

ALPINE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Regular Meeting

Thursday, October 14, 2021 - 7:30 P.M.

(This meeting was taped in its entirety).

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

This regular meeting of the Alpine Zoning Board of Adjustment was called to order by Chairman Glazer at 7:30 p.m., Thursday, October 14, 2021 at the Alpine Borough Hall, the Pledge of Allegiance recited and the Public Announcement read according to the requirements of N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 et seq.: In accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Law the notice of this Regular meeting of the Alpine Zoning Board of Adjustment held on Thursday, October 14, 2021 which date was changed from the originally scheduled date of October 21, 2021 has met the requirements of the law by means of being published in the record on September 28, 2021 in The Record, posted on the bulletin board of the lobby in the Borough Hall and a copy filed in the office of the Borough Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Richard Glazer	<i>Present</i>	Tony Clores	<i>Absent</i>
David Kupferschmid	<i>Present</i>	Richard Bonhomme	<i>Present</i>
Anthony Barbieri	<i>Present</i>	George Abad	<i>Present</i>
Elizabeth Herries	<i>Present</i>	Amy Lerner, Alt. I	<i>Absent</i>

Staff Present: Board Attorney Michael B. Kates, Esq. Borough Engineer, Perry Frenzel, Board Secretary Nancy Wehmann.

PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

Resolution: Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting July 15, 2021

Upon a motion by Mr. Barbieri, seconded by Mr. Abad and approved by all to approve the minutes of the regular Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting held July 15, 2021 as amended on page 5 pp4 line 4 correcting "accomplishment" to "accomplish."

Bills and Claims and Return of Escrow deferred to later to permit time to review. See Other Business.

HEARINGS

Blancato Block 75 Lot 13 – 30 Overlook Road (continued from July 15, 2021)

Attorney Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq. 11 Hillside Avenue 2nd Floor, Tenafly, NJ 07670 returns on behalf and with Applicant Frank Blancato along with Applicant's Engineer Michael Hubschman, Hubschman Engineering, P.A. 263 A S. Washington Avenue, Bergenfield, NJ 07621 and Architect Noah Harris Adler, Noah Harris Adler Architecture, LLC, 233 Whitman Street, Haworth, NJ 07641.

Applicant returns with revised plans reducing requested relief for:

- building coverage from 10.65% to 10.59% where 10% is the maximum permitted and
- improved coverage from 27.58% to 23.91% where 20.23% exists and a maximum of 20% is permitted.

The following additional Exhibits received subsequent to the last hearing on this matter held July 15, 2021 marked as follows:

A – 11 Cover letter from Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq. dated August 23, 2021, revised August 24, 2021 listing revised items submitted.

A – 12 Engineering Plans signed and sealed by Michael J. Hubschman, PE PP consisting of two pages dated March 19, 2021 revised no August 17, 2021:

- Dwg. No. 2020026-1 entitled "Site Plan"
 - Dwg No. 2020026-2 entitled "Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan; Details; Existing Conditions Plan"
- A – 13 Architectural Plans signed and sealed by Noah Harris Adler, R.A. of Noah Harris Adler Architect, LLC 233 Whitman Street, Haworth, NJ 07641 with a note architectural design by: Kurt Otto / K.O. Group LLC 100 Herbert Avenue, Closter, NJ 07624 dated April 8, 2021 last revised August 10, 2021 consisting of seven pages:
- Sheet No. A-100 entitled "Proposed Basement Plan"
 - Sheet No. A-101 entitled "Proposed 1st Floor Plan"
 - Sheet No. A-102 entitled "Proposed 2nd Floor Plan"
 - Sheet No. A-103 entitled "Proposed Roof Plan"
 - Sheet No. A-202 entitled "Right Elevation"
 - Sheet No. A-203 entitled "Rear Elevation"
 - Sheet No. A-204 entitled "Left Elevation"
- A – 14 Borough engineer's letter dated June 15, 2021 revised September 8, 2021
- A – 15 Supplement cover letter from Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq. dated September 9, 2021 along with Architectural Renderings signed and sealed by Noah Harris Adler, R.A. of Noah Harris Adler Architect, LLC 233 Whitman Street, Haworth, NJ 07641 dated April 10, 2021 consisting of two pages:
- Sheet No. A-001 entitled "Front 3D Rendering"
 - Sheet No. A-002 entitled "Rear 3D Rendering"
- A – 16 Letter from Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq. dated September 22, 2021 confirming agreement to carry meeting to a Special Meeting October 14, 2021 and granting extension of time through October 31, 2021.
- A – 17 Refreshed Notices for October 14, 2021 Meeting.
- Proof of Publication in The Record September 25, 2021.
 - Certified Mailing to Residents within 200' on September 29, 2021 per Tax Assessor's List dated September 9, 2021.

Architect Mr. Adler remains under oath and referenced his revised rendering **[A-15]** as compared to the original rendering **[A-8]**. They eliminated the first floor section closer to the side of the house and the second floor deck re-designing the loggia as a one-story deck off the kitchen with an open pergola. This significantly reduces mass, scale and dimensions from 555 square feet to 258 square feet. The fascia and columns were also reduced and a proposed outdoor fireplace and chimney deleted. Redesign with some darker siding at the second-floor level was explained and does not reflect any change in massing.

Opened to the public for questions. There were none.

Opened to the Board for questions. Queries regarding coverage changes, drainage, patio area changes and pool were deferred to their engineer.

Engineer Mr. Hubschman remains under oath and utilized Mr. Adler's exhibits to denote where they deleted the walk going underneath to the driveway, the patio area under the decks and all of the patio going to the east side of the pool including patio that would have covered the septic tank per Mr. Frenzel's letter. These areas will remain landscaped. Referencing his revised engineering plan **[A-12]** no changes are proposed to the pool or spa. The deck off of the kitchen area has a reduced footprint. Along with removal of an overhang in the front, the proposed changes reduce building coverage from the pre-existing 10.65% down to 10.59% For improved coverage they propose 23.9% mostly for the terrace stairs and pool area. 60% of the overage relates to the pool area. The pre-existing improved coverage is 20.2% or about 50 – 60 square feet. Applicant wishes the pool to remain. It is a modest size at 26 feet by 16 feet. For drainage there are two seepage pits and everything drains to an existing drainage feature on

the west. They are willing to add more storage. He opined the pool provides for some detention having the ability to detain stormwater runoff within the six inches of freeboard between coping and water surface over the pool area.

Opened to the public for questions. There were none.

Opened to the Board for questions.

Ms. Herries asked the improved coverage without the pool. Mr. Hubschman calculated 21.5%.

Mr. Kupferschmid questioned justification for c(2) variance where benefits exceed burdens. Mr. Capizzi recalled Mr. Adler's prior testimony that the proposed presents an architectural improvement by virtue of adding the deck to soften the jog in the rear building wall and the pergola to soften the elevation. Mr. Kupferschmid asked how that applies to the pool? Does this benefit the community or just the homeowner?

Attorney Kates read from Cox: New Jersey Zoning and Land Use. In the matter of Kaufman vs. Planning Board¹:

"By definition no c(2) variance should be granted when merely the purposes of the owner will be advanced. The grant of approval must actually benefit the community in that it represents a better zoning alternative for the property. The focus of a c(2) case then will be not on the characteristics of the land that, in light of current zoning requirements creates a hardship,....." but rather speaks to "...improved zoning and planning that will benefit the community."

Some examples refer to situations such as N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2(j) that can be helpful to understand the purposes of zoning that subsection 2 is talking about. For example, subsection j. "...intends the prevention of 'degradation of the environment' through the improper use of land; thus a property crossed by a stream might call for an adjustment of a side or front yard to better protect the stream bed; a stand of trees might cause for a shifting of lot sizes (if a minor subdivision). In some cases, a height variance might serve to conserve 'open space ,,,,,,and valuable natural resources.'"

The Kaufman case and the c(2) standards are asking the applicant to relate the requested relief to what's best for the Borough of Alpine.

Mr. Capizzi offered pools are common place which is why they are a permitted accessory use in this zone. Another purpose of zoning is providing appropriate uses in appropriate locations and here you have a pool that complies with required setbacks, does not require tree removal, provides a drainage feature being essentially a detention pond they can swim in; a basin that holds six inches of water. This is an important benefit to those living downhill who have experienced prior concerns with runoff as discussed at the July hearing. The pool is an at-grade feature providing over retention on site. Typical concerns regarding pools are drainage and aesthetics and Mr. Hubschman's testimony has indicated there would be no aesthetic impacts after landscaping and provides a benefit regarding drainage. Plus, having some outdoor recreational space results in better citizenry as the family can enjoy a pool. They recognize they take the property as they see it, realize it is already slightly nonconforming and they are going to exacerbate that but they have tried to design this with the least amount of impact.

Opened to the public for comments. None

¹ Kaufmann v. Planning Bd. For Warren Tp., 110 N.J. 563 (1988)

Frank Blancato, owner, was sworn. States the pool is a modest size. A neighbor two doors down has a pool. They will do whatever drainage and landscaping is necessary to help against any type of soil erosion. He needs the pool. He has two young children and with the pandemic he wants them to be able to enjoy their own home.

Opened to the Board for comments.

Mr. Bonhomme asked if the pool size remains 635 square feet. Mr. Hubschman notes that includes the coping, spa and stair area. The pool alone is 504 square feet. The water surface is 416 square feet.

Mr. Kupferschmid expressed appreciation that the Applicant attended to express their point of view. The proposed is vastly improved from the prior plan. He opines it can be difficult to judge the benefit questions for c(2) variances. Ms. Herries understands the desire but notes outdoor pools can also be a negative due to noise. Mr. Bonhomme and Mr. Glazer questioned if the benefit inures just to the owner and wished he had a lot sized to accommodate the pool.

Attorney Capizzi questioned the main objection to the pool? Mr. Bonhomme noted neighbors' testimony concerned with not exacerbating drainage problems already existing in the area. Mr. Kupferschmid asked the Board Secretary if she had heard from neighbors whether or not they could attend this evening. Ms. Wehmann advised one neighbor had come in to review the revised plan and said both neighbors who spoke in July had conflicts and would not be able to attend this evening's meeting.

Mr. Frenzel advised he has changed his opinion about pools over the years. In light of rainfall conditions over the last few years he now considers the retention benefit of pools which can be subtracted during total runoff calculations. The pool would be able to hold the rainfall from three standard design (two-inch) storms on that surface meaning that's three days in a row of rainfall that wouldn't run onto someone else's property downstream. From a drainage aspect he believes they do provide a benefit. Mr. Glazer relayed that during Hurricane IDA his pool not only absorbed rainfall but also massive runoff from uphill properties causing his pool to overflow even though he had an 8" freeboard. In response it was noted this property is relatively flat to the pool level. The pool is at elevation 455.9, the coping is 455.5 and slopes down to 454 feet towards the brook. Everything drains from east to west in that neighborhood.

Attorney Capizzi asked how they could augment drainage? Mr. Hubschman replied they could add a seepage pit and work on the calculations with Mr. Frenzel. They could replace remaining patio areas with pervious pavers. While this still counts as improved coverage it would provide a significant improvement over about 250 square feet. Mr. Frenzel agreed noting studies have shown in laboratory conditions (not necessarily real world) pervious papers can pass up to 2,000 inches of rain an hour through the separations between the pavers. That's not the real-world situation but the bed beneath the pavers is different from what was installed years ago. Years ago, the sand and stone dust base would pack down and become impervious over time but now they use a specified layering of different graded size stone to optimize the storage capacity of that extra deep stone layer beneath the pavers. If using the standard 40% void ratio in stones, a five-inch rainfall could be retained in a sixteen-inch stone layer beneath the pavers and that is usually what the paver box is beneath the pavers.

Attorney Kates noted by Mr. Bonhomme posing the question of the pool's impact on drainage the deliberation was now focusing on impact to the community.

Attorney Capizzi added the first purpose of zoning is to promote the general welfare and certainly drainage improvements contribute to this.

Mr. Bonhomme questioned how pool covers could impact retention. Mr. Kupferschmid offered membranes vary. If impervious they may sag but still retain water until it is pumped out or, as is most common in winter when water levels are lowered 2-3 feet, an impervious cover would still allow rain or snow melt to pass through.

Mr. Kupferschmid questioned if construction of a swale to the west or a planted berm could further slow runoff perhaps combined with a seepage pit to the southern portion of the property. Attorney Capizzi stated these would be acceptable conditions subject to Mr. Hubschman and Mr. Frenzel working out the particulars.

Mr. Frenzel offered Applicant has stated he intends to heavily landscape the property to remind the value of uptake of water because of landscaping which will also play a part in improving drainage patterns in the area. Mr. Bonhomme noted they cannot landscape over the septic systems. Mr. Hubschman noted there is still twenty-five foot around the septic system which is plenty of room to landscape around the south and westerly sides.

Mr. Glazer noted a question of the coverages' square footage still remains.

Being no further questions Mr. Glazer called for a motion. Ms. Herries asked if they should bifurcate the loggia and the pool. Mr. Capizzi requested a recess to confer with his client.

Board took a five-minute recess from 8:21 – 8:26.

Upon return Attorney Capizzi advised they had discussed means to whittle down the variance noting it's still very important for them to have the pool. Mr. Hubschman explained proposed revisions to benefit the community with drainage mitigation by adding another seepage pit, construct a two-foot berm along the west side with a total screening of 8-foot Green Giant arborvitae 6 foot to 6 foot on center which would trap a lot of water from going back into the stream. They would not place a berm on the east but provide a similar heavy arborvitae screen. They'd replace the lower patio with pervious pavers. They can delete the spa or include that into the pool rectangle shaving off about 0.9% or 200 square feet. The pool is actually higher than the lower patio but it would not be beneficial to eliminate the little stairway and bring the pool closer. They cannot adjust the section of the garage driveway that has a retaining wall required for the garage backing up area but note the length of the existing paver driveway out to the street is about 120 feet with a narrow width of ten feet. If they remove a two-foot strip in the center portion for part of the driveway they could eliminate about 210 square foot of coverage or another 1%. This would reduce the proposed improved coverage to about 22.9%. Applicant is amenable. Mr. Hubschman worked to demonstrate and calculate changes on his exhibit **[A-12]**.

Mr. Bonhomme made a motion to disapprove the application. Ms. Herries seconded the motion.

Vote to disapprove: Ms. Herries, Mr. Bonhomme, Mr. Glazer

No on motion to disapprove: Mr. Abad, Mr. Kupferschmid, Mr. Barbieri

Attorney Kates advised the motion to disapprove is defeated on a tie. The Board may proceed to make a motion to approve with conditions. If that results in a tie the application is denied.

Mr. Kupferschmid asked how significant the berm and seepage pit would be in dealing with runoff and drainage which was the biggest concern of the neighbors? Mr. Frenzel opined it would be an important improvement reminding they're not just adding the seepage pit but also the retention volume across the pool surface as well. At six inches over 416 square feet this would provide about 1,200 to 1,300 gallons of water that the pool could hold exceeding the capacity of a large seepage pit which is typically 1,000 gallons. Adding that much capacity where you

only have two seepage pits now is more than doubling what currently exists. This is a sensitive locale but the proposed would be a significant benefit.

Attorney Capizzi offered it may make sense to allow the Applicant to return a third time with a revised plan set incorporating all of the proposed conditions and providing Mr. Frenzel time for review prior to the next hearing. Mr. Glazer recommended they spell out all the benefits to the community as discussed. Ms. Herries asked if the property as exists meets criteria for stormwater runoff? Mr. Frenzel offered it meets whatever was in place at the time it was built and that is all the more reason for a complete analysis of what is now proposed.

Ms. Herries questioned why the property was already over existing coverage? The Board Secretary had confirmed there were no prior zoning board resolutions for this property. Mr. Frenzel explained years ago, it was common practice to measure from the property line to the foundation, call that the setback and base coverage calculations on that figure. Surveyors now know that you have a foundation but then siding and finishes can add to the coverage. He believes that is where the discrepancy occurred in this case. This is why he now requires architectural drawings accompany the engineering plans. Mr. Glazer reminded they are talking about 23/100ths of 1%. Mr. Frenzel qualified that translates to about 50 square feet which spread out around the perimeter of the house is probably how the number was found to be different during the recent calculation.

Matter carried. Attorney Kates announced per Applicant's request the meeting will be carried to **Thursday, November 18, 2021** without further notice required and with Applicant's tacit agreement to continue time constraints under MLUL.

Skillman Block 78 Lot 4 – 421 Anderson Ave

Attorney Matthew G. Capizzi, Esq. 11 Hillside Avenue 2nd Floor, Tenafly, NJ 07670 appeared on behalf of Applicant Cheryl Skillman along with Applicant's Engineer Steven L. Koestner, P.E., L.S., Koestner Associates 61 Hudson St., Hackensack, NJ 07601 and Iljoong Kim, A.I.A. IJKIM Architect 300 Sylvan Avenue, 2nd Floor, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632.

Applicant proposes addition and renovation of a one and a half story pre-existing, non-conforming single-family dwelling in the same footprint. They propose adding a second story and a rear addition and wood frame deck. The property is significantly undersized in the R-A Zone. The relief required would be just to maintain the pre-existing non-conformities with the exception of a proposed bay window in front that would increase the pre-existing nonconforming front yard condition by two feet for just that feature.

- Lot size 40,286 square feet where 87,120 square feet required
- Lot width 135 feet where 250 feet required
- Min side yard setback (each) 29.70 and 39.40 feet where 50 feet is required
- Min front yard setback 65.5 feet where 75 feet is required except for the setback to a proposed bay window which would be 63.52 feet

Exhibit list distributed and marked by affirmation:

- A- 1 Proof of Publication in The Record date: October 3, 2021.
- A- 2 Certified Mailing to Residents within 200' on October 1, 2021 per Alpine Tax Assessor's List dated September 9, 2021 and Closter Tax Assessor's List dated August 31, 2021
- A- 3 Application – signed and dated by owner on August 25, 2021 with attachments
 - Cover Letter from Matthew Capizzi dated September 3, 2021
 - Proposals and Reasons for Relief
 - Tax Collector's Proof Statement September 2, 2021 through 2nd Q [3rd qtr. tax bills due 10/15/2021]

- A – 4 Zoning Officer's Review letter dated August 19, 2021
- A – 5 Photo Exhibit set of 4 color photos not dated or signed
- A – 6 Drainage Calculations prepared by Steven L. Koestner, P.E., L.S. of Koestner Associates dated January 12, 2021 last revised July 19, 2021
- A – 7 Site Plan signed and sealed by Steven L. Koestner, P.E., L.S. of Koestner Associates dated August 14, 2021 last revised September 9, 2021
- A – 8 Architectural Plans signed and sealed by IJKIM Architect 300 Sylvan Avenue, 2nd Floor, Englewood Cliffs, NJ dated July 9, 2021 last revised July 30, 2021 consisting of three pages
 - Sheet No. A005 "NJDEP Applicable Rules & Permits Analysis, Zoning Data/Analysis Chart, Comparison Diagrams between Proposed Addition and Existing Condition, Proposed Roof/Site Plan
 - Sheet No. A006 "Proposed Floor Plans – Cellar, 1st, 2nd Floor Plans, Roof Plan
 - Sheet No. A201 "Bldg Elevations, North/Front, South/Rear Facades)
- A – 9 Borough Engineer's letter dated September 21, 2021

Engineer Koestner was sworn, testified to his credentials² and accepted to provide testimony in his fields. Referencing his plan **[A-7]** Mr. Koestner explained the property is located on the easterly side of Anderson Avenue north of Cambridge Way and reviewed the pre-existing nonconformities as noted above. The existing one and a half story framed dwelling is vintage 1950's. The house angles slightly and is not completely parallel with Anderson Avenue. Environmental constraints consist of a watercourse that runs from north to south through the rear of the property and a wetlands area immediately behind the house with a fifty-foot buffer as noted on the plan. They have obtained a DEP Permit by Rule approval for the proposed small addition to the rear of the home and approximately 100 square feet for the rear deck. The rear addition provides a rear yard setback of 191 feet and the deck is 183 feet where 50 feet is required. They plan to connect to the Closter sanitary sewer system per prior interlocal agreement. Drainage to be addressed by a 500-gallon seepage pit in the front yard to handle runoff from the addition and slight enlargement of the driveway. The design will handle runoff from a 25-year storm. Referencing Mr. Frenzel's letter **[A-9]** Applicant wishes to preserve a 24-inch caliper maple tree located approximately six feet off the deck and the tree protection detail is shown on the plan.

Opened to questions from the public. None

Opened to questions from the Board.

Mr. Frenzel reviewed Mr. Koestner's calculations and methodology. The required runoff volume that has to be managed through the seepage pit system is 88 cubic feet. The system, as designed, exceeds that being 113 cubic feet.

Architect Kim was sworn, testified to his credentials³ and accepted to provide testimony in his fields. Referencing his plan **[A-8]** Mr. Kim explained they intend to update an older home that has been vacant and in disrepair for many years with minimal environmental impact. They want to ensure the home is health by reconstructing the frame within the existing footprint and a small addition to the rear that will be within the building envelope. They propose a 4 bedroom 3 bathroom home as detailed on the plans with a bay window In front, a 451 square foot addition to the rear and a small 182 square foot deck beyond that. The overall size of the house is about

² Graduated Clarkson College of Technology 1974; Practicing since 7/15/1974 originally under his grandfather and father. Licensed land surveyor since 1983. Professional engineer since 1988. Has appeared before numerous boards in Bergen, Hudson and Essex Counties and most of northern NJ. License is in good standing.

³ Graduate M.I.T. practicing since 1992 and Licensed Architect 2008. Has appeared in other Bergen County towns including Demarest, Englewood Cliffs, Ridgefield, Fort Lee.

2,400 square feet plus a 300 square foot garage which is much less than the zoning. The house is very compact. They provide for a lot of windows to bring in natural light. Utilizing the floor plans Mr. Kim pointed out the areas of the house that comprise pre-existing encroachments into the front and side yard setbacks. The expansion of front and side yard encroachments by virtue of adding a second floor above the pre-existing is about 80 square feet. They kept the rear expansion minimal as they do not want to remove any trees.

Opened to questions from the public. None

Opened to questions from the Board.

Mr. Bonhomme asked what happens to the existing septic system? Mr. Kim noted the system in the back near the proposed crawlspace will be removed. Mr. Frenzel noted they typically get crushed and filled to eliminate voids and agreed this is an advantage.

Attorney Kates received clarification that by virtue of the second-floor addition no further encroachments from the original footprint are created except for the bay window. Attorney Kates noted that one basis for granting relief to increasing intensity of deficiencies is whether the existing structure is substandard. Mr. Kim noted the home was built in the 1950's and has no insulation. They propose more insulation than is standard to increase the energy efficiency. They are using a metal roof which is recyclable as opposed to asphalt shingles. While the house will not be carbon zero it will be substantially upgraded. The existing is a two-bedroom two-bathroom home but utilizes the attic space for living space where it is really not a proper habitable space. The ceiling is seven feet. The home has been vacant for a very long time. With the design of the house they tried to honor the feel of the neighborhood by using lath siding and appropriate window designs. The bay window helps provide additional lighting and better aesthetics. They are going from a one car garage to a two-car garage within the same footprint and slightly increasing the driveway.

Opened to comment from the public. None

Ms. Herries asked if the lot is less than half the required size, how do the percentages work; do you apply the same setback and coverage requirements? Attorney Kates replied yes you do and the undersized lot becomes the basis for the hardship.

Mr. Capizzi again reviewed the requested relief. Even though the lot is significantly undersized they comply with building coverage 4.86% where 9% is the maximum permitted and improved coverage 8.84% where 25% is the maximum permitted. This is a classic c(1) hardship case. They do satisfy some c(2) criteria by repurposing materials namely the foundation. He further noted conscious efforts to increase energy efficiency and use of reusable materials. Aesthetically the proposed improves an unsightly older home in disrepair and thus the streetscape as well.

Mr. Glazer agreed the proposed should be a substantial sight improvement to the town. Mr. Bonhomme agreed and Mr. Kupferschmid also commended the design.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abad, seconded by Mr. Barbieri to approve the application.

Vote: Ayes: Mr. Abad, Mr. Barbieri, Mr. Bonhomme, Mr. Glazer, Mr. Herries, Mr. Kupferschmid

OTHER BUSINESS

2021 Annual Report – Attorney Kates reviewed this purpose of the report is to alert the Governing Body and the Planning Board to issues encountered by the Board such as building height and need for plans presented with significant applications to be professionally prepared signed and sealed. Board members requested a few more minutes for review.

Resolution: Approval of Bills and Claims

Upon a motion by Mr. Barbieri, seconded by Mr. Glazer at the regular meeting of the Alpine Zoning Board of Adjustment held on October 14, 2021 to approve the following Bills and Claims:

North Jersey Media Group	Blancato 75/13	Inv.49244189	\$9.00
Azzolina & Feury Eng., Inc.	Blancato 75/13 – Aug	Inv. 75080	\$228.00
Azzolina & Feury Eng., Inc.	Victor 22/10	Inv. 75081	\$342.00
Azzolina & Feury Eng., Inc.	995 Closter Dock Rd 47/2	Inv. 75191	\$684.00
Azzolina & Feury Eng., Inc.	Blancato 75/13 Sep	Inv. 75204	\$427.50
Azzolina & Feury Eng., Inc.	Skillman 78/4 Sep	Inv. 75207	\$1,054.50

Vote: Ayes: Mr. Abad, Mr. Barbieri, Mr. Bonhomme Mr. Glazer, Ms. Herries, Mr. Kupferschmid

MOTION APPROVED

Resolution: Return of Escrow

Upon a motion by Mr. Bonhomme, seconded by Mr. Barbieri and approved by all those eligible to vote at the regular meeting of the Alpine Zoning Board of Adjustment held on October 14, 2021 to return the following escrow which has been reviewed and approved by the Board Attorney and Borough Engineer.

Arris Corporation (Conrad Roncati) c/o Revolution Architecture LLC 1 Executive Drive Ste LL 100 Fort Lee, NJ 07024-3316	11 Dogwood Lane Block 74 Lot 5	Res 6/17/2021	\$306.65
--	-----------------------------------	------------------	----------

Vote: Ayes: Mr. Abad, Mr. Barbieri, Mr. Bonhomme, Mr. Glazer, Ms. Herries, Mr. Kupferschmid

MOTION APPROVED

Resolution: 2021 Annual Report Upon a motion by Mr. Glazer seconded by Mr. Bonhomme authorizing Mr. Glazer to sign the 2020 Annual Report and directing Secretary Wehmann to transmit copies of the report and schedule of cases to the Planning Board and Mayor and Council pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70.1.

Vote: Ayes: Mr. Abad, Mr. Barbieri, Mr. Bonhomme, Mr. Glazer, Ms. Herries, Mr. Kupferschmid

MOTION APPROVED

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from Secretary Wehmann advising the Board of intent to retire effective February 1, 2022. She will be missed.

Attorney Kates advised Case Management for Eun-Rae Jo v. BOA ZBA & Harings has been scheduled for next week.

Mayor Tomasko advised the recent newsletter highlights what's happening in town and expressed appreciation to Board on their thorough deliberations.

ADJOURNMENT at 9:25 p.m. upon motion by Mr. Barbieri, seconded by Ms. Herries and approved by all.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Wehmann, Secretary