

**LEONIA PLANNING BOARD AGENDA
WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 24, 2014
AT THE BOROUGH ANNEX
7:30 P.M.**

1. ROLL CALL

2. OPEN MEETING STATEMENT

Please turn off all electronic devices

Conditions of the Sunshine law have been met by a notice on the bulletin board at Borough Hall and notices sent to the official newspapers

3. SALUTE TO FLAG

4. REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF August 27, 2014-WAVE READING OF MINUTES

5. OLD BUSINESS – Continuation of testimony in the matter of PB 2014–11 – 313 Woodland Place , LLC Block 901 Lot 6; Applicant seeks approval to develop the premises with a 45 residential unit development. Variances required are Use; Rear Yard Setback; Side Yard Setback; Building Coverage; Side & Rear Yard Impervious Coverage; Impervious Coverage and Building Height. Represented by Mark J. Sokolich, Esq. and plans submitted by CPA Architecture and Azzolina & Feury Engineering, Inc. Filed August 15, 2014.

6. Public Speaking to the Applications.

Any other new business at the discretion of the chair.

7. NEW BUSINESS

(Five minutes per speaker or at the discretion of the Chair)

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS

9. REPORT FROM CONSTRUCTION/ZONING OFFICIAL

10. COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

11. REPORT OF PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

12. CORRESPONDENCE

A) Correspondence from Mr. Frank Regan, Esq. representing Kulite Semiconductor Products, Inc. regarding a pending application for a Use Variance for the property located at 127 Spring Street. Application received on August 28, 2014 and Mr. Regan, on behalf of his client, is requesting a Special Meeting.

B) Correspondence from Mr. & Mrs. David Sclafane of 254 Glenwood Avenue opposing PB 2014-11 Application for the project located at 313 Woodland Place.

13. ADJOURNMENT

FORMAL ACTION ON ANY BOARD BUSINESS MAY BE TAKEN

NEXT MEETING – October 22, 2014 – 7:30 PM

September 17, 2014

To the Leonia Planning Board,

I am writing this letter on the behalf of my husband and myself to document that we disapprove of the planned building for 313 Woodland Place. We feel that the proposed building is asking to break too many zoning variance laws, would cause crowding conditions in a small space, parking issues in the surrounding neighborhood, potentially increased property taxes and cause crowding conditions in the Leonia Public school system if the building is not approved as only a 55 and older building.

We feel the proposed property is simply too large for the space and asking to change too many zoning variances. If we wanted to live in a crowded area, we would have stayed in the Bronx or Bayonne, where my husband and I are from. Even though we have not heard from the expert witnesses about traffic and parking, our "expert" opinion as residents, who have first-hand experience with parking on our streets since 2003, is that it would cause parking problems. Two parking spots per unit is not enough, if the building is zoned for any use and not only 55 and over. You are potentially having up to 4 and 5 cars per unit (i.e. family of 5 with 3 college aged drivers, 4 adult friends as roommates). What about when someone has guests over? This can potentially cause an additional 100 cars on and around the immediate surrounding streets. During the time the addition to the Glenwood was being constructed, the residents of that building did not have access to their parking lot for months. This resulted in residents of that building parking in surrounding streets and at times in resident's driveways. I have also noticed a serious change on my own street, since the home across the street was rented to 4 single adult males vs. the former couple with one small child. Now we have 2 additional cars parking on our streets, plus their guests who are here often. Now multiply that by 45. It makes a difference. Making this building available for rent to anyone vs. just 55 plus community will have a huge impact on parking.

I hear one of the draws of the building is we will now receive tax ratables for this land. However, how much of a net benefit will we gain if the building is rented to anyone and now we have an increase of about 100 school children to pay for? The comparative cost per pupil in 2009-2010 was \$13,312. Will we be collecting more than \$1,331,200 in taxes from this property to cover the cost for all of these potential school children?

Now let's look at what an additional 100 students would do to the schools itself. ACS does not have any room to spare. They do not have room to add additional classes (not even one tuition-based Pre-Kindergarten class I advocated for in 2012). Where are these students going to go? We will then have overcrowded classrooms, which leads to poorer student performance. This will then lead to our school district losing its draw and therefore lower property values. We have no desire and cannot afford to pay for private school for our three children and our currently high property taxes.

We understand supporters of this building want an option in town for seniors to transition. We agree with that. However, a huge building that breaks so many zoning variances, in this space, is not the answer. A building that follows the zoning laws, allows for ample parking for residents and guests, and that is approved for only 55 and over (like the existing Glenwood) would be fine.

One of the reasons we moved to Leonia was because of its charm, beautiful old houses, strong community and good schools. We feel breaking the zoning laws for this building is a slippery slope that could mean the beginning of the end of Leonia as we know and love.

Sincerely,

Jamie Sclofane 9/17/14
David Sclofane 9/17/14

Jamie and David Sclofane

254 Glenwood Ave.





OFFICE
GLENPOINTE CENTRE WEST
500 FRANK W. BURR BLVD. SUITE 31
TEANECK, NEW JERSEY 07666
T: 201.928.1100 F: 201.928.0588
WWW.DECOTIISLAW.COM

DIRECT
FRANCIS X. REGAN, ESQ.
FREGAN@DECOTIISLAW.COM
201.907.5280

September 16, 2014

VIA E-MAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Land Use Board Secretary
Leonia Land Use Board
Borough of Leonia
Borough Hall
312 Broad Avenue
Leonia, New Jersey 07605

**RE: Kulite Semiconductor Products, Inc.
127 Spring Street, Leonia, N.J. / Block 1209, Lot 9**

Dear Sir/Madam:

This firm represents Kulite Semiconductor Products, Inc. ("Kulite") and 127 Spring Street, LLC, the owner of the above subject property (the "Property").

On August 28, 2014, Kulite submitted an application and plans for a use variance to use the Property as a parking lot for Kulite's employees. To date, Kulite has not received any response from the Land Use Board regarding the application or the schedule for a hearing.

Kulite had expected this application to be scheduled for a hearing at the September 24, 2014 Land Use Board meeting. However, the time for providing notice to appear at such meeting has passed. Therefore, Kulite hereby requests a special meeting of the Land Use Board as soon as possible to hear the application. Please advise. Thank you.

Very truly yours,
DeCotiis, FitzPatrick & Cole, LLP

By: 
Francis X. Regan

cc: Abraham Morcos, Kulite Semiconductor Products, Inc.
Lloyd Frank, Esq.
Peter F. Pulice, RA
Jack Terhune, Borough Administrator

