving the application was adopted.

Continued Hearings:

1. Vista at Vincent LLC.
110 Vincent Drive and 96 Fairfield Road

Block 63.01, Lots 24.01 and 24.02; 14 lot Major subdivision/ site plan approvals

The applicant has amended its plans and has noticed and published for the new plans. The new plans are for 14 single and conforming residential lots. The applicant is represented by Stephen Sinnisi, Esq. Mr. Sinnisi stated that there are no variances requested. Jack Dusinberre, Esq. represents interested parties. Mr. Dusinberre identified his 4 clients as Caruso, Pavick, Lyons, and Coucolides. Mr. Sinnisi states that efforts were made to address some of the concerns of the neighbors through the respective engineers especially regarding drainage and storm water management. The applicant called its engineer, William Page. Mr. Page was previously sworn and qualified. Mr. Dusinberre expressed concern that some plans had just been filed and had not been fully reviewed by the Board’s engineer and the engineer for his clients. The Board directed that it would hear testimony but not on items that had just been submitted. Katelyn Kester, a neighbor addressed the Board to state that she has not had the opportunity to see any new plans that had just been filed and preferred that the matter be adjourned. The Board allowed the hearing to proceed and to testify regarding plans that had been filed more than 10 days before the hearing. As to plans just filed, testimony may need to be represented at the request of anyone. Mr. Sinnisi agreed to emphasize the testimony on the plans that had been submitted in time. Comr. Binaso asked if the applicant will re-present what was discussed in

April. City Manager asked when the decision was made to add the 14th lot and asked why there was such a delay. City Manager stated that we are starting with a brand new application. Mr. Page is the project engineer for this application. He prepared the original application. At some point a decision was made to alter the original application to 14 lots. He stated that the geotechnical consult was not engaged until the middle of July. The percolation data was then obtained and ultimately submitted. Material on the site was also checked to be sure it was clean. The applicant submitted percolation test results and subsurface soil investigation. The percolation test was performed by AN S consultants. The soil was determined to be clean and the percolation test showed that they can go down deep enough for their structures. Mr. Page stated that borings were taken and there was no groundwater at all. A1 was marked as the initial plan filed in April. A2 was the plan that was submitted for the 14 lot major subdivision and it consists of 17 pages, dated last revised July 27, 2022 with all the trees and drainage and the extra lot. A3 is a colored drawing of the 14 lot subdivision which is page 14 of 17 of A2. A lot is added on the far west side and the access road to the monastery was re-routed. A signed and sealed survey was also submitted. Report of ANS consultants dated June 10 was marked as A4. The soil contamination report by ANS consultants dated June 6 was marked as A5. A laboratory gradation report by ANS dated April 4 was marked as A6. A6 shows that soil that will be moved or remain on site is clean and can be used as clean fill. A5 is a more detailed investigation than A6. A4 shows that with the foundation design, the report shows the soil conditions for purposes of designing the foundations. Mr. Page stated that aside from the 14th lot and the relocation of the road that most of the changes have to do with underground changes. Mr. Page located all the trees and has shown all the trees and their diameters and what would be removed. Comr. Binaso asked for a list of all trees by species and caliper of trees to remain and trees to be removed. Comr Binaso asked if any trees have been taken down since the last hearing. Mr. Page stated that there were trees removed and Mr. Page included the trees on the plan as trees existing and trees to be removed. Mr. Page stated that he has the information on the plans. Mr Page stated that these plans were submitted at least ten days ago. He referred to drawing 3 of A2. City Manager was concerned about trees impacting detention sites. Drawing 4 of 17 is the subdivision plan with the bulk requirements for each lot. There are no variances. Drawing 5 of 17 are the deed descriptions for each lot. Drawing 6 of 17 is existing conditions. Neglia wanted a signed and sealed copy of the survey that the applicant will submit at the next meeting. A7 was marked as the signed and sealed topographical and boundary survey by GB Associates dated December 17, 2018. . A8 is the major subdivision plan signed and sealed by Page Consultants dated June 6, 2022. City manager asked how many yards of material will be removed from the site. About 12,000 cubic yards are being removed. City Manager asked if more material can be used on site. Mr. Page stated that as material is moved around there may be areas where the material can be retained on site. Mr. Page stated that most of the drainage is to the East and South. Some drainage is on the southwest side because of the change in grade. Drawing 7 of 17 is the proposed site plan with the realignment of the roadway. There is a 20 foot easement for the main waterway down Vincent Drive to tie into a main on the northeast corner of the property. Vice Chair Withers asked about the decks on lots 5 and 9 going over the set back line. Mr. Page stated that he could shift the decks. He will be sure the decks are conforming. Mr. Page stated that on the east side is a berm similar to the one on the south side. There is still some water flowing to the east and south although less than currently flows. Mr. Dusenberre stated that Mr. Page is testifying from plans just submitted. Mr. Page stated that page 8 of the plans is a revised page, last revised July 22 which was submitted yesterday to the Board. Pages 1 through 7 were submitted in time. Page 9 was revised recently. Page 10, the utility plan has not changed. Mr. Page stated that it is typical to inquire about a "will serve " letter. Those were

submitted to Passaic Valley Water and PSE&G. Mr. Page stated that there is no indication that utility services might not be available. Vice Chair asked about sidewalks. The RSIS applies and if one is not proposed, the applicant should request a waiver. The road is a public right of way. There is double V inlet shown on the plans. Drawing 14 of 17 lighting and landscape has no changes. No light will spill on to adjoining property. Pages 16 and 17 have no changes. The Board had a discussion about the detention system being in the public road and becoming the obligation of the City.

The meeting was opened to the public. Katelyn Kester is concerned that there will not be enough time to review the reports for the next meeting. She was hoping that the matter could be carried to September so everyone has time.

Patricia Karas appeared and she thanked the Board members for their hard work. Her husband felt there are too many units in a small plot. Mary Plummer appeared and she stated that on August 25 she will be on vacation. She asked if she can submit her concerns especially about drainage on the south side. Mr. Plummer was advised that she can submit questions to the Board and the Board may choose to ask them.

The matter was then carried to the August 25, 2022 meeting of the Board at 7:00 p.m. and the public was so advised.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert A. Ferraro, Esq, Secretary/Counsel