

**MINUTES**  
**CLIFTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**MEETING OF December 9, 2021**

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 December 9, 2021. 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, DeGhetto, Lataro, Welsh, City Manager Villano, Vice Chair Withers, Chairwoman Kolodziej

Those absent: Comr. Greco, Councilman Eagler, Mayor Anzaldi

**Resolutions:**

1. 610 Brighton Road LLC

610 Brighton Road. Upon motion duly made and seconded, the resolution to extend the time of approval was adopted.

**Continued Hearings:**

1. Meridia Regency on Valley LLC. Mr. Intindola had responded to Mr. Zecker’s questions. Mr. Intindola responded on the record to Vice Chair Withers’ questions. City Manager Villano stated that if there were any questions that anyone wanted Neglia to address, that those questions would be submitted to Neglia and answered by Neglia. Vice Chair moved to open the meeting to clear up any questions. The Board then allowed Mr. Zecker to ask questions if he didn’t feel that his questions were not answered. Comr, DeGhetto removed himself from the dais as he is not eligible to vote. Motion by to grant preliminary and final site plan approval, subdivision and variances requested, subject to the stipulations before the Board. Seconded by Comr. Korbanics. Those in favor: Comrs. Welsh, Lataro, Korbanics, City Manager Villano, Vice Chair Withers, Chairwoman Kolodziej  
Those opposed: Comr. Binaso

**New Hearings:**

1. NutClif; On 3 Campus subdivision and variances.

Meryl Gonchar, Esq. represents the applicant. This is an applicant for a preliminary and final subdivision approval and bulk variances. The applicant has provided proof of service and publication. No development is being proposed at this time. Applicant seeks only to establish development lots. The bulk variances generally relate to existing conditions. When to lots are developed the applicant intends to comply with the total development area plan impervious coverage allowed. The applicant’s surveyor was sworn and qualified in the field of land surveying. The plans were marked and identified. The witness described the existing lot layout.

The witness then described the lots as they are proposed to exist if the subdivisions are granted. The lots comply with the size requirements of the Phase III redevelopment plan.

The applicant's engineer, Mr. Chu, was sworn and qualified. He stated that most of the area was a paved parking area. This explains why there is a lack of impervious surface on the site. There are multiple roadways on the site. The existing utility buildings will remain at this time. One variance relates to the setback of an existing utility building. He stated that there is an excess of impervious coverage presently. Applicant will comply with impervious requirements as the lots are developed. He affirmed the lot dimensions as testified to by the surveyor. He stated that it is anticipated that the lots through which the utilities go through will be developed together. Mr. Chu described the setback and impervious coverage variance requests. Mr. Chu further discussed access to Route 3 or previously approved Routes, so that lots which may appear landlocked will be used in conjunction with other lots to provide access to street access. Lot D will be developed as a future roadway.

In response to questioning from Comr. DeGhetto, Ms. Gonchar stated that during development that there will be a reduction in impervious coverage.

The Applicant's planner was sworn and qualified and testified in support of the various and stated that there is justification for the grant of the variances after a review of the positive and negative criteria, . conformity with the master plan. The first variance is the impervious coverage variance which is at 86.86 percent. The applicant also seeks a side yard set back variance and the variance for lot not fronting a roadway. The witness provided testimony for these variances using the public purpose test. He stated that the variances can be granted under either the C1 or C2 test. The variances presently exist and relate to the unique nature of the site. The applicant will have to deal with these issues again when developing the lot. The conditions will remain for the purpose of simply subdividing the lots. No members of the public appeared.

Motion by Comr. Binaso to grant the relief requested. Applicant will provide the information for which waivers were requested. The applicant will comply with the Neglia report. Seconded by City Manager Villano

All present voted in favor of the application.

#### Miscellaneous:

1. Master Plan re-exam. Ms. Hartmann discussed several items requested to be reviewed by the Board of Adjustment in its letter to the City. Members of the public appeared with concerned that the public is not being appropriately included in the process. Comr Binaso suggested scheduling that the Board schedule a public hearing on the re-exam in February and that the notice will be on the website. The matter was then adjourned to be included on the February 24, 2022 agenda, at 7:00 p.m. Everyone is invited to submit comments to the City Manager.

There be no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert A. Ferraro, Secretary Counsel.