

Erik E. Boe, PE, RA

310 Van Winkle Avenue
Hawthorne, NJ 07506
erikboe@gmail.com
201-805-1229

March 10, 2025

Village of Ridgewood
Zoning Board of Adjustment
131 N Maple Avenue
Ridgewood, NJ 07450

Attn.: Ms. Jane Wondergem
Board Secretary

Re: ZBA 25-03 Waldek – 385 Realty, LLC
385 Goffle Road
Block 2603, Lot 20.01
Village of Ridgewood, Bergen County, NJ

Dear Ms. Wondergem,

We are in receipt of a memo from Heyer, Gruel & Associates dated 2/20/25 pertaining to the abovementioned application. We have revised the site plan in order to address the HGA comments. Each of the comments from this review memo is noted below, along with how each was addressed:

1. *The subject property is a slightly oversized property with an angled rear lot line on the east side of Goffle Road in the R-2 Zone. The lot is developed with a two-family dwelling. The application addendum indicates that the two-family use was in place when a subdivision of the property was approved in 1971.*

This comment is informational.

2. *The applicant is proposing covered front and rear entry additions at the ground floor and new dormers on the second floor to expand the usable area of the unit on that floor. A minimal increase in building and improved coverage is proposed.*

This comment is informational.

3. *The applicant requires the following relief:*
 - a. *D(2) Expansion of a Non-Conforming Use – The application materials indicate that the non-conforming use was acknowledged as part of the 1971 subdivision approval. It is the applicant's burden to demonstrate that the existing use has legal non-conforming status. If the non-conforming status is confirmed, the proposed modifications and expansion of the 2nd floor area will require a variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70.d(2).*

The applicant will provide testimony before the ZBA to support the historical use of the property.

- b. *Insufficient Front Yard Setback – A minimum front yard setback of 40 feet is required. The proposed entrance portico is proposed to be setback 32.9 feet from the property line and 30.9 feet from the Bergen County road-widening easement.*

This comment is informational.

4. *Per section 190-119.A(1)(a) the front yard setback shall be measured from an easement present along the right-of-way. As noted above, the existing condition should be considered a 37.9 foot setback and the proposed condition a 30.9 foot setback. The applicant should update the drawings and zoning table to reflect the setback to the easement.*

The site plan has been revised to reflect the setback distances from the easement as required. Four copies of the revised site plan are enclosed.

5. *The proposed coverage by above grade structures is well below the permitted limit; however, the number is shown to increase for the total lot area but not for within 140 feet. It appears that all the improvements are proposed within 140 feet, so the numbers do not appear to be consistent. The applicant should review and update the calculations as needed.*

We have reviewed the calculations for existing/proposed coverage by above-grade structures and coverage by above-grade structures within 140 feet of the front lot line, and we believe the calculations as presented are correct.

The existing area of above-grade structures is 1,278 square feet. The proposed area of above-grade structures is 1,345 square feet. (Both are entirely within 140' of the front lot line.) The existing/proposed total lot area is 11,218 square feet. The lot area within 140' of the front lot line is 10,500 square feet.

Existing Conditions:

1,278 sf / 11,218 sf = 11.39% (entire lot)

1,278 sf / 10,500 sf = 12.17% (within 140' of front lot line)

Proposed Conditions:

1,345 sf / 11,218 sf = 11.99% (entire lot)

1,345 sf / 10,500 sf = 12.81% (within 140' of front lot line)

These percentages are shown on the site plan zoning table. If the village requires these to be calculated differently, please let us know and we can provide different calculations via testimony before the ZBA.

6. *The site driveway appears to provide cross-access to the neighboring property to the south and to the Village-owned property to the east. The applicant should provide testimony about the operational aspects of the driveway, whether any easements exist, and whether there will be any changes to the parking and circulation on the subject property as a result of the proposed improvements.*

The applicant will provide testimony regarding the cross-access to the neighboring property.

7. *The application is technically complete and can be scheduled for a hearing. The applicant and their professionals should be prepared to address the comments and minor technical corrections noted in this review.*

The applicant and their professionals will be prepared to address these comments at the public hearing.

Please feel free to contact the undersigned if you have any questions or need any further information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Erik E. Boe', with a stylized, cursive script.

Erik E. Boe, PE, RA

CC: Mr. Eric David Becker, Esq. (via email at: dbecker@davidbeckeresq.com)

Enclosures: Site Plan, Rev. 03/10/25, 4 copies, signed & sealed