

**MINUTES**  
**CLIFTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Meeting May 28, 2026**

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 May 28, 2026. 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, Korbanics, Lataro, Welsh, Rodgers, Fragapane, Mayor Grabowski, Chair Susan Kolodziej

Those absent: Councilman D’Amato, Vice Chair Withers, Comr. Gurkov

The minutes of the April 23, 2026 meeting was approved.

3. New Matters:

- A. Catalyst Development Group, LLC  
301 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Block 18.09, Lot 13.01  
Minor subdivision and bulk variances

Dominick Iannarella, Esqs. represents the applicant. Mark Leber was sworn and qualified as an expert in the field of engineering. This is an application for a minor subdivision with bulk variances. This is a rectangular shaped corner lot with 125 feet of frontage along 3<sup>rd</sup> street. Surrounding uses are residential with a variety of lot sizes. There is an existing 2 ½ story on the property. The property is in the RA3 zone. The applicant seeks to subdivide the property into two lots by placing a division line on the property parallel to Washington Ave. 74.5 feet from the intersection. The existing house would remain on a conforming lot. (Lot 13.02). A second lot would be created which measures 99.1 feet by 54.1 feet (Lot 13.01). A new home on that property could have a conforming footprint. There are variances requested for the new side yard setback for the sunroom on the existing house would be 3.89 feet with 6 feet required. There are other non-conformities which are not affected by this application: rear yard setback to the existing house, 10.5 feet is existing and 35 feet required; the existing house is 2 ½ stories where 2 stories is permitted, and the existing height is 34 feet with the zone limit being 30 feet. Proposed parking conforms with the zone requirements. Mr. Leber stated that the sunroom is on a one-story portion of the house and is barely discernible. Mr. Graviano stated there is another variance required. The subdivision also makes the former side yard a rear yard, so a variance is needed for a rear yard setback of 10.5 feet where 35 feet is required. The applicant has reviewed the report of Neglia Engineering dated, and the applicant stipulates that it will comply with all of the conditions. The applicant also agrees with the conditions of the Board Planner’s reports. There is a max of four bedrooms, There is a garage required, and the side yard setbacks will be 8 feet and 8 feet for the new home. There are about 7 good sized trees on the corner lot that will remain. There is a large tree on the back of the lot which will remain. At least three new trees for each lot will be provided. The applicant will provide a plan showing the tree planting that shows what trees will come down and where trees of

4 inch caliper will be provided. The applicant will work with Neglia to come up with a approved landscape plan. No members of the public appeared. Motion by Comr. Binaso to approve the application, seconded by Comr. subject to:

1. Compliance with May 18, 2026 report of the Board Planner.
2. Compliance with the Neglia report of May 14, 2026.
3. Neglia will work with the applicant to provide a detailed planting schedule, and Neglia will monitor the project to completion.

Those in favor: all present.

Those opposed: none.

#### 4. Continued Hearing:

##### A. Chick-Fil-A, Inc.

340 Kingsland Street

Block 80.02, Lots 1, 1.01, 1.02 & 2.01

Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval

Minor amended subdivision approval to adjust lot dimensions

This matter was previously heard on March 26, 2026, and continued to April 23, 2026. Meryl Gonchar represents the applicant. The Board stated that it would take out of order the applicant's traffic and planning experts and then circle back to engineering.

Nick Verderese, was sworn and qualified as an expert in the field of traffic engineering. The witness prepared a December, 2025 traffic impact report for this application. He looked at existing conditions and traffic studies for the area. He added traffic from approved but not constructed projects. The bulk of traffic utilizes Route 3. He analyzed the westerly driveway on Route 3. He stated that the proposed site would function at acceptable levels of traffic. He stated that access to the site is safe and efficient. He stated that sufficient parking is provided. There are 3 ADA spaces as required. There are two EV spaces. There is safe and adequate access and circulation. The meeting was opened to the public. Robert Gorrie, Esq. with Davis Environmental Law appeared on behalf of Nutley Lumber. The witness described what is on the site. He said there are barricades that prevent him from driving on the site. He stated that there is no traffic currently on the Chik Fil-A site. He said he is familiar with a good part of the ON3 campus. The witness stated that he referenced other traffic studies on other approved lots on the site because they are traffic generators. He included intersections impacted by 100 or more trips which is the industry standard. He used traffic counts from a Stonefield Study. The public portion for this witness was closed.

Steve Lydon, was sworn and qualified as a professional planner. He reviewed the variance request for Section 35/36 variance. Other than that, there are no other variances or waivers being requested. He has heard all prior testimony and all drawings submitted, reports prepared, and reviews by the City's professionals. He testified about the Section 35/36 variance. He says that he is not sure these sections apply, but out of caution they are requesting it. He says that the concern is about safety, and whether emergency services can access. The Clifton Fire and Police Department have no objection to the application. The roads are adequately designed and there is a sufficiency of drainage. Even if they are private roads, they are designed to proper engineering standards and are safe. Robert Gorrie, Esq. asked if Mr. Lydon assessed the roadways. He stated that he did not assess the roadways, but the reports, to determine if the roadways meet the criteria for the variance from a planning perspective.

The applicant then recalled the applicant's engineer, Mr. Kelly. He reviewed additional documents submitted to the Board. Mr. Kelly submitted a revised stormwater management report. The hydraulic modeling method was amended to the CFS method which he stated is more appropriate. The proposed drainage method was changed to the NRCS method. A small portion of the JCMUA property in the northwest corner on Exhibit A-1, is impervious, and the plan was revised to show same. Basin A and B are slightly modified to fit with the proposed more conservative analysis. Other changes in the plan were discussed. Mr. Kelly stated that the project is designed in compliance with the DEP regulations and any applicable City ordinances.

Mr. Gorrie questioned Mr. Kelly. He asked if the rational method was used in the prior report. He stated that the rational method could be used, but he stated that the revised report is a better statement of existing conditions and provides a more conservative report as a result of interested party's concerns. He says that both reports are compliant with DEP regulations. Mr. Gorrie asked about 2023 amendments to the DEP regulations. Mr. Kelly stated that those regulations apply to this application. He stated that the current analysis is more representative of the present rules. Mr. Kelly stated that the 2023 regulations permit the use of the rational method. There was a discussion about existing conditions and prior reports. Mr. Kelly also stated that the drainage area expanded which had more motor vehicle surface. He looked at the full disturbance area, which he has done in his revised report. He expanded the drainage area knowing that the applicant will expand its disturbance limits. The Basins are a closed system, and they will go back and retest during construction to show where a seasonal high exists. Mr. Kelly stated that if the seasonal high is higher than anticipated, that can be resolved in the field. Mr. Kelly stated that the soil type on the USGS map is of a certain type. He doesn't remember if the soil survey is in his report. Hydrologic soil group C was identified for the soil type. Mr. Gorrie gave Mr. Kelly a copy of a Web Soil survey of the subject area which was marked 0-1 for identification. 0-1 includes the subject property and identifies a soil type. Mr. Kelly stated that the underlying soil has an HSG of C which was cross referenced with an approved storm water management report. Mr. Gorrie then questioned if the storm water design could handle designed storms. He says there is an established drainage area with different ridge lines, you have a slope to the land, and you are required to take the longest path of travel in the drainage area and it is subject to sheet flow and shallow concentrated flow as dictated by the land cover. A discussion took place about these factors. There was a discussion about the point of analysis, which is the point where the water drains to on the site. The rules specify where that point of analysis should be. Mr. Kelly established a drainage area to the east of the site, which is point OA 1 and there is one other point. Mr. Gorrie asked where the rules require the point of analysis to be. NJAC 7:8-5.6 was discussed. Mr. Gorrie asked if the point of analysis was in accordance with that section. Mr. Kelly stated that it was. He stated that he could not put the POA at the site boundary. There is infrastructure in Roadway B and D that drains to POA 1. The POA was not established within the lot lines. Mr. Kelly stated that the distance of where the boundary of the site meets the receiving storm sewer is about 230 feet. He stated his reason for positioning the other two points of analysis.

The hearing was then carried to the June 25, 2026 meeting of the Board at 7:00 p.m. and this was announced at the hearing.

There was a discussion about getting documents to the Board in sufficient time for the Board to review. The Board requires the applicant to submit documents 10 days in advance. The Board requested that the objector submit documents as soon as possible.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert A. Ferraro, Esq. Secretary/Counsel