

Regular Public Meeting of the Englewood Cliffs
Planning Board Minutes
July 9, 2026

The Regular Meeting of the Englewood Cliffs Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Porrino at 7:37pm.

Roll Call:

Present:

Chairman Porrino
Mr. Kim
Mrs. Villari
Mr. Lee – Borough Representative
Councilwoman Biegacz

Absent:

Vice Chairwoman O'Shea
Ms. Correa
Mr. You
Mrs. Rizvi – 1st Alternate
Mrs. Zimecki – 2nd Alternate
Mr. Woo – Mayor Designee
Mayor Park

Present:

Tom Randall Esq., of Randall & Randall, LLP, the planning board's attorney.
Mr. Craig Zimmerman, of Colliers Engineering, the planning board engineer

Flag Salute

Public notice of this regular meeting has been given in compliance with the Open Public Meeting Law by advertisement in The Record, notification to The Press Journal, and posting of notice on the municipal website at www.engagewoodcliffsnj.org and posting on the entrance of the borough hall building at 482 Hudson Terrace, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to adopt the March 5, 2026, special meeting minutes. Mr. Lee made the motion and was seconded by Mrs. Villari with a roll call vote. (5) Ayes Mr. Kim, Mrs. Villari, Mr. Lee, Councilwoman Biegacz, and Chairman Porrino. No Nays, No Abstentions.

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to adopt the March 12, 2026, regular meeting minutes. Mr. Lee made the motion and was seconded by Mrs. Villari with a roll call vote. (5) Ayes Mr. Kim, Mr. Lee, and Chairman Porrino. No Nays, (2) Abstentions Mrs. Villari and Councilwoman Biegacz.

Old Business:

Application #345K - Commercial Site Plan Approval
Englewood Hospitality, LLC – 495 Sylvan – Block 512 Lot 3
Resolution – Approval

Mr. Randall stated that due to the recent fire no action is required at this time. Chairman Porrino stated we will carry it to a future date.

New Business:

Application #352K - Minor Subdivision – Site Plan Approval w/Variances

Mr. & Mrs. Iskenderian – 56 Hudson Terr. – Block 201 – Lot 1

Mr. Mathew Capizzi, attorney for the applicant, gave an overview of the property at 56 Hudson Terrace in the RB-1 zone. He stated it is an oversized lot that they would like to subdivide and construct two new homes. The lot is approx. 10,500 sq. ft. whereas 5000 sq. ft. is the minimum requirement. The frontage is 101 feet along Hudson Terrace whereas 50 ft. is the required size. They would like to divide the lot into two fully conforming lots for the zone except for the lot width at the setback line. That variance is because of the angle of the front lot line. The buildings on the plan were designed by Mr. Lachanaris who will testify this evening. The side yards are not only conforming but over conforming by several feet. Building coverage, height and impervious coverage are all being met. We feel that the short fall at the setback line of each lot will not be a detriment to the streetscape along Hudson Terrace. We feel the project will enhance the area. The applicant will live in one of the new homes and sell the other.

Mr. Collazuol, engineer for the applicant submitted as exhibit "A1" a color rendering of the landscape plan which was dated as 7/9/26. This plan was submitted with the application but not in color. Mr. Collazuol gave an overview of the existing conditions of the property. It is an irregular shape lot which was the result of a subdivision that was done in the late 1920's. The site is 10,480 sq. ft. The applicant lives in the house presently on the lot. The property is on Hudson Terrace which is a county road. The application will have to go to the county for an exemption or approval which will follow the application this evening. The site is gently sloped. There are no sidewalks on Hudson Terrace. Mr. Collazuol gave an overview of the subdivision plan. He stated they plan to divide the property basically in half which will be somewhat equal. Mr. Collazuol went over the zoning chart on the plan. Proposed lot 1.01 will be 5,421 sq. ft. and lot 1.02 will be 5,058 sq. ft. whereas 5,000 sq. ft. is required so both will comply. The issue with this application is the area of the lot width at the setback line where the requirement is 50 ft. and 1.01 will be 44.3 ft and lot 1.02 will be 45.11 ft. They will both require a variance. Approx a 5 ft. deficiency for each lot when all other zoning requirements comply. Mr. Collazuol went over the site plan with the new proposed homes. He explained that they propose to have the driveways with turn arounds on the front to have an easier egress onto Hudson Terrace for each home. Mr. Collazuol went over the zoning table for the two homes. He noted that there will be approx. 7.2 ft. on each side of each home with an approx. total of 15 ft between the homes. The front yards and rear yards comply. Mr. Collazuol went over all other information on the zoning chart for each home which complies with all other zoning requirements. Mr. Collazuol went over Collier Engineering's review letter dated June 19, 2026. He stated that there was a comment about the site distances. We have for lot 1.01 a site distance of 330 ft. to the north and approx. 390 ft. to the south for lot 1.02 we have approx. 300 ft. to the north and approx. 340 ft. to the south that is at a 35 mile an hour posted speed limit. We believe we can comply with the county requirements. There is a comment in the letter about sidewalks where there are none on Hudson Terrace presently. We are not providing any since there are none on any of the properties along Hudson Terrace. The other comment was in respect to the

utilities that are close to the drainage system and based on the system it could be altered to provide sufficient distance. There was a comment about providing soil testing prior to demolition of the existing home. We are requesting that we be able to complete that prior to issuance of a building permit for either of the new homes since that is usually how it is completed in the borough. Mr. Collazuol gave an overview of the landscape plan which was marked as exhibit "A1". He went over all types of plantings that were proposed.

Mr. Zimmerman of Colliers Engineering, planning board engineer stated that this is a very straight forward application the only two waivers being requested are for the two resulting lot widths at the setback and everything else complies with the borough zoning codes. I would like to see the sight lines on the plan. Is this application going to keep the fencing on the rear of the property? Mr. Collazuol stated yes there is a 6' white PVC fence that will remain. Mr. Zimmerman stated that he liked the "K" turn driveway plan for each home. Mr. Zimmerman questioned if the applicant would address all concerns of his report. Mr. Collazuol stated yes, with any issue or concerns whether the soil testing can be done later. Mr. Zimmerman stated his only other comment is that you have an existing house on the lot and if the board is to approve the application there needs to be some timing as to when the house is to be demolished as to when the subdivision will be completed. I think there needs to be a timeline of events. I think the house has to be demolished first and then the subdivision perfected. Mr. Capizzi stated they will handle it differently. It's a common question to the board. Typically, we handle this through the developer's agreement, so the subdivision has to be perfected within 190 days of the board's adoption of the resolution. The developers' agreement will call for that and we could not get a building permit until the existing home is demolished. So, we wouldn't be able to improve the property until the existing improvements are demolished. We can give a timetable for when the existing home is to be demolished.

Chairman Porrino stated that we usually do not request a developer's agreement for this type of subdivision. Mr. Capizzi stated then instead of a developer's agreement it can all be stipulated in the board's resolution. Mr. Randall agreed to that and stated we can extend the 190 days.

Mr. Lee commented on the "K" turn driveway that our codes don't specify that it is a circular driveway. If it were a circular driveway there are other factors that need to be considered like front yard coverage and curb cuts, but in this case, it is a "K" drive, and I could not consider those items as restriction. At the end of the day if you look at it the front yard is quite dense. I am not sure if that is something we can approve based on the fact that the front is basically all covered beyond the circular drive requirements and the site triangle if that plays in this case since there is a lot of traffic on Hudson Terrace. Mr. Capizzi stated that the traffic issue is under the jurisdiction of the county, and they will review the application and make the determination.

Mr. Collazuol went over how they can narrow down the driveway from 14 ft. to 12 ft. in the right of way. There was discussion on reducing some of the "K" turn area by the raised platform to reduce coverage of the front yard.

Mr. Lachanaris, architect for the applicant marked into exhibit as "A2" Color rendering of the two proposed new homes and gave an overview of the proposed home on lot 1.02 which is on the south side of the subdivision property. Mr. Lachanaris also gave an overview of the proposed home on lot 1.01 on the northside of the subdivision property. The plan for each home was submitted with the application.

Chairman Porrino asked what the distance from the left side of the garage door and the corner of the front entrance is. Mr. Lachanaris stated it is 2 ft. to the entrance, and it is 14 inches to the wall of the portico.

Ms. Kathryn Gregory, planner for the applicant, gave an overview of the plan. We are taking one lot and subdividing it into two lots and the only issue is the lot width at the setback line for each lot. One lot will be along side the B2 zone next to the LG property. We feel it is a C1 or C2. I feel we promote the well fair for the public good in all forms for this application. There is no substantial detriment to the public good for this application or to the zoning ordinances of the borough.

Chairman Porrino had comments regarding landscaping because of the amount of impervious in the front yard. I think more can be done to beautify the view of the property. I think some more of an enhanced landscape can be between the properties so that a buffer can be set. There should be at least one shade tree on each property depending on the fact that it is a county road. New curbing along the front of both properties will have to be determined if allowed. There was discussion about plantings between the two homes and that a revised landscape plan should be submitted for the planning board engineer to approve.

Mr. Lee questioned the traffic if that will be an issue since Hudson Terrace is a busy street. Mr. Capizzi stated that it will be reviewed by the county.

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to open the meeting to the public for this matter only. Motion was made by Mr. Lee seconded by Mr. Kim and carried unanimously by voice vote.

No Comments

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to close the public for this matter. A motion was made by Mrs. Villari seconded by Mr. Lee and carried unanimously by voice vote.

Chairman Porrino questioned where the air condition and generator will be located. Mr. Collazuol stated that it hasn't been determined as of now but may be at the rear of the property.

Mr. Lee questioned if there are any window wells. Mr. Lachanaris stated they are at the rear of the property.

Chairman Porrino requested a motion of approval with the listed conditions of approval. Motion was made by Councilwoman Biegacz seconded by Mrs. Villari with a roll call vote. 4 Ayes (Mrs. Villari, Mr. Lee, Councilwoman Biegacz and Chairman Porrino) 1 Nay (Mr. Kim)

Conditions of Approval:

1. Revised site plan with site lines depicted
2. Soil testing to be completed prior to issuance of building permits
3. Seepage pits if required to have a clean out
4. Time period by perfection of the subdivision where the improvement needs to be demolished. Determined to be 3 months from date of perfection of subdivision
5. Shade Tree & curbing request to county. If tree not approved by county, then a tree is to be planted back on each property.
6. Submission of revised landscape plan for enhancements to be reviewed by Planning Board Engineer.
7. Landscaping to be planted and maintained.
8. Wavier for sidewalks.
9. Width of driveway curb cut to be a maximum of 12' and driveway to be tapered down to 12' up to where the "K" turn starts.
10. No air condition units in side yards
11. New curbs to be on plan submitted to board which can be on the revised landscape plan.
12. Subject to all county or other entities approvals.

Application #353 K -Site Plan Lot Coverage & Accessory Structure Variance
Mr. & Mrs. Parikh – 82 Roberts Rd. – Block 1101 – Lot 2

Mr. Capizzi, attorney for the applicant gave an overview of the property that is under renovation, and they are installing a pool and patio area on the rear yard and to accompany the patio area they are proposing a covered portion of the patio and enclosed structure like shed in the southerly portion of the property to enclose the pool equipment. The cover area over the patio is a little over 500 sq. ft. and is open on three sides and is considered building coverage even though the lot is oversized. The ordinance reads once you reach 20,000 sq. ft. you are capped at 4,400 sq. ft for building coverage, and this lot is over 30,000 sq. ft. The principal dwelling is complying but there is a slight overage of the 4,400 sq. ft. to allow for the cover patio and the shed/storage for the pool equipment. The outdoor patio area will have a grill where the ordinance has a relationship to where it is to be in the rear to the dwelling that it cannot be no more than 10' from the building and we exceed that. We are trying to make an outdoor kitchen area and note that it will be more than conforming from the side yard area. Also, we cannot have more than 15% of accessory area per the ordinance. We interpret it as per accessory structure whereas the zoning official interpreted it as a total of accessory structures with the rear yard area. We are exceeding that slightly due to the two structures. Mr. Capizzi handed out two exhibits "A1" color rendering of the covered patio/kitchen area and "A2" color rendering of site plan with landscaping plan.

Mr. Cory Vandervelk engineer for the applicant, gave an overview of the plan existing and what is being proposed. We are seeking approval for the shed and covered area of the patio all other items on the plan have already been approved and are under construction. Mr. Vandervelk

went over the zoning whereas the lot area required is 10, 000 sq. ft. and the property is 30,475 sq. ft. The lot building coverage allotted is 4,4000 sq. ft. and we are proposing 5,109 sq. ft. Even though the requirement stops at 20,000 sq. ft. we are well over that amount and have to hold at 4,400 sq. ft. The breakdown for this application is the dwelling at 4,200 sq. ft., cabana/kitchen area 551 sq. ft. and the shed at 287 sq. ft. The next variance we are requesting is the maximum allowance of accessory structure. Whereas 15% is allowed of the required yard area which comes to 572 sq. ft. maximum we are proposing 838 sq. ft. The cabana is open air on three sides and shed is not habitable. The height of both structures is 13.5 ft. Setbacks on the side yard are well within the requirements with additional footage. The requirement for the side yard of the cabana is 5 ft. We are proposing 13.4 ft. and there will be landscaping around it. There is existing 20-25' high evergreens around the rear yard that will remain. The third variance is the location of the BBQ in the kitchen area. The requirement is to be no more than 10 ft. from the dwelling whereas we are proposing it to be 36.5 ft. Mr. Vandervelk went over the landscaping and the enhancements they will be making to the property so as for the neighbors on both sides will not be able to see either structure.

Chairman Porrino questioned if the types of trees will be planted are on the site plan. Mr. Vandervelk stated we do not have a final landscape plan. Mr. Vandervelk went through the plan with what trees are on site and what is going to be added.

Mr. Zimmerman questioned the plan that he was going over compared to what was submitted and he reviewed in regard to planting. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the plan just has too much going on it he feels there should be an existing plan then a proposed plan so that we can see the differences because when everything is on one plan it becomes confusing on what is existing and what is proposed.

Mr. Capizzi stated that for resolution compliance we can have submitted a proposed planting plan. Chairman Porrino also requested to have evergreen screening on each side of the cabana and shed so as the neighbors do not see 13' high walls on each structure.

Mrs. Scancarella stated that the applicant already has a tree permit and replacement requirements that should be taken into consideration when designing the landscaping.

Mr. Zimmerman questioned the shed and equipment if utilities will be run. Mr. Vandervelk stated yes, it is just for the pool equipment and will be 20'x14'. Mr. Zimmerman went over his review letter and Mr. Vandervelk agreed to address any concerns of his letter.

There was discussion about the drainage which was all approved at the time of the issuance of the pool permit by the building dept. Mr. Vandervelk stated the only items for this application are the cabana/kitchen area and the shed for the pool equipment.

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to open the meeting to the public for this matter only. Motion was made by Mr. Lee seconded by Mrs. Villari and carried unanimously by voice vote.

No Comments

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to close the public for this matter. A motion was made by Mr. Lee seconded by Mrs. Villari and carried unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Kathryn Gregory planner for applicant, gave an overview of the project and variances for the improvement to the rear yard. Ms. Gregory went through all of the zoning requirements

compared to what is being proposed and how the site that is extremely oversized shows that what is being proposed is not excessive to the amount of rear yard they have. Ms. Gregory stated that she feels this request is not a detriment to the public good since the lot is greatly oversized and can totally support these items.

Chairman Porrino made a motion to approve with the listed conditions of approval and seconded by Mrs. Villari with a roll call vote. 5 Ayes (Mrs. Villari, Mr. Kim, Mr. Lee, Councilwoman Biegacz and Chairman Porrino) No Nays

Conditions of Approval:

1. Landscape plan to be submitted with enhancements around the cabana and shed areas.
2. Revised site plan stipulating existing, what has been permitted and what is proposed.
3. Landscaping is to be maintained and plantings to be 8'-10' in height pending existing planting.
4. Venting for shed to face interior of the property.
5. Any trees to be removed additional permit is required.

Application #354K - Residential Variance Front Yard Lot Coverage

Mr. Zhang & Ms. Peng – 160 Chestnut St. – Block 701 – Lot 15

Ms. Priscilla Triolo attorney for the applicant requesting a variance for a circular driveway on the front of the home, which is a nonconforming lot due to the width being 80 ft. when 100 ft. is required. We are requesting a front yard coverage variance where 30% is required and we are proposing 44%. We are proposing a 12' wide driveway circular part of the existing 16.7 ft. wide driveway. Whereas the requirement is that the driveway be 16 ft. wide. We would like to keep that width for the straight part of the driveway.

Ms. Peng owner of the property gave a statement on why they are requesting this driveway variance. We are requesting this variance due to having children with school and many other events, my husband who has changing work schedules since he works at multiple hospitals the coming and going and moving of vehicles is always an issue. We are looking for a way to park and maneuver vehicles more safely on our property.

Ms. Kirsten Osterkorn engineer for the applicant, gave an overview of the site plan. The lot is 80 ft. wide whereas 100 ft. is required. The sole purpose of their application is for the installation of a circular driveway. The lot coverage of the front yard is over by 14%, which is only 391 sq. ft. We are proposing drainage to offset the coverage. We are going to capture the front roof to offset the coverage in the front so as to not install trench drains etc. in the front. The width of the driveway is the other variance. The drop curbing existing is 16.7 ft whereas 16 ft. is required. We are proposing not to change that but the drop curb on the other side is to be 16 ft. We are proposing to use asphalt instead of pavers for the driveway. Ms. Osterkorn gave an overview also as a planner and that she feels that this plan is not a detriment to the public's good. She also stated that they reviewed Collier's letter and feels they can address all concerns. We are not planning on any tree removal if anything changes, we will comply with the borough requirements.

Mr. Lee questioned the large tree on the property if they are planning to keep it. Ms. Osterkorn stated they are keeping that tree. Mr. Lee asked how many cars do they have. Ms. Peng stated we have four. Mr. Lee asked how long the driveway is now. Ms. Osterkorn stated it is 34 ft. Mr.

Lee asked how many cars can you fit on the driveway. Ms. Osterkorn stated they can fit 2 x 2. Mr. Lee stated also there is street parking.

Chairman Porrino stated the maximum curb cut to a circular driveway is 12 ft. and you are requesting 16 ft. which is another variance. We separate the 12 ft. for pavers versus 10 ft for asphalt for the look. So, the variances requested are the circular driveway coverage in the front yard, the distance between the curb cuts, curb cut size and width of the driveway pending which material is to be used.

Mr. Zimmerman went over the variance requests that were previously mentioned and stated he has no concern about the proposed drainage. Ms. Osterkorn stated if we go down to 10 ft. wide due to using asphalt then the turn radius may still work but we are requesting it to be kept at 12 ft.

There was discussion between members and professionals about changing the width size, material to be used to try to get percentage of coverage lower.

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to open the meeting to the public for this matter only. Motion was made by Mrs. Villari seconded by Chairman Porrino and carried unanimously by voice vote.

No Comments

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to close the public for this matter. A motion was made by Mr. Lee seconded by Mrs. Villari and carried unanimously by voice vote.

Chairman Porrino requested a motion. Mrs. Villari made a motion to approve the application with no second.

Chairman Porrino stated maybe we can work on something to make it more appealing to the members.

Mr. Lee questioned if a "K" turn drive would work. Ms. Osterkorn stated we looked at that and the same issue came up when Ms. Peng's husband has to leave at all times of day or night since he works in hospitals as an emergency doctor. They will have to move cars around pending where his car is parked. We tried many ways and if we go to the 10 ft. wide it will only bring the coverage from 44% to 40% and a new curb cut at 12 ft.

There was discussion of possible changes among members and professionals.

Chairman Porrino requested a second motion which was made by Mrs. Villari to approve the application with a 10 ft. wide driveway and a 12 ft. wide curb cut with the usage of asphalt. This was seconded by Councilwoman Biegacz with a roll call vote. 2 Ayes (Mrs. Villari, Councilwoman Biegacz) 3 Nays (Mr. Kim, Mr. Lee and Chairman Porrino). Motion failed.

Chairman Porrino made a motion to deny the application which was seconded by Mr. Lee with a roll call vote. 3 Ayes (Mr. Kim, Mr. Lee and Chairman Porrino) 2 Nays (Mrs. Villari and Councilwoman Biegacz

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to open to the public for any matter. Motion was made by Mr. Lee seconded by Mr. Kim and carried unanimously by voice vote.

No Comments

Chairman Porrino requested a motion to close the public portion and adjourn the meeting at 10:20 pm. A motion was made by Councilwoman Biegacz seconded by Mr. Kim and carried unanimously by voice vote.

Respectfully submitted.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Caterina Scancarella". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Caterina" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Scancarella".

Caterina Scancarella
Planning Board Administrative Secretary

ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS PLANNING BOARD

REGULAR MEETING – July 9, 2026, 7:30 PM

10 Kahn Terrace, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Englewood Cliffs Planning Board will come to order this (date). The time is (time).

FLAG SALUTE:

"OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT" STATEMENT

This meeting which conforms with the Open Public Meetings law, Chapter 231, Public Laws of 1975, is a regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting by advertisement in The Record, notification to the Northern Valley Press Journal, the Suburbanite, posting of notice on the municipal website at www.EnglewoodCliffsNJ.org, and at Borough Hall, 482 Hudson Terrace, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 5, 2026 – Special Meeting

March 12, 2026 – Regular Meeting

OLD BUSINESS:

Application #345K - Commercial Site Plan Approval
Englewood Hospitality, LLC – 495 Sylvan Ave. – Block 512 – Lot 3

NEW BUSINESS:

Application #352K - Minor Subdivision – Site Plan Approval w/Variations
Mr. & Mrs. Iskenderian – 56 Hudson Terr. – Block 201 – Lot 1

Application #353K - Site Plan Lot Coverage & Accessory Structure Variance
Mr. & Mrs. Parikh – 82 Roberts Rd. – Block 1101 – Lot 2

Application #354K - Residential Variance Front Yard Lot Coverage
Mr. Zhang & Ms. Peng – 160 Chestnut St. – Block 701 – Lot 15

COMMUNICATIONS :

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

PUBLIC COMMENTS OTHER THAN HEARING ON THIS AGENDA

ADJOURNMENT

400 Valley Road Suite 304
Mt. Arlington, NJ 07856
Main: 877 627 3772



June 19, 2026

Cathy Scancarella, Administrative Secretary
Borough of Englewood Cliffs
482 Hudson Terrace
Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07627

Engineering Review #1

Viken & Angela Iskenderian (Applicant)
56 Hudson Terrace (Block 207, Lot 1)
Minor Subdivision of Property into Two (2) Single Family Building Lots
Colliers Engineering & Design Project No. ECP-0189

Dear Ms. Scancarella,

As requested, our office has reviewed a certain application submitted by Viken & Angela Iskenderian (Applicant), seeking Minor Subdivision of Property into Two (2) Single Family Building Lots

The following documents, which were submitted in support of the Application, have been reviewed:

1. Planning Board Application Form, Checklists and Denial Letter dated March 30, 2026, prepared by Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq., Attorney for the applicant, six (6) pages;
2. Borough of Englewood Cliffs, official 200 ft list regarding the subject property, dated March 30, 2026, two (2) pages;
3. Proof of Taxes Paid, dated March 30, 2026;
4. Engineering Plan prepared by Collazuol Engineering & Surveying Assoc., LLC consisting of eight (8) sheets dated March 13, 2026;
5. Boundary Survey Map prepared by Collazuol Engineering & Surveying Assoc., LLC dated December 12, 2025;
6. Architectural Plan for Proposed Lot 1.01 prepared by Marios Lachanaris, Architect LLC, consisting of three (3) sheets dated March 12, 2026;
7. Architectural Plan for Proposed Lot 1.02 prepared by Marios Lachanaris, Architect LLC, consisting of three (3) sheets dated March 12, 2026;

A. Existing Conditions

The subject property, known as 56 Hudson Terrace and located at Lot 1 of Block 207, is in the R-B1 (Single-Family Residential) zone district. The property has 101' of frontage along Hudson Terrace without sidewalks. The property contains approximately 10,479 square feet in area and currently is improved with a single-family dwelling, patio, walkways, carport, driveway, and related appurtenances.

B. Proposed Development

The Applicant is seeking to subdivide the existing Lot 1 into two (2) single-family building lots (proposed Lots 1.01 and 1.02) and to construct two (2) single-family dwellings, one on each lot. Each proposed property will contain a two-and-a-half story dwelling, covered porch, asphalt driveway, attached two-car garage, and paver patio, as well as other associated improvements (the "Application"). The Application requires variance relief as to Minimum Lot Width for each of the two (2) lots.

Below is the bulk table from the applicant's plan:

ZONING SCHEDULE			
R-B1 DISTRICT (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL)			
ZONING SCHEDULE	REQUIRED	PROP. LOT 1.01	PROP. LOT 1.02
Min. Lot Area (s.f.)	5,000	5,421.28	5,058.19
Min. Lot Width (ft.)	50	44.30*	45.11*
Min. Front Yard (ft.)	20	23.15	25.26
Min. Rear Yard (ft.)	20	34.54	24.52
Min. One Side (ft.)	5	5.55	6.50
Min. Both Sides (ft.)	13	13.05	14.20
Max. Lot Coverage (%) (1)	35	33.87	32.30
Building & Overhang		1,745	1,535
Covered Porch		59	59
Steps		32	40
Max. Impervious Coverage (%)	51	50.76	50.73
Lot Coverage (s.f.)	—	1,836	1,634
Driveway	—	656	673
Raised Platform	—	60	59
Patio	—	200	200
Max. Rear Yard Coverage (%)	60	15.80	17.16
Rear Yard Area (s.f.)	—	1,418	1,305
Impervious Areas (s.f.)	—	224	224
Building Height Computations (ft./story)			
From Average Grade	30/2.5	29.57/2.5	29.82/2.5
From Mean Curb Level	32/2.5	29.57/2.5	29.82/2.5
Min. Floor Area One Floor (s.f.)	1000	1,722	1,525
Min. Floor Area Two Floor (s.f.)	1200	1,520	1,460

* VARIANCES REQUIRED

(1) IN RB-1 DISTRICT MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE MAY BE INCREASED TO 35% IF AT LEAST 3% OF THE COVERAGE OF BUILDING AREAS IS UTILIZED FOR COVERED PORCHES, CHIMNEY, STEPS, AND EXTENSIONS.

C. Variances

The applicant is proposing and requesting two (2) variances.

Minimum Lot Width – Lot 1.01 : 50' is allowed, 44.30' proposed

Minimum Lot Width – Lot 1.02 : 50' is allowed, 45.11' proposed

D. Engineering Comments

1. The plans propose removing the existing driveway and constructing two (2) new driveways and curb cuts. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding the proposed sight distance and access.
2. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding sidewalks.
3. The applicant has not provided cut and fill soil quantity calculations. Applicant shall provide these for review.
4. The applicant has provided building height calculations, and our office takes no issue with either.
5. The plans indicate proposed utility lines in close proximity to the stormwater seepage pits. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding utilities.
6. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding tree removals. It appears two (2) existing trees are proposed to be removed, one on proposed Lot 1.02 marked "20 inch" and one on proposed Lot 1.01 labeled "30 inch".
7. Drainage:
 - a. Our office has reviewed the drainage calculations provided by the Applicant's engineer, and our office takes no issue with them.
 - b. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding the maintenance and long-term functionality of the proposed drainage treatment systems, including but not limited to:
 - i. Where the over-flows are to be located and directed. It is suggested the overflows be directed to the storm drains in the street.
 - ii. How the drainage areas have been changed as it appears the proposed conditions direct more impervious areas (and resulting runoff) to the rear of the property and onto adjacent properties.
 - iii. How the seepage pits can be properly maintained being located under the asphalt driveways.
 - c. Our office suggests the soil log permeability testing be completed prior to the demolition of the existing residence. If the proposed location is determined to be inappropriate, then alternative designs should be submitted to the board for review.
 - d. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding any potential water discharge related to the sump pumps being connected to the infiltration system.
 - e. The appropriate Stormwater Maintenance Plans & Easements shall be provided to the Borough for Review and be filed in accordance with NJDEP standards.

8. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control: The plans include Soil Erosion and Sediment Control plans and details. This application will be subject to Bergen County Soil Conservation District review and approval.

E. Miscellaneous Comments

1. The Applicant is hereby advised that if stormwater runoff drainage problems occur as a result of the site improvements that are detrimental to the property and/or neighboring properties as a result of this construction, it shall be the responsibility of the owner of the property to remedy that drainage issue to the satisfaction of the Building Department and/or Borough Engineer.
2. All excavated material shall be removed from the site unless approved for backfill by the Borough. Any soil disturbance shall be done as set forth by Borough Ordinance.
3. The Applicant shall be aware of their responsibility to repair any damage to improvements within the Borough Right-of-Way including, but not limited to, sidewalk, curb, and asphalt, caused by construction activities associated with the installation of the improvements on the subject lot. We defer to the Borough's Department of Public Works in regard to this item.
4. The Applicant shall determine the limits of disturbance and install appropriate soil erosion preventative measures as necessary prior to constructing the proposed scope in association with this application and as shown on the plans.
5. The Applicant shall obtain any and all applicable approvals required by the Borough Building Department as well as outside agencies, including, but not limited to, the NJDOT, NJDEP, BCUA, and Bergen County. It is the Applicant's responsibility to determine what outside agency permits are required. Copies of said approvals shall be provided upon receipt.
6. The Applicant shall be aware that posting of engineering escrow for construction administration oversight, plan review, and project closeout will be required at the time building permits are issued. Please be aware that unused escrow money will be returned to the property owner upon the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.).
7. The Applicant shall adhere to the building department's approved design plan. Any alterations and/or changes to the approved design plan(s) and contractor questions shall be brought to the attention of the Building Department for review prior to construction or installation on-site.
8. A signed and sealed "As-Built" site plan should be submitted as a requirement for this office to "sign off" on the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.). The provided "As-Built" should accurately show all installed site features including grading, spot elevations, structures,

etc., and will be compared to the approved design plan in association with the application. The Applicant is hereby advised that deviations from the approved design plan without prior consent or approval by the building department are not acceptable. If in the event the As-Built deviates significantly from the approved design plan, the Building Department may not sign off on a C.O, especially if said deviation triggers or requires a zoning variance.

Should you have any questions concerning the above comments, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.
(DBA Maser Consulting)



Craig Zimmermann, PE, CME
Planning Board Engineer

CZ/nm

cc: Russell Porrino, Englewood Cliffs Planning Board President
Thomas Randall, Esq., Board Attorney (via email)
Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq., Applicant's Attorney (matthew@capizzilaw.com)

400 Valley Road Suite 304
Mt. Arlington, NJ 07856
Main: 877 627 3772



June 18, 2026

Cathy Scancarella, Administrative Secretary
Borough of Englewood Cliffs
482 Hudson Terrace
Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07627

Engineering Review #1

Ashish & Manjeet Parikh (Applicant)
82 Roberts Rd (Block 1101 Lot 2)
Application #353K: Construction of a Pool Cabana and a Detached Shed
Colliers Engineering & Design Project No. ECP-0190

Dear Ms. Scancarella,

As requested, our office has reviewed application #353K submitted by Ashish & Manjeet Parikh (Applicant), for the Construction of a Pool Cabana and a Detached Shed.

The following documents, which were submitted in support of the Application, have been reviewed:

1. Planning Board Application Form, Checklists and Denial Letter dated April 8, 2026, prepared by Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq., Attorney for the applicant, six (6) pages;
2. Borough of Englewood Cliffs, official 200 ft list regarding the subject property, dated March 2, 2026, two (2) pages;
3. City of Englewood official 200 ft list regarding the subject property, dated February 12, 2026, two (2) pages;
4. Borough of Tenaflly, official 200 ft list regarding the subject property, dated February 10, 2026, two (2) pages;
5. Proof of Taxes Paid, dated February 11, 2026;
6. Engineering Plan prepared by Schwanewede, Hals & Vince, consisting of one (1) sheet dated November 20, 2025, last revised March 10, 2026;
7. Boundary Survey Map prepared by Lantelme, Kurens & Associates, PC, dated March 26, 2024, last revised April 4, 2024;
8. Drainage Calculations prepared by Schwanewede, Hals & Vince, consisting of two (2) pages, dated November 20, 2025.

A. Existing Conditions

The subject property, known as 82 Roberts Road and located at Lot 2 of Block 1101, is in the R-A Residential Zone. The property has 153' of frontage along Roberts Road without sidewalks. The property contains approximately 30,475 square feet in area and currently is improved with a single-family dwelling, pool, patio, driveway, and related appurtenances.

B. Proposed Development

The Applicant is seeking to demolish the existing pool and patio areas and construct a new pool, spa, cabana with outdoor kitchen, shed, patios, two (2) raised decks, fire pit, as well as other associated improvements at the Property (the "Application"). The Application requires variance relief as to Maximum Building Lot Coverage, Maximum Accessory Building Area, and Accessory Structure to Be Located Within 10' of the Principal Building.

Below is the bulk table from the applicant's plan:

ZONING TABLE - ZONE R-A ZONE			
	REQUIRED	EXISTING	PROPOSED
LOT AREA	10,000 S.F.	30,475 S.F.	NO CHANGE
LOT WIDTH	100'	152.8'	NO CHANGE
FRONT YARD	30'	37.5'	NO CHANGE
SIDE YARD	10'	14.9'	NO CHANGE
BOTH SIDE YARD *	45.84'	48.5'	NO CHANGE
REAR YARD	25'	104.3'	NO CHANGE
LOT COVERAGE	4,400 S.F. MAX.	4,271 S.F.	5,109 S.F. (V)
IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE	51%	35.5%	38.1%
REAR YARD COVERAGE	60% MAX.	18.8%	24.2%
BUILDING HEIGHT AVG.	30'	29.2'	29.1'
BUILDING HEIGHT CURB	32'	31.1'	NO CHANGE
BUILDING HEIGHT	2.5 STY.	2 STY.	NO CHANGE
MIN. FLOOR AREA	1,800 S.F.	6,592 S.F.	NO CHANGE

* SIDE YARD BASED ON 30% LOT WIDTH AT SETBACK LINE

$152.8 \times .3 = 45.84'$

(EN) - EXISTING NON-CONFORMING

(V) - VARIANCE REQUIRED

ACCESSORY ZONING TABLE - ZONE R-A ZONE			
	REQUIRED	EXISTING	PROPOSED
COVERAGE - CABANA	572 S.F. MAX. *	N/A	551 S.F.
COVERAGE - SHED	572 S.F. MAX. *	N/A	287 S.F.
DISTANCE TO PRINCIPAL	10' MIN.	35.0'	31.6'
SIDE YARD	5'	25.2'	13.4' / 9.8'
REAR YARD	5'	40.1'	9.6'
HEIGHT - CABANA	14' / 1 STY.	N/A	13.5' / 1 STY.
HEIGHT - SHED	14' / 1 STY.	N/A	13.5' / 1 STY.
PERMANENT BBO OR STRUCTURE FROM HSE.	10' MAX.	N/A	36.5' (V)

* MAXIMUM COVERAGE OF ANY ACCESSORY BUILDING IN REQUIRED REAR YARD
 $0.15 \times 25' \times 152.57' = 572 \text{ S.F.}$

(EN) - EXISTING NON-CONFORMING

(V) - VARIANCE REQUIRED

C. Variances

The applicant is proposing and requesting two (2) variances.

Max. Lot Coverage: 4,400 SF is allowed, 4,271 SF exists, and 5,109 SF is proposed (+709 SF over allowed).

Max. Accessory Building Area: 572 SF is allowed, 0 SF exists, and a total of 838 SF is proposed (551 SF for the cabana and 287 SF for the shed, totaling +266 SF over allowed).

Max. Distance of Permanent Barbecue or Structure from House : 10' max. is allowed, 0' is existing and 36.5' is proposed (+26.5' over allowed).

D. Engineering Comments

1. The Applicant shall comply with section 30-7.8(c)2.b of the Borough Ordinance which indicates, *"Plot plans showing property lines of the premises upon which the swimming pool is to be constructed or installed, all existing houses and structures thereon abutting streets and properties and the location and dimensions of the proposed pool and its auxiliary structures including a description of the enclosure or fence to be used."* The Applicant shall revise the plans to include the adjacent structures and the details of the proposed fence to be installed.
2. It is recommended that the Applicant provide cut-and-fill soil quantity calculations.
3. The Applicant has provided building height calculations, and our office takes no issue with them.
4. As the provided plans indicate existing and proposed conditions together on one plan sheet, the plans are unclear regarding existing conditions, demolition, and proposed utilities. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding utilities. It is recommended that plans are provided that indicate existing conditions and demolition plans separate from proposed conditions.
5. Height of the pool fence shall be clarified.
6. The Applicant is showing fencing located on the adjacent properties and only indicates the installation of fencing in the side yard areas. The Applicant shall provide testimony regarding the ownership and height of the existing fence. The plan shows chain-link and wood fencing and does not note if either are to be removed.
7. The Applicant shall provide testimony regarding section 30-7.8(e)6 of the Borough Ordinance which indicates, *"Lights used to illuminate any pool shall be so arranged and shaded as to reflect light away from the adjoining premises."*
8. The Applicant shall clarify the use of the cabana to ensure it does not qualify as a dwelling.
9. The Applicant shall revise site plans to provide construction detail(s) for the proposed patio.
10. The Applicant is not showing any impact to the existing trees located on site. The Applicant shall provide a landscaping plan to indicate the existing trees onsite and indicate if trees will be removed as part of this application. The Applicant shall provide testimony.

11. The Applicant has not indicated the proposed pool discharge location. The Applicant shall provide the proposed drainage location for the pool.

12. Drainage:

- a. Our office has reviewed the drainage calculations provided by the Applicant's professionals, and our office takes no issue with them.
- b. The Applicant shall revise plans to show invert elevation and slopes of all proposed stormwater collection and stormwater management systems.
- c. The Applicant is showing the seepage pits located 6-96 inches below grade. This depth shall be clarified.
- d. The Applicant shall revise site plans to provide a construction detail for the proposed overflow for the Stormtech chambers.
- e. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding the maintenance and long-term functionality of the proposed drainage treatment systems, including but not limited to:
 - i. Where the over-flows are to be located and directed. It is suggested the overflows be directed to the storm drains in the street.
 - ii. How the drainage areas have been changed as it appears the proposed conditions direct more impervious areas (and resulting runoff) to the rear of the property and onto adjacent properties.
 - iii. The Applicant shall install a 6" observation/maintenance port for the seepage pits at grade to allow the resident to maintain and inspect the seepage pit as required by NJBMP manual. The plans shall be revised to show this condition.
- f. Our office suggests the soil log permeability testing be completed prior to the demolition of the existing residence. If the proposed location is determined to be inappropriate, then alternative designs should be submitted to the board for review.
- g. The appropriate Stormwater Maintenance Plans & Easements shall be provided to the Borough for Review and be filed in accordance with NJDEP standards.
- h. The Applicant shall add a note to the plans as follows, "The Applicant is responsible for obtaining the Seasonal High-Water Table (SHWT) and the soil infiltration results to support the proposed underground drainage system. The Applicant shall provide the result to our office for review and approval prior to scheduling of the seepage pit inspection. The Applicant shall notify the engineering office 48 hours prior to requesting the inspection. If the soils are unfavorable, the Applicant is responsible for submitting revised plans to show the updated stormwater results."

13. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control: The plans include Soil Erosion and Sediment Control plans and details. This application will be subject to Bergen County Soil Conservation District review and approval.

E. Miscellaneous Comments

1. The Applicant is hereby advised that if stormwater runoff drainage problems occur as a result of the site improvements that are detrimental to the property and/or neighboring properties as a result of this construction, it shall be the responsibility of the owner of the property to

remedy that drainage issue to the satisfaction of the Building Department and/or Borough Engineer.

2. All excavated material shall be removed from the site unless approved for backfill by the Borough. Any soil disturbance shall be done as set forth by Borough Ordinance.
3. The Applicant shall be aware of their responsibility to repair any damage to improvements within the Borough Right-of-Way including, but not limited to, sidewalk, curb, and asphalt, caused by construction activities associated with the installation of the improvements on the subject lot. We defer to the Borough's Department of Public Works in regard to this item.
4. The Applicant shall determine the limits of disturbance and install appropriate soil erosion preventative measures as necessary prior to constructing the proposed scope in association with this application and as shown on the plans.
5. The Applicant shall obtain any and all applicable approvals required by the Borough Building Department as well as outside agencies, including, but not limited to, the NJDOT, NJDEP, BCUA, and Bergen County. It is the Applicant's responsibility to determine what outside agency permits are required. Copies of said approvals shall be provided upon receipt.
6. The Applicant shall be aware that posting of engineering escrow for construction administration oversight, plan review, and project closeout will be required at the time building permits are issued. Please be aware that unused escrow money will be returned to the property owner upon the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.).
7. The Applicant shall adhere to the building department's approved design plan. Any alterations and/or changes to the approved design plan(s) and contractor questions shall be brought to the attention of the Building Department for review prior to construction or installation on-site.
8. A signed and sealed "As-Built" site plan should be submitted as a requirement for this office to "sign off" on the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.). The provided "As-Built" should accurately show all installed site features including grading, spot elevations, structures, etc., and will be compared to the approved design plan in association with the application. The Applicant is hereby advised that deviations from the approved design plan without prior consent or approval by the building department are not acceptable. If in the event the As-Built deviates significantly from the approved design plan, the Building Department may not sign off on a C.O, especially if said deviation triggers or requires a zoning variance.

Should you have any questions concerning the above comments, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.
(DBA Maser Consulting)



Craig Zimmermann, PE, CME
Planning Board Engineer

CZ/nm

cc: Russell Porrino, Englewood Cliffs Planning Board President
Thomas Randall, Esq., Board Attorney (rrslaw@aol.com)
Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq., Applicant's Attorney (matthew@capizzilaw.com)

400 Valley Road Suite 304
Mt. Arlington, NJ 07856
Main: 877 627 3772



July 1, 2026

Cathy Scancarella, Administrative Secretary
Borough of Englewood Cliffs
482 Hudson Terrace
Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07627

Engineering Review #1

Zhou Zhange and Diana Peng (Applicant)
160 Chestnut Street (Block 701, Lot 15)
Variances for Driveway Reconstruction to Circular Driveway
Colliers Engineering & Design Project No. ECP-0191

Dear Ms. Scancarella,

As requested, our office has reviewed a certain application submitted by Zhou Zhange and Diana Peng (Applicant), seeking variances for reconstruction of a driveway to a circular driveway.

The following documents, which were submitted in support of the Application, have been reviewed:

1. Zoning Board Denial Letter dated July 29, 2025
2. Planning Board Application Form, Checklists and Statement of Purpose Letter dated May 27, 2025, prepared by Priscilla J. Triolo, Esq., of Bittiger, Elias, Triolo & Diehl P.C., Attorney for the applicant, six (6) pages;
3. Copies of checks
4. Engineering Plan prepared by Kiersten Osterkorn P.E. of Omland & Osterkom, Inc. consisting of one (1) sheet, signed, dated June 1, 2025;
5. Form W-9 Request for Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification

A. Existing Conditions

The subject property, known as 160 Chestnut Street and located at Lot 701 of Block 15, is in the R-A (Single-Family Residential) zone district. The property has 80-feet of frontage along Chestnut Street without sidewalks. The property contains approximately 11,940 square feet in area and currently is improved with a single-family dwelling, wood deck, walkways, driveway, and related appurtenances.

B. Proposed Development

The Applicant is seeking to reconstruct the existing asphalt driveway into a circular driveway with two curb openings and proposes to install a new stormwater drywell pit. It appears that the Application requires three (3) variance reliefs which are detailed at C. below.

Below is the bulk table from the applicant's plan:

ZONING TABLE			
BLOCK 701 LOT 15			
BOROUGH OF ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY			
ZONE: R-A (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL)			
ITEM	REQUIRED	EXISTING	PROPOSED
MIN LOT AREA	10,000 S.F.	11,940 S.F.	NO CHANGE
MIN LOT WIDTH	100 Ft	80 Ft (E)	NO CHANGE
MIN FRONT YARD SETBACK	30 Ft	34.5 Ft	NO CHANGE
MIN SIDE YARD SETBACK ONE/BOTH	10 Ft	10.2 Ft / 28.1 Ft	NO CHANGE
MIN. REAR YARD SETBACK	25 Ft	82.8 Ft	NO CHANGE
MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT	30 Ft / 2.5 Stories	<30 Ft / 1.5 Stories	NO CHANGE
MAX LOT COVERAGE	27.1% (4,036 S.F.)	13.4% (1,599 S.F.)	NO CHANGE
MAX IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE	51% (7,595 S.F.)	27.1% (3,233 S.F.)	32.8% (3,918 S.F.)
CIRCULAR DRIVEWAY NOT TO EXCEED 30% OF THE FRONT YARD (FRONT YARD = 2,779 S.F.)	30% (834 SF)	NA	44% (1,225 S.F.)(V)
MAX CIRCULAR DRIVEWAY WIDTH (PAVERS)	12 Ft	na	12 Ft
DRIVEWAY SHALL HAVE A MIN. SIDE YARD SETBACK	3 Ft	na	4.6 Ft
MAX WIDTH CURB CUT	12 Ft	16.7 Ft	16.7 Ft
(E) = EXISTING NON-CONFORMANCE			
(V) = VARIANCE REQUESTED			

COVERAGE TABLE					
BLOCK 701 LOT 15					
BOROUGH OF ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY					
TOTAL LOT AREA	11,940 SF				
ALLOWABLE LOT COVERAGE (27.1%)	3,236 SF				
ALLOWABLE IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE (51%)	6,089 SF				
Existing Coverages			Proposed Coverages		
Description	Area (SF)	Percentage	Description	Area (SF)	Percentage
Dwelling	1,599		Dwelling	1,599	
Total Lot Coverage	1,599	13.4%	Total Lot Coverage	1,599	13.4%
Driveway	614		Driveway	1,254	
Front Stoop	76		Front Stoop	49	
Concrete Sidewalk & Rear Patio	533		Concrete Sidewalk & Rear Patio	533	
Rear Deck & Steps	411		Concrete Walkway Extension	72	
			Rear Deck & Steps	411	
Total Impervious Coverage	3,233	27.1%	Total Impervious Coverage	3,918	32.8%
			Increase In Impervious Coverage	685	

C. Variances

The applicant is requesting the following three (3) variances.

- Circular Driveway Coverage Not-To-Exceed 30% of Front Yard Area, where 44% is proposed.
- The minimum distance between curb cuts serving the same lot or parcel of land shall not be less than 50 feet as measured at the top of the curbing. The horizontal distance appears to be approximately 33 feet proposed, based on our approximate scaling of the provided drawing. The plans should be revised to indicate this distance.
- The curb cut shall not exceed 33 1/3% of the frontage upon any street of a lot or lots or parcel of land to be served thereby. It appears to be approximately 37.5% based on scaled drawings. The plans should be revised to indicate this value.

D. Engineering Comments

1. The plans propose removing the existing driveway and constructing a circular driveway and adding a curb cut. The applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony regarding the proposed sight distance and accessibility on and off the Right-of-Way (ROW).
2. The Applicant shall be aware that a road opening permit may be required for the new curb cut and driveway installation.
3. The plans propose concrete depressed curb at the new driveway entrance, however no concrete curb details are provided. The applicant shall provide a detail for all proposed concrete curbing which is consistent with Englewood Cliff Borough standards.
4. The provided plans show an asphalt driveway, however per Ordinance, a driveway width of 12-feet requires the driveway to be constructed of pavers as shown on the Zoning Table and as provided on the drawings. The Applicant shall be prepared to provide testimony as to the final material of the proposed driveway.
5. There appears to be an existing tree in the ROW. The applicant shall provide testimony as to if this tree, or any trees on the property, will be removed.
6. It appears that the proposed driveway will be constructed over existing underground utility lines (water and gas). The Applicant shall be sure that existing utilities are not affected by any such construction required for the proposed driveway.
7. The provided plans do not appear to show any geotechnical conditions or soil drainage capability. The Applicant shall be aware that if existing soil conditions do not allow proper drainage, it shall be the responsibility of the owner of the property to remedy that drainage issue to the satisfaction of the Building Department and/or Borough Engineer.
8. The Applicant shall revise the plans to provide construction detail(s) for the proposed soil erosion and sediment control measures required for the lot.

E. Miscellaneous Comments

1. The Applicant is hereby advised that if stormwater runoff drainage problems occur as a result of the site improvements that are detrimental to the property and/or neighboring properties as a result of this construction, it shall be the responsibility of the owner of the property to remedy that drainage issue to the satisfaction of the Building Department and/or Borough Engineer.
2. All excavated material shall be removed from the site unless approved for backfill by the Borough. Any soil disturbance shall be done as set forth by Borough Ordinance.
3. The Applicant shall be aware of their responsibility to repair any damage to improvements within the Borough Right-of-Way including, but not limited to, sidewalk, curb, and asphalt, caused by construction activities associated with the installation of the improvements on the subject lot. We defer to the Borough's Department of Public Works in regard to this item.
4. The Applicant shall determine the limits of disturbance and install appropriate soil erosion preventative measures as necessary prior to constructing the proposed scope in association with this application and as shown on the plans.
5. The Applicant shall obtain any and all applicable approvals required by the Borough Building Department as well as outside agencies, including, but not limited to, the NJDOT, NJDEP, BCUA, and Bergen County. It is the Applicant's responsibility to determine what outside agency permits are required. Copies of said approvals shall be provided upon receipt.
6. The Applicant shall be aware that posting of engineering escrow for construction administration oversight, plan review, and project closeout will be required at the time building permits are issued. Please be aware that unused escrow money will be returned to the property owner upon the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.).
7. The Applicant shall adhere to the building department's approved design plan. Any alterations and/or changes to the approved design plan(s) and contractor questions shall be brought to the attention of the Building Department for review prior to construction or installation on-site.
8. A signed and sealed "As-Built" site plan should be submitted as a requirement for this office to "sign off" on the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (C.O.). The provided "As-Built" should accurately show all installed site features including grading, spot elevations, structures, etc., and will be compared to the approved design plan in association with the application. The Applicant is hereby advised that deviations from the approved design plan without prior consent or approval by the building department are not acceptable. If in the event the As-

Built deviates significantly from the approved design plan, the Building Department may not sign off on a C.O, especially if said deviation triggers or requires a zoning variance.

Should you have any questions concerning the above comments, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Colliers Engineering & Design, Inc.
(DBA Maser Consulting)



Craig Zimmermann, PE, CME
Planning Board Engineer

CZ/gr

cc: Russell Porrino, Englewood Cliffs Planning Board President
Thomas Randall, Esq., Board Attorney (via email)
Priscilla J. Triolo, Esq., Applicant's Attorney (ptriolo@bittigerelias.com)