

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 23, 2021 PLANNING BOARD MEETING (VIRTUAL)  
BOROUGH HALL, BOROUGH OF HILLSDALE**

MEMBERS PRESENT: E. Lichtstein, E. Alter, M. Kates, J. Miano, S. Riordan  
Chairman, D. Burleson, D. Friedman, Mayor J. Ruocco,  
M. DiPisa, S. Raymond, Zoltan Horvath

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

EMPLOYEES PRESENT: **N. Nabbie, Board Attorney**  
C. Statile, P.E., Board Engineer  
R. Hamman, Deputy Secretary

Secretary Kates called the meeting to order at approximately 7:30pm. Secretary Kates recited the Open Public Meetings Statement and Pledge of Allegiance.

OPEN TO PUBLIC (for matters not on the agenda):

Meeting was open to the public. There being none, the meeting was closed to the public.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**PZ-08-20, Block 1119, Lot 4**

**Matesic, 61 Cedar St**

*Bulk Variance for Impervious coverage and use variance for Floor Area Ratio*

Mayor Ruocco and Council Liaison Horvath recused themselves from the hearing.

The Board engineer was sworn in. He stated the applicants applied for a 223 sq foot addition on their home. They are asking to increase both their impervious coverage and Floor Area Ratio.

The applicants were sworn in.

The applicants described the changes they want to make to their home. They want to increase their living space while making some changes to the interior.

A board member asked a question regarding the impervious coverage request and if a change to the storm drain is warranted.

A board member asked if the current owners requested an addition in the past and had a question regarding the amount of impervious coverage requested.

A board member asked about the location of the requested addition and what was being done with respects to the addition.

The applicant explained how they were going above existing porch. They will remove the existing stairs from the kitchen and move the location to the proposed addition.

A Board member asked the Engineer about the Floor Area Ratio percentage that would be added.  
A Board member asked about the current use of the existing garage.

A question was asked regarding the architect the applicants were using.

A question was asked regarding a prior variance.

A question was asked about the size of the driveway and drainage changes that should be made. Possibly replacing the asphalt with pavers or something. (pea gravel).

A question was asked regarding the make up of the addition from 2 bedrooms upstairs to 2 bedrooms plus a master suite.

A question was asked about the concrete slab. (patio)

A question was asked about the FAR.

A question was asked about trees and if any were coming down.

A question was asked about the size of the existing shed and its location.

A question was asked about an office being added on the second floor and how the basement will be used for storage.

A statement was made that the applicants were already over impervious coverage and with the proposed addition, they would be over even more.

A question was asked if the applicants would be willing to give up something such as the backyard/driveway and replace with pea gravel.

A question was asked if the applicant could replace the concrete patio with some pavers or instead of pavers use crushed stone.

A question was asked if they were willing to give up their shed to reduce their impervious coverage.

A point was brought up that there is no breakdown of square footage for driveway, walkway etc. on the Zoning Table.

A statement was made that the architect representing the applicant should be present to ask questions about the square footage.

It was suggested that the applicant, meet with their architect to see if they can reduce impervious coverage and provide a Zoning table with the list of all square footage for each of the components of the property.

The applicant was given the additional information they will need to provide the Board so a decision can be made.

The applicant will return with their architect and return for the Planning Board meeting of April 8, 2021.

An announcement by the Board attorney that the hearing will be carried until April 8, 2021.

The meeting was open to the public. Since there were no questions, the meeting was closed.

A question was asked that the applicant ask the architect to provide a reason the variance was requested.

**PZ-01-21, Block 1909, Lot 5**

**Freedberg and Miller, 46 Hillsdale Ave**

*Bulk Variance for Impervious Coverage, Use Variance for Floor Area Ratio, Distance from Dwelling to Accessory Structure and Front Yard Setback*

The engineer state that the applicant is requesting a 742 square foot addition to a single-family dwelling to increase bedroom count. The master suite will be in the first floor

The applicant and architect were sworn in.

The architect was asked to provide his qualifications.

The applicant explained what they currently want to do with their home. They are increasing both their impervious coverage and F.A.R. He described the variances that are needed.

The architect described what was being done and why.

A comment was made that the addition would look nice while not standing out too much with the respects to the rest of the neighborhood.

A question was asked about the 10 foot setback from the detached garage.

A question was asked about the lack of a walk way and whether one is needed.

A question was asked about the size of the garage.

A question was asked about the drainage between the detached garage and the back of the addition.

A question was asked regarding the similarities between the original application in 2008 and the present application.

A question was asked regarding changes to the landscaping for this addition.

A question was asked to reduce the impervious coverage on the driveway.

A question was asked regarding the storm water requirements and to add a seepage pit.

It was determined approval lapsed from the last application.

A comment was made had the home been on a full lot, there would have been no need for a variance application.

A question was asked why the addition could not be made more toward Highland Ave.

Discussion was open to the public. Since there were not comments, the discussion was closed.

A motion was made by Scott Raymond. Motion was seconded by Ed Alter.

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Hamman, Deputy Planning Board Secretary

