

June 24, 2026

Michael Greco, Board Secretary
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Borough of Demarest
118 Serpentine Road
Demarest, NJ 07627

8 Ross Avenue
Block 133, Lot 42
Borough of Demarest, Bergen County, NJ
Joint Land Use Board Application County - **Engineering Review 5**
Colliers Engineering & Design Project No. DEZ0059

Dear Mr. Greco:

Pursuant to your request, our office has reviewed the following plans and other documents filed by the Applicant in support of a Variance Application. The Applicant is proposing to construct a two-story addition, driveway, patio, and other related improvements at the subject property;

- a) Site plans consisting of one (1) sheet, prepared by prepared and signed by Stephen P. EID, P.E, PLS, of EID Associates, Inc, dated November 20, 2025, **last revised June 16, 2026**;
- b) Architectural Plans consisting of ~~five (5)~~ **four (4) sheets**, prepared and signed by Stanley J. Kufel, RA, dated ~~October 14, 2025, last revised April 23, 2026~~ **dated June 19, 2026**;
- c) Topographic survey of the property consisting of one (1) sheet, prepared and signed by Stephen P. EID, PLS, of EID Associates, Inc, dated February 11, 2025;
- d) Variance Application for the subject property and attachments; signed and dated January 20, 2026;
- e) Zoning Analysis prepared by Stephen P. EID, P.E, PLS, of EID Associates dated January 13, 2026;
- f) Zoning Denial letter dated January 14, 2026.
- g) Engineer Response letter by Stephen P. EID, P.E, PLS, of EID Associates, Inc, dated April 20, 2026; and
- h) Cover letter prepared by Gloria Duby, of Capizzi Law Offices, dated May 22, 2026.

The Property Owner/Applicant is:

8 Ross Avenue LLC
c/o Scott Nela
8 Ross Avenue
Demarest, NJ 07627

The Applicant/Owner shall notify the Borough of Demarest Zoning Board of Adjustment of any changes to the above information.

Engineering Review

I. Project Description & Location

According to the property survey, the site is currently occupied by a 2-story single-family dwelling with associated driveway, walkways, deck, frame garage, and other related improvements, some of which are to be demolished. The Applicant is proposing to construct a new 2 story addition on the east side of the existing dwelling, driveway, rear patio, drainage improvements and other related improvements on the property.

The property is a rectangular shaped parcel consisting of 7,000 SF. The property is located on the north side of Ross Ave, between County Road and Elm Place. The dwelling front faces Ross Avenue and driveway access is provided on Ross Avenue. The property is located in the residential D Zone according to the Borough Zoning Map.

The property is located in Zone X (area determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain) as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the Borough of Demarest dated August 2019.

II. Zoning Requirements & List of Variances / Waivers Requested

A. Bulk Zoning Requirements:

Zone: D

Use: Single Family Residential

Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Complies
Lot area**	10,000 sf.	7,000 sf.	7,000 sf.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Lot Frontage**	100 ft.	70 ft.	70 ft.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Lot depth	100 ft.	100 ft.	100 ft.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Front yard setback**	20.8 ft.	15.0 ft.	15.0 ft.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Side yard setback-west **	10.0 ft.	9.9 ft.	9.9 ft.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Side yard setback-east	10.0 ft.	35.9 ft.	15.5 ft.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Rear yard depth	30 ft.	44.20 ft.	44.20 ft.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Building Height	30 ft.	30.15 ft.**	30.36 ft. 30.0 ft.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Max Building Coverage*	20 %	16.2 %	26.9 % 24.94%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Max Livable Floor Area*	30 %	22.6 %	39.1 % 37.36%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Residential & Parking Coverage*	25 %	27.3 %	30.7 % 28.63%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Improved Coverage*	30 %	30.9%**	35.2% 33.26%	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
---------------------------	-------------	----------------	--	---

N/A = not applicable
 * = variance required
 ** = pre-existing non-conformance

B. The Following Variances Appear to be Required:

1. Lot Area – There is a pre-existing nonconformance for lot area of 7,000 SF, where a minimum of 10,000 is required.
2. Lot Frontage – There is a pre-existing nonconformance for lot frontage of 70 FT, where a minimum of 100 FT is required.
3. Minimum Front Yard setback – There is a pre-existing non-conformance for the existing dwelling for front yard setback of 15 FT where a minimum of 20.8 FT is required. The Applicant is proposing an addition with a front yard setback of 19.1 FT where a minimum of 20.8 FT is required.
A variance is required for this condition.
4. Building Coverage – The Applicant is proposing a max building coverage of ~~1,880 SF (26.9%)~~ **1,746 SF (24.94%)** where the maximum of 1,400 SF (20%) is permitted.
A variance is required for this condition.
5. Livable Floor Area – The Applicant is proposing a max livable floor area of ~~2,737 SF (39.1%)~~ **2,615.52 SF (37.36%)** where a maximum of 2,100 SF (30%) is permitted.
A variance is required for this condition.
6. Residential & Parking Coverage – The Applicant does not include this calculation of the zoning sheet and should revise the plans to include this calculation. Based on the coverage breakdown provided on the plans; it appears the district maximum is exceeded. The Applicant should be prepared to provide testimony to clarify the total residential and parking coverage proposed. The Applicant is proposing a residential and parking coverage area of ~~2,152 SF (30.7%)~~ **2,004 SF (28.63%)** where the maximum of 1,750 SF (25%) is permitted.
A variance is required for this condition.
7. There is an existing garage in the northern corner of the property which is considered an accessory structure. The existing garage encroaches on the rear and side yard accessory structure setbacks. The Applicant is proposing to remove the garage as part of this application.
8. As noted in comment D below, there is a pre-existing nonconformance for building height of 30.1 FT, where a maximum of 30 FT is permitted. *The Applicant proposes to construct the addition to a building height of 30.36 FT.*
A variance is required for this condition.

6/19/26 – The plans have been revised to reduce the building height to 30 feet. The Applicant has provided a revised average grade calculation. A variance is no longer required. The Applicant to confirm in testimony.

- 9. Improved Coverage – The Applicant is proposing a max improved coverage of 2,328 SF (33.26%) where the maximum of 2,100 SF (30%) is permitted.**

A variance is required for this condition.

III. Engineering Review

- B.** The Applicant is proposing to increase improved lot coverage from 2,160 SF (30.9%) to ~~2,464 SF (35.2%)~~ **2,328 SF (33.26%)** with a net increase in coverage of ~~304 SF~~ **168 SF**.
1. There is a wooden deck, stairs, and frame garage in the rear of the existing dwelling which are to be removed.
 2. **Per the revised the plans the applicant is reducing the proposed addition from 820 SF to 502 SF**
- C.** The Applicant is proposing one (1) precast concrete seepage pit in the rear yard area to collect and store stormwater runoff from what appears to be the roof area of the proposed addition. We offer the following comments related to the drainage design:
1. The Applicant has provided design calculations which indicate approximately 2,446 SF of area being collected and conveyed to the proposed seepage pit. The Applicant has provided adequate storage for this drainage area. We take no exception to the calculations provided. The Applicant should provide testimony if there are any existing drainage improvements on-site.
 2. The Applicant should provide testimony indicating where the seepage pit is proposed to overflow.
 3. A soil test shall be provided prior to the installation of the proposed seepage pits. Soil test shall include information regarding the location of the seasonal high-water table (SHWT) and percolation rate of the soil.
 4. The Applicant proposed an at-grade manhole cover for future maintenance. We take no exception.
 5. The Borough Engineer shall be notified to inspect the seepage pits prior to backfilling.
- D.** There is an existing basement. No basement is proposed for the new addition. The Applicant is advised that any basement must be a minimum of 70% below finished grade; otherwise, the area shall be included in the calculation of gross livable floor area.

- Calculations have been provided and indicate the existing basement is 48.7 % below grade, and 51.4 % below the proposed finished grade. As such, the basement does not appear to meet the 70% below-grade requirement. The Applicant indicates that the existing basement is utilized solely for storage and utilities and has therefore not been included in the gross livable floor area calculation. No basement is proposed as part of the new addition. *Revised calculations have been submitted indicating that the existing basement is currently approximately 54% below grade. Based on the proposed grading modifications, the basement is projected to be approximately 73% below grade.*
- E. The Applicant has depicted existing and proposed contours on the property. We offer the following comments related to grading:
1. Under existing conditions, the site drains from north to south. The highest point of the property is in the southeastern side where elevations are approximately 78 and the lowest point of the property is in the northeastern corner, where elevations are approximately 77.5.
 2. Under proposed conditions, the high and low points are generally maintained, and drainage patterns should not be substantially impacted. Proposed grading appears to be minimal.
 3. *The grading plan has been revised since the previous submission and reflects increased proposed elevations adjacent to portions of the existing dwelling and proposed addition foundation, resulting in additional fill placement. In particular, the proposed grades along the northern side of the property appear to be raised by more than one (1) foot in certain areas located approximately six (6) feet from the adjacent property line. The Applicant should be prepared to provide testimony and demonstrate that the revised grading will not adversely impact drainage patterns or result in stormwater runoff, ponding, or other drainage-related issues on neighboring properties.* **Continuing comment.**
- F. The Applicant has submitted calculations indicating approximately 80 cubic yards of cut and 65 cubic yards of fill, for a total soil movement of 145 cubic yards. Based on the information provided, the proposed soil movement does not exceed the 250 cubic yard threshold, and a soil movement permit does not appear to be required. *Revised fill calculations have been provided, indicating 95 cubic yards of fill and a total movement of 175 cubic yards.*
- G. Should the Board act favorably upon this application, the Applicant is hereby made aware that drainage issues may arise during or after the proposed construction. It will be the Applicant's responsibility to remedy any drainage issues caused by the proposed improvements. In addition, water runoff directed to neighboring properties is prohibited. If runoff water does enter neighboring properties as a result of the proposed improvements, the Applicant will be responsible to remedy the situation at no cost to the Borough.

Should you have any questions, you may contact me at (201) 775-1283.

Sincerely,

Colliers Engineering & Design



Nick Chelius, P.E., C.M.E.
Joint Land Use Board Engineer

CC: Board Members (via Joint Land Use Board Secretary)
Matthew Capizzi, Applicant's Attorney (via email)

R:\PROJ\GOV\NJ\A-D\DEZ\DEZ0059 - 8 Ross Avenue\Correspondence\OUT\260624_nhc_8 Ross Avenue_Engineering Review 5_DEZ0059.docx