

**Township of Washington  
BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY  
Planning Board Meeting  
Minutes/Special Meeting  
July 9, 2014**

**Meeting Called to Order at 7:35PM**

**First Order of Business:** Salutation to the Flag

**Open Public Meetings Act:** Read into the record by the Board Secretary.

**Roll Call Taken:**

Messrs. Dumaresq, Golick, Murphy, Pinnick, Sabino (absent), Councilman Sears, Chairman Calamari, Mayor Sobkowicz

**Also in Attendance:** Board Attorney Robert Wertalik; Board Engineer Paul Azzolina; Board Secretary JoAnn Carroll

**Open Public Portion:** Dumaresq, Golick

**Ayes:** Dumaresq, Golick, Murphy, Pinnick, Sears, Chairman Calamari, Mayor Sobkowicz

**No Public Comment**

**Close Public Portion:** Dumaresq, Golick

**Ayes:** Dumaresq, Golick, Murphy, Pinnick, Sears, Chairman Calamari, Mayor Sobkowicz

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Paul Imbarrato, 191 and 195 Linwood Avenue, Block 2501.01, Lots 16 & 17:** site plan matter; concept/classification review.

**Chairman Calamari:** introduced the application; wanted clarification of this hearing being classified as a “completeness review”; was decided upon that the applicant was before the Board for a classification of his application; Chairman Calamari stated the ordinance was read at the last meeting which stated a major subdivision is the creation of more than three lots; it doesn’t specify if they are new, or if old ones were deleted, etc.; there were two lots on this tract of land and now there are four; in his own opinion, if there were two, now there are four, this means that two lots were created; the decision is up to the Board; asked Mr. Wertalik to add his comments.

**Mr. Wortalik:** stated his review did not reveal any case law that would contradict Chairman Calamari's analysis nor does the statute in any way prohibit this type of analysis; the Board has a great deal of power in matters like this and a great deal of flexibility; especially in areas of first impression, the Board is free to decide this issue the way it wishes to.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated he reviewed the minutes from June 25, 2014 which were an accurate representation of the statements he offered at the last meeting.

**Mayor Sobkowicz:** stated she is still thinking this might be a major subdivision because the applicant is still going to end up with four pieces; if the Board were to determine this application was a minor subdivision, and the Board reviews it, could the Board change items from the other sections.

**Chairman Calamari:** stated this was a good point; Chairman Calamari posed a question to Mr. Azzolina; the distinction between a major and minor subdivision, are there any additional considerations for the Board that the Board would not consider if it is classified a minor as opposed to what the Board would consider if it was classified a major subdivision.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated the considerations are the same under either classification; this application, the way it was presented as a minor was unusual in that basically the same information that is required for a major subdivision was already presented as part of the minor application just because of the nature of it; the driveway has the appearance of a roadway so a profile was provided which indicates the grading of the roadway; the drainage system and the stormwater management report provided would be required for a major subdivision; the applicant complied with the stormwater regulations because it was, at that time, a major development; continues to be a major development.

**Chairman Calamari:** stated that up to now, the Board has looked at it as if it were a major subdivision.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated that was correct.

**Mayor Sobkowicz:** stated many people had come forward in 2012 regarding flooding; with another house proposed on the property, which the Mayor does prefer, asked what it would entail for the Township to have to make sure this additional house will not change anything in the drainage or even the size of each lot.

**Chairman Calamari:** stated that was a good question, but Chairman Calamari was not sure if this topic would affect the distinction between a major and minor subdivision.

**Mayor Sobkowicz:** stated this subdivision needs to be viewed in conjunction with the other one; the whole picture needs to be looked at.

**Chairman Calamari:** stated the Board is looking at the whole picture.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated, in response to the Mayor's question, the lot sizes did change; they are all greater than the required minimal lot area; the stormwater management system will be modified to accommodate the increased impervious surface created by the new roof, the new driveway; that is what is set forth in the revised stormwater management report; Mr. Azzolina has not checked this yet but it has been done and it would be required for either a major or minor subdivision.

**Chairman Calamari:** asked if the Board would review these same items either way.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated "Yes."

**Mayor Sobkowicz:** asked how the County views a major vs. a minor subdivision.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated the County's position is typically that they will go along with whatever determination the municipality makes; the County will look at this either way since it requires access of the County road and it also ties into the County drainage system; the overflow; the County will perform a review of the application under either scenario; regarding the Paramus sewer, as was stated on the original application, the applicant needs to seek an amendment from Paramus in order to allow; what was then one additional house, now there will be a second additional house into the Paramus sewer.

**Mayor Sobkowicz:** stated she doesn't have a problem with the way it is; wants to make sure all aspects of the application are covered by the Board.

**Chairman Calamari:** stated that if the County appears to be satisfied, the attorney appears to be satisfied and the engineer appears to be satisfied, now it is up to the Board.

**Motion to classify this application as an amended minor subdivision:**  
Pinnick, Dumaresq

**Ayes:** Dumaresq, Pinnick, Chairman Calamari

**Nays:** Mayor Sobkowicz

**Abstain:** Golick, Murphy, Councilman Sears,

**Absent:** Sabino

**Vote reviewed; Abstained votes go to the majority; motion is carried.**

**Mr. Imbarrato:** asked if another set of plans needs to be submitted to the Board.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated he doesn't know if the information is complete at this time; if the same documents were submitted to the Board as were submitted to Mr. Azzolina, then he would determine Mr. Imbarrato would not need to resubmit at this time.

**A discussion followed regarding meeting schedule; it was determined that the applicant would return on July 30, 2014 for a Completeness Review; at that time, a public hearing date would be determined.**

**Chairman Calamari:** stated, for the record, the Imbarrato application will be continued at the July 30, 2014 Planning Board meeting to determine if the application is complete; July 30, 2014 is a regularly scheduled meeting date and part of the Board's annual notice of meetings.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated at the next meeting, July 30, 2014, Mr. Azzolina would determine if the application is complete or not; the Board would then set a public hearing date; Mr. Azzolina had a question for the applicant; stated on the plans rectangles are shown as far as the building envelope is concerned; asked if any site specific house plans were available that may impact height, etc.

**Mr. Imbarrato:** stated he did meet with his architect and did lay out the homes and the sizes and made them a little bit smaller; the houses are generally going to be where they are depicted by the rectangles, and if anything, smaller.

**Mr. Azzolina:** asked for confirmation that Mr. Imbarrato was showing the maximum sized homes on his plans.

**Mr. Imbarrato:** stated that was correct.

**Mr. Azzolina:** asked for confirmation that everything would be overstated in the drainage design, the soil movement calculations, etc.

**Mr. Imbarrato:** stated he took into perspective the new drainage; feels he has a full plan which encompasses the fourth lot.

**Mr. Azzolina:** stated, procedurally, believes the completeness determination on July 30, 2014 makes the most sense; prefers to have standard review time; he would have a conflict with the first meeting date in August.

**Mr. Imbarrato:** reviewed with the Board the schedule and proposed timeline for his application; asked if it were possible that an approval could be made by the Board at the August 27, 2014 meeting.

**Chairman Calamari:** stated the application could be approved but that would partly depend on if the applicant's engineer is responsive to the Board Engineer's requests or noted shortcomings in the site plans, etc.; the Board has already reviewed 2/3 of the project; asked for any additional Board comment.

**No further comment from Board Members present.**

**Motion to Adjourn:** Dumaresq, Pinnick  
**All Board Members present in favor of Motion to Adjourn.**

**Meeting adjourned at 8:00PM**

Respectfully submitted by:

JoAnn Carroll  
Planning Board Secretary  
July 10, 2014