

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
BOROUGH OF BERGENFIELD
MAYOR AND COUNCIL WORK SESSION
OCTOBER 6, 2026**

PRESENT: Mayor Arvin Amatorio and Council President Domingo Almonte, Council members Buddy Deauna, Ora Kornbluth, Hernando Rivera and Marc Pascual

ABSENT: Councilperson Thomas A. Lodato

ALSO PRESENT: Borough Administrator Corey Gallo
Borough Attorney John Schettino
Borough Clerk Marie Quiñones-Wilson

Mayor Amatorio called the meeting to order at 8:04 p.m. with the reading of the Open Public Meetings Act Statement, “in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, the notice requirements have been satisfied. Meeting dates for the year are confirmed at the Annual Meeting. The Annual Notice was published in the Record Newspaper, placed on a Municipal Bulletin Board, posted on the Borough website, and is on file in the Office of the Borough Clerk. In case of an emergency, exits are in the back and to your right. Please turn off all cell phones.”

The Salute to the Flag was led by Council President Almonte.

Mayor Amatorio requested a moment of silence in honor of Mr. Albert “Dusty” Bright, Jr., a member of our community and volunteer of the Bergenfield Museum.

AGENDA CHANGES

Councilperson Kornbluth motioned to remove Resolution #26-261 appointing Temporary Municipal Court Judge and adding a resident’s request to reserve Cooper’s Pond for a workshop on October 21st from 5:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. to Correspondence, and Resolution #26-265 to hire Keyboard Clerk I – Danielle Plonchak and Resolution #26-266 to authorize the appointment of Municipal Representatives to the Bergen County Development Regional Committee to Resolutions. Council President Deauna seconded the motion. All present voting in favor, none opposed.

PRESENTATIONS

None.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS/BOROUGH ENGINEER

A. Engineering & Inspection Status Report

Borough Engineer Tino D’ Amore of Remington and Vernick Engineers stated that all roads have been paved, completing the project by the deadline in early September. He stated that now we are working on addressing punch list items and restoration throughout town. Mr. D’ Amore stated that Porter Avenue was also paved on Monday. We are also completing the punch list items and restoration for that project as well. He further stated that we are currently working on the sanitary sewer cleaning on Washington Avenue that is being completed today.

Mayor Amatorio inquired if the entire 2026 road program is complete.

Mr. D’ Amore confirmed that all the roads have been paved and the projects have been completed.

Borough Administrator Gallo stated that all the projects have been completed and National Water Main has been cleaning out the lines on Washington Avenue. This will be completed in the next two weeks. The road program has humps that need to be installed.

Mr. D'Amore stated that the contractor will be coming in to complete the speed humps and buttoning up landscaping in the parking lot, resurfacing some of the properties grass areas and driveways. He stated that the roads that will be having speed humps installed are Jersey Avenue, New York Avenue, and Clinton Avenue.

Councilperson Rivera inquired which were the roads paved this year.

Mr. D' Amore stated that the roads that were paved were Brook Street, Harcourt Avenue, North Queen Street, South Queen Street, Wildrose Avenue, Rivera Way, sections of S. Demarest Avenue, and Porter Avenue.

Councilperson Pascual asked the engineer to look into the profile heights of the speed humps.

ORDINANCES

A. Adoption of Ordinances

Mayor Amatorio stated he understands there is a large presence in the meeting because the residents would like to come forward on share their views on the ordinances being considered. He understands there are concerns and differences of opinion on the ordinances, and assured all that we are here to listen. No decision has been made on the ordinances. We have been discussing this for some time and will only do what is best for the community. We are here and willing to listen. He explained that the titles of the ordinances will be read and then the public comments will be opened.

Mayor Amatorio read into the record:

The following ordinances published herewith were first read by title on Tuesday, August 18, 2026 and posted on the bulletin board of the municipal center.

ORDINANCE 26-2676 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING CHAPTER 186 OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF BERGENFIELD, ENTITLED "LAND DEVELOPMENT"

ORDINANCE 26-2677 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING CHAPTER 186 OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF BERGENFIELD, ENTITLED "LAND DEVELOPMENT"

The following ordinances published herewith were first read by title only on Tuesday, September 1, 2026 and posted on the bulletin board of the municipal center.

ORDINANCE 26-2678 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 186 OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF BERGENFIELD, ENTITLED "LAND DEVELOPMENT"

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ORDINANCE 26-2676:

Borough Administrator Gallo provided clarification on the ordinances as there is misinformation being shared. He stated that in relation to Ordinance #26-2676, the borough is trying to prevent the side yards from exceeding what is permitted to be there. In an R5 zone, there is a five feet set aside allowed. There shouldn't be anything blocking the pathway between a resident's home and their neighbors' home. He referenced this includes windows, air conditioners, but doesn't include a temporary hose. He stated there are windows that require holes in the ground and no room between two home, making it difficult for firefighters to pass through during an emergency. He

explained that laws exist, but people are circumventing this by going to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance. Mr. Gallo demonstrated photos as examples.

Mayor Amatorio stated a setback ordinance already exists, and people have to adhere to it when building a home. He explained that in an R5 zone, the land area is 50 x 100 and the setback between the property line is five feet. The ordinance isn't prohibiting an air conditioner be installed there, provided you have the five feet set aside. The borough is setting the parameters for public safety. The Fire Department knows how difficult it is to navigate in the tiny spaces. The ordinance may need to be polished and language needs to be changed. Safety is a main concern. Mayor Amatorio expressed that heaven forbid there be an emergency and the firefighters are unable to rescue the residents because of the limited space.

Mr. Gallo stated that it is becoming far too common for residents to place egress windows on their side yards as part of their plans.

Councilperson Kornbluth inquired if a resident has an air conditioner on the side of their home and it breaks, can the existing air conditioning unit be replaced.

Borough Attorney Schettino stated that anything pre-existing the ordinance is allowed to stay.

Mayor Amatorio stated that those nonconforming existing conditions are able to remain the same.

Mr. Schettino explained that the restriction will only be going forward, if someone does an addition or new construction to their home, they will need to conform with the setbacks. If they don't conform, they will need to seek a variance. For those who are concerned with their own existing nonconforming conditions, there is nothing to worry about.

Steven Bellavia, resident, commented with regards to ordinance 2676 and agreed that safety is important, but expressed concern over selling his home if this ordinance makes his air conditioner on the side of his home nonconforming. He is concerned with the language in the ordinance and whether he will be able to obtain a Certificate of Compliance due to preexisting conditions.

Borough Administrator Gallo stated that if an addition is added to the home, now the air conditioner will become nonconforming and will need to be moved. Otherwise, there is no issue with the existing air conditioner.

Mr. Bellavia further inquired what if the air conditioner has to be replaced.

Borough Attorney Schettino explained that if the nonconforming condition preexists the ordinance, it is grandfathered in. Homes built 60 to 100 years ago probably do not conform at all with current zoning laws because restrictions were significantly less than they are today. The person isn't required to seek a variance for all preexisting conditions. The borough has no authority to pass an ordinance and require residents to change preexisting conditions retroactively to make them conform. He explained that replacing the unit will not be an issue and there will be no issues when selling the home. He further explained it only becomes an issue when you want to expand and add to your side yard, then a variance will be required. Mr. Schettino stated that although there is a safety issue, there is also a concern of the impact to the adjacent property. If an air conditioning unit or generator is being placed on the side that only has a five feet setback, and the neighbor has 5 feet, now the distance between their property and the apparatus is less, impacting the adjacent property.

Zalman Gershuni, resident, inquired how does a resident prove that a condition is preexisting and what happens if an item needs to be replaced. He commented whether a survey will need to be obtained in order to prove the item is preexisting. He expressed concern over the language and

commented that the existing rules need to be enforced. He stated that instead of changing all the rules, the borough should ban the Zoning Board of Adjustment from providing the variances.

Mr. Schettino responded that his suggestion is illegal. The Zoning Board of Adjustment is an independent board that is statutorily required to hear applications when someone needs a variance. That is the purpose of the board. The State legislature would need to change the law to allow the governing body the authority to inform the Zoning Board whether to grant variances.

Mr. Gershuni questioned what is the point of this ordinance if the Zoning Board can continue to grant variances. He commented that if the concern is safety, Thames Boulevard is a disaster with double side parking.

Marc Stein, resident, stated that he has been dealing with the Zoning Board of Adjustment and Building Department for more than twenty years. He explained that when building homes, the plans are submitted, reviewed and approved, and they move on. No one has ever brought up the issue about a window well or side yard setback with stairs being in the plans. He expressed that the setback exists for a reason, but this has always been allowed. Mr. Stein referenced the photos and explained that one of the homes was called in several times, and the Zoning Officer allowed it. This could have been prevented if the employees handled it differently while it was going on. The homes were brought to the borough's attention while the homes were being built and nothing was ever done.

Borough Attorney Schettino stated that the current ordinance has a setback requirement, but didn't prohibit air conditioners or generators. This ordinance will now prohibit these units from being placed in the side yard setback. As a result of complaints received, the Zoning Officer recommends the governing body change the ordinance.

Mayor Amatorio commented there were many complaints from neighbors regarding the noise from air conditioners and generators.

John Smith, resident, stated that the preexisting condition is grandfathered in, so long as there is no addition made to the property. He explained that replacing an existing unit is permitted. He further stated that when applications come to the board, residents are advised to place the egress windows and air conditioning units in the rear of the home for safety purposes. He referenced an incident where a neighbor's child fell into the hole of an egress window and broke his arm. He knows the board encourages the egress windows and units be placed in the rear of the home, and 95% of the applicants say no. This has led to the issue we have today because many people are complaining about noise. Mr. Smith noted that he has the same issue with his neighbor, and has made them aware that they cannot come onto his property. He expressed that no one is taking the safety concern into consideration.

Yehuda Borg, resident, commented that many residents live on average lots and are trying to make the best use of their properties. He stated if the residents are forced to place their units in the rear of their home, it will take away from their backyard and the noise will continue to bother the neighbors. He recommended that fences be permitted in between homes or encourage all to place their units on one side of the home, to allow the other to serve as the egress access for firefighters.

Daren Marshall, resident, inquired whether a shed in the backyard is grandfathered in. He expressed concern with the ordinance because he needs to move an existing shed in order to replace his deck. Mr. Marshall stated that permits were pulled for the shed and it was inspected and approved.

It was noted that this is separate from the side yard setback.

Mr. Schettino explained that the most cost-effective way to prove a preexisting condition is by taking a dated photograph. If the Zoning Officer questions this, the decision can be appealed to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The board then decides on whether the condition is preexisting.

Bruce Shapiro, representative of New Jersey Realtors, stated that he understands the safety concerns, but residents have also raised important concerns. He referenced that his association has worked with several towns on their ordinances and encouraged the governing body to work with professionals, special interest groups, and residents. He noted that the resident made a great recommendation to have all the units placed on one side of the home, making it uniform and identifying an egress route for the Fire Department.

Tiago, resident, stated that he understands the safety concern but expressed that he works on tires and sometimes has them on the side of his home. He commented that it cannot all be about safety.

Johnathan Schloss, resident, commented that the ordinance references nonconforming conditions but does not quantify the size of units. He expressed the ordinance reads that if it is increased in any way, then it will be considered a nonconformity. There should be a quantification. Also, the statute doesn't read that you are grandfathered in.

Rachel Christian, resident, stated that as a homeowner and investor, homes are very appealing when they are conforming. She expressed concern this ordinance will make many preexisting conditions nonconforming, as there are many properties that have their units in their side yards. She further commented that backyards are for enjoyment and family gatherings. She also noted that if an item is conforming, many people will need to go on the lengthy and expensive process for a variance.

Ken Vogel, resident, suggested the borough look into Seaside Height's ordinance as the properties are much closer to each other and also have a five foot setback.

Jason Baum, resident, stated that purpose of the ordinance is safety, but if a window well is placed in the home for the safety of these children, it is contrary to code.

Mr. Schettino stated that if the resident currently has a window well that he would like to bring up to code, then it can be done without a variance. Mr. Schettino further expressed that he cannot get into specific facts and provide legal advice, but no one will ever have an issue for correcting a nonconformity. If there is less than five feet setback, then a variance is required.

Neil Rothman, resident, discussed the grandfathered clause and expressed concern over the burden of proof falling on the resident. He asked if the proof can be clearly defined on what is considered.

Mr. Schettino explained that the burden of proof always falls on the resident. He referenced a matter where a homeowner needed clarification on whether his home is a two or three family home, and provided PSE&G bills and photographs to prove the home had separate meters. He expressed that photographs are also used as proof.

Borough Administrator Gallo referenced that a survey would show the location of the air conditioning unit.

Mr. Rothman expressed concern over selling his home twenty years from now, and if he is unable to produce photographs, buyers may no longer be interested.

Mr. Schettino explained that the burden of proof falling on the resident is State statute, and is not decided by the town. A town ordinance cannot supersede State law. The State law doesn't provide specifics, it is purposely written that way for residents to be able to show any document as proof.

There is case law regarding existing proof, but no specific record that establishes the evidence, because documents that are good today, may no longer be acceptable years from now. The proof can be any document that shows the preexisting condition, and satisfies the requirements of the Zoning Officer or Zoning Board.

Mr. Rothman noted the burden this ordinance is now putting on the homeowners. He recommended that the language in the ordinance be changed to a three feet passage way, rather than stating that an air conditioning unit is nonconforming.

Mr. Schettino explained every town is different, but a five-foot setback is one of the lesser amounts that exist. He commented that residents usually argue the opposite and want more of a setback to avoid homes being on top of each other.

Borough Administrator Gallo stated he understands the concerns with regards to the grandfather status. He explained this evolved because residents have been asked to place their units in the rear yards and haven't complied. Furthermore, the Zoning Officer doesn't have the authority to enforce this because it's not in the ordinance. He commented that developers are taking 50x100 properties and building bigger homes than what should be there. This creates other issues and now we are debating five-foot setback. We are trying to minimize the exposure going forward.

Joel Berkowitz, residents, expressed concern over garages built on driveways where there is zero setback. He inquired if a new owner will be required to remove the garage.

Mr. Gallo explained that if a garage is built without permits, then it's an issue. He stated people come in for permits and when the inspection is done, there is much more work that is done. There are many illegal builds during the weekends when borough is closed. The property referenced would have required a variance from Zoning Board of Adjustment for zero setback.

Deborah Schloss, resident, stated that she understands quality of life and safety concerns. She expressed that in terms of quality of life perspective, we are living in 50x100 and 50x99 lots and are making the most of our homes. She further expressed that noise shouldn't be a concern, as everyone generates noise and we need to accept it. In terms of safety, it is definitely important to require fencing around window wells to increase security and the borough should require glow in the dark belts around the units for safety.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ORDINANCE 26-2677:

Borough Administrator Gallo explained that everyone is familiar with the term Certificate of Compliance, also known as CO. The State of New Jersey Department of Community Affairs changed the language in the law to Zoning Certificate of Compliance instead of CO. In reviewing the ordinance, there will be modifications pertaining to Section E, which requires information like name of owner, location of building structure, proposed use of the property, occupants, and so on, as well as the survey requirement and the calculations required by the Zoning Official for impervious surfaces. All this language will be modified.

Mayor Amatorio stated many people are asking if they will be required to obtain a new survey if they will sell their property. Mayor explained that people believe they need a new survey in order to sell their property, but that isn't the case. If alterations impacting the pervious and impervious surfaces are made to the property, the survey is required to determine the lot coverage. The survey is the only document that will help the Zoning Officer determine if the coverage is correct. If there are no changes to the property, no survey is required.

Mr. Gallo added that every person selling a home, is required to obtain a CO from the building department. This verifies there are no open permits or violations on the property. DCA created the language change and we have to amend the ordinance to reflect the change.

Erika Gershuni, resident, inquired if the ordinance is simply a language change or are there additional changes.

Mayor Amatorio stated that in addition to the name of the certificate, the Zoning Officer is proposing that any application for permit, such as an addition, requires a survey from within the last five years.

Ms. Gershuni commented this wasn't required in the past, and now a survey will be required before and after the work is done.

Mr. Gallo explained that a survey is required if an addition will be made to the home to show lot coverage.

Borough Attorney Schettino stated that an architect or engineer may require the survey to complete the plans, and may be able to provide the calculation.

Ms. Gershuni inquired if this is required to update a bathroom. It was explained that it is only required if it impacts lot coverage. Ms. Gershuni also inquired if lot coverage changes were made a few years ago regarding permeated pavers.

Mayor Amatorio explained that in an R5 zone, 50x100, lot coverage is 40%. If there is an addition, then a new calculation is required.

Mr. Schettino explained that no one is allowed to build an addition in any town that is going to impact the setbacks, the pervious and impervious surfaces, without having a professional verify the numbers.

Councilperson Kornbluth referenced that the ordinance made it easier for residents to have more lot coverage if pervious pavers were used.

Nina Eizikovitz, resident, noted that a Certificate of Compliance for a resale property never required a survey. She requested clarification on whether a survey would be required for construction on a home, which requires a CCO. She stated that no one requires a survey.

Mayor Amatorio explained that if there are no changes to the property, no open permits, then a survey isn't required.

Yehuda Borg, resident, expressed concern over the language of \$1,000 fine and/or jail time. There should be guidelines on the offense.

Mr. Gallo explained that there have been instances when matters with excessive fines have gone to Court, the Municipal Judge sets penalties, and the builder refuses to pay the fees. We are limited on what we can do. These instances are rare, but if further action is taken, it is guaranteed that the fees will be paid.

Zalman Gershuni, resident, requested clarification on the requirements for patios being replaced with the same pavers that were previously approved.

Mark Stein, resident, commented with regards to paver patios in the backyard and how difficult it would be for a buyer to show pictures to prove the existing use 43 years later. He also expressed concern over the Zoning Officer procedures and referenced an issue where a home was issued a CO, and then several years later, there were issues because there was no proof of a patio. He inquired if there is a process to this. He also commented with regards to requiring a survey within five years. He has a survey that is 12 years old.

Mr. Gallo stated the Zoning Officer is looking at certain things because they have come to his attention. Everyone should have a survey, but the community is voicing their concern about them because of the cost. A survey would resolve all issues.

Borough Attorney Schettino stated that if a building official issues a permit incorrectly, the legal term is ultra-virus, it was illegal from the beginning, but you cannot make it legal because of the mistake. According to the scenario referenced, a permit should have never been issued.

Mr. Stein stated there should be more conversation and dialogue on these ordinances.

Mr. Gallo responded with regards to the survey that is 12 years old, if there were no permits or changes to the home, the survey is acceptable. It has become the norm to require surveys within five years. In Teaneck, all builds require a survey within 5 years.

The resident confirmed that Teaneck also requires a survey that is done within 5 years.

John Smith, resident, stated he has been on the board for over 8 years and only once did a resident have a survey that was older than 5 years. All applications include a survey less than five years old. He stated that with regards to the pavers, the additional coverage isn't guaranteed. It all depends on the type of pavers being used. In Bergenfield, residents may be provided up to 10%, but it isn't guaranteed, it depends on the pavers.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ORDINANCE 26-2678:

Borough Administrator Gallo explained that when parking requirements result in a fraction of a space, any space greater to or equal to a half, should require an additional space. Mr. Gallo expressed there are parking issues in town and homes are being built without the proper number of parking spaces. Instead of having a .5 space, there is a need to round up. He commented that residents have attended the meetings to express their concerns over developments in areas of redevelopments in commercial zones such as Washington Avenue, West Main and Church Street, but over developments have been occurring in residential areas, and we need to make it more responsible.

Councilperson Kornbluth inquired whether a parking garage counts as a parking spot.

Borough Attorney Schettino explained that if the parking garage allows for two vehicles and there is space for two vehicles outside, then the home has four legal parking spaces.

It was referenced that for a five-bedroom home, residents are required to have three parking spaces.

Mayor Amatorio explained that the purpose for this ordinance is to limit cars being parked on the street.

Yehuda Borg, resident, stated that the borough already passed an ordinance that extended the parking regulation past the five bedrooms. The State RSIS stops the requirements at five bedrooms and the borough added a .5 spot for each additional bedroom. This ordinance rounds up and takes a stricter approach than RSIS, which allows that half spaces be disregarded. Mr. Borg stated that if someone tries to add a bedroom in a three-bedroom home, this ordinance will require them to add a third parking space. He stated that if overnight parking is enforced, there is no issue. He commented that the borough is providing developers on Washington Avenue additional height, but stifling the residents.

Mr. Gallo stated that there is a parking issue and if the borough didn't open the parking lots during snow emergencies, people would have no where to park their cars. This is an ongoing issue.

Resident, inquired what is considered a bedroom in a unit. She inquired if a bedroom is any room or room with a closet. She inquired if a bedroom she uses for crafts is considered a bedroom. The resident expressed that this should be defined in the ordinance as the Tax Assessor may have other considerations for a bedroom. She also inquired if a unit needs to have a specific number of bedrooms and requested clarification on the requirements for apartments and multi-family dwellings. She expressed concern over the building of apartments and overcrowding.

Resident, expressed that if the borough never allows overnight parking, there is no need for the ordinance. There shouldn't be a concern with the number of spaces in someone's home. No one is buying a home with fewer parking spaces if they need more. If residents park their cars on the street and call them in every night or risk receiving a parking ticket, that is on them. He commented this sounds like an HOA. He stated that Police Officers should ticket them. The Police Officers need to enforce the rules on the books and collect more revenue instead of changing the rules.

Mark Stein, resident, stated that the Zoning Officer tells everyone building a home that any room that can have a bed in it, will be counted as a bedroom. He stated that if people build a gym, it could be counted as a bedroom. He reiterated that a bedroom needs to be defined in the ordinance. He also referenced primary versus guest bedrooms as relatives visit him for a short period of time every year.

Karly Fuentes, resident, expressed that the governing body should have been more prepared with a power-point with bullet points on the changes being made instead of showing pictures. She further commented that parking is an issue in the Borough and something needs to be done. She lives with her family in a home that has one parking space and her family has three vehicles. She pays five to seven tickets each week. She stated that there can't be over 700 apartments built without having a solution for residents that have lived here for years.

Mr. Gallo explained that is exactly what this ordinance is trying to prevent. He commented that homes need to be built with enough parking. This ordinance is trying to prevent homes being built without enough parking.

Mary Sullivan, resident, mentioned that a room is considered a bedroom when it has a closet. Her craft room is considered a bedroom and requires a parking space. She explained that just because she isn't using the room as a bedroom, the next person may use it as a bedroom. That's the reason for the parking requirement. She expressed that .5 parking spaces should be rounded up because no one can park in a half space. She further commented that if residents cleaned out their garages, they would have more parking. She also referenced people moving in know the overnight parking regulations and need to plan ahead. Otherwise, this town isn't for you.

Mayor Amatorio closed public comments on Ordinances 26-2676, 26-2677, and 26-2678.

MOTION by Councilperson Kornbluth to table Ordinances 26-2676, 26-2677, and 26-2678. Councilperson Rivera seconded the motion.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

The following ordinances published herewith were first read by title only on Tuesday, September 1, 2026 and posted on the bulletin board of the municipal center.

ORDINANCE 26-2679 – AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOROUGH OF BERGENFIELD, COUNTY OF BERGEN, STATE OF NEW JERSEY, AMENDING REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BLOCK 122, LOTS 1-14 – 60-90 WEST CHURCH STREET, 11-43 TYSON PLACE, 22-24 NORTH FRONT STREET, AND 31 NORTH DEMAREST AVENUE

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ORDINANCE 26-2679:

Renee Carr, resident, stated that the proposal is for 69 units and inquired how many units currently exist at this property.

It was explained there are no units there as the proposed building is for the location of the old Nissan dealership on Church Street.

Ms. Carr inquired if there is a contingency plan for the children that may be attending the schools because the classrooms in Franklin School are already full. She also inquired how many units are one-bedroom apartments.

Borough Administrator Gallo mentioned that he learned the schools are not close to capacity and have therefore lost millions in school funding.

Mayor Amatorio stated that he also learned there are about nine children at the Bella apartments, and none of them attend the public schools.

Mr. Gallo stated that he can provide a breakdown of the units as there are additional COAH requirements that need to be considered.

Mayor Amatorio closed public comments on ordinance 26-2679.

MOTION by Councilperson Rivera to table Ordinance 26-2679. Council President Almonte seconded the motion.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

The following ordinance published herewith were first read by title only on Tuesday, September 15, 2026 and posted on the bulletin board of the municipal center.

ORDINANCE 26-2680 - AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE SALARY RANGES OF EMPLOYEES NOT SUBJECTED TO UNIONIZED CONTRACTUAL UNITS OF THE BOROUGH OF BERGENFIELD

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ORDINANCE 26-2680.

No one came forward.

Mayor Amatorio closed public comments on Ordinance 26-2680.

Motion by Councilperson Deauna, seconded by Council President Almonte, to pass Ordinance 26-2680 on second and final reading and are hereby adopted and notice of same shall be published according to law as amended.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

No Report.

MAYOR & COUNCIL REPORTS

No Reports.

CORRESPONDENCE

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| a.) Paton/Resident | RE: Request to Reserve Memorial Park Pavilion for Birthday Party/October 10, 2026/2:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. |
| b.) Fernandez/Resident | RE: Request to Reserve Cooper's Pond for Workshop/October 21, 2026/5:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. |

Motion by Councilperson Kornbluth, seconded by Council President Almonte, and all members present voting in favor, to accept Correspondence. All present voting in favor, none opposed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Fred Shalberg, resident, thanked the governing body and the Police Department for taking action on the concerns he expressed at the last public meeting regarding people living on the street in a van. He commented that if overnight parking restrictions are lifted, the borough should consider lifting the ban for the municipal lots as well.

Yehuda Borg, resident, thanked the governing body for the new addition at the park on Hallberg Avenue. He stated that the shade above the playground is great.

Joel Berkowitz, resident, requested that a speed hump be installed on Ralph Street. He asked that a traffic study be conducted because cars speed down the road.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS TO BE ACTED UPON:

A. CONSENT AGENDA

CONSENT RESOLUTION 26-250. All matters listed below are considered by the Governing Body to be routine in nature. There will be no separate discussion of these items. If any discussion is desired by the Governing Body, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately.

- 26-251/**To Approve Bill List
- 26-252/**To Cancel Grant Balances
- 26-253/**To Approve Tax Refund – N. Washington Avenue

- d. **26-254**/To Approve Veteran Tax Exemption – 31 S First Street
- e. **26-255**/To Approve Agreement – Administrative Agent Services for Affordable Housing Program – Community Grants, Planning, and Housing, LLC “CGP&H”
- f. **26-256**/To Approve Payment – 2026 Road Program Sanitary and Storm Sewer Cleaning, Video Inspection and Repairs – National Water Main Cleaning
- g. **26-257**/To Authorize RFQ for 2027 Professional Services
- h. **26-258**/To Approve Purchase of Turnout Gear for the Bergenfield Fire Department – New Jersey Fire Equipment Company
- i. **26-259**/To Authorize Aggregate Purchases – Elmwood Services Inc.
- j. **26-260**/To Authorize Purchase – New Gasboy Fuel Management System for the Department of Public Works – Petroleum Equipment Services of New Hampshire LLC

MOTION by Councilperson Kornbluth, seconded by Councilperson Deauna, to approve Consent Resolution #26-250.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

B. RESOLUTIONS

26-261/To Approve Salary Increase – Michael Ravenda

MOTION by Councilperson Rivera, seconded by Councilperson Kornbluth, to table Resolution #26-261.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>recuse</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

26-262/To Hire Part-Time Electrical Sub-Code Inspector – Anthony Detrick

MOTION by Councilperson Rivera, seconded by Council President Almonte, that Resolution #26-262 be approved.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

26-263/To Hire Part-Time Laborers

MOTION by Councilperson Rivera, seconded by Council President Almonte, that Resolution #26-263 be approved.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

26-264/To Hire Part-Time Per Diem Violations Clerk – Evan Havlicek

MOTION by Councilperson Rivera, seconded by Council President Almonte, that Resolution #26-264 be approved.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

26-265/To Hire Keyboard Clerk I – Danielle Plonchak

MOTION by Councilperson Kornbluth, seconded by Council President Almonte, that Resolution #26-265 be approved.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

26-266/To Authorize the Appointment of Municipal Representatives to the Bergen County Development Regional Committee

MOTION by Councilperson Rivera, seconded by Councilperson Deauna, that Resolution #26-266 be approved.

On a roll call, the vote was recorded as follows:

Councilperson Lodato:	<i>absent</i>	Councilperson Kornbluth:	<i>aye</i>
Councilperson Deauna:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Rivera:	<i>aye</i>
Council President Almonte:	<i>aye</i>	Councilperson Pascual:	<i>aye</i>

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council President Almonte commented that wording is important and the purpose for the ordinances is safety. We need ordinances that are clear and practical for all residents.

Councilperson Kornbluth thanked all for coming to the meeting tonight.

Councilperson Rivera expressed that he had questions for the resident, but they all left early. He wanted to learn more about the resident living in a home with three vehicles and 1 parking space. We don't want this in town. He thanked all for staying in the meeting till the end and wished all a good night.

Councilperson Pascual commented that safety is priority, but he understands the residents' concerns. We will go back to the drawing board.

Mayor Amatorio expressed that we had great discussion and thanked all for attending the meeting.

CLOSED SESSION

RESOLUTION **26-267**/Authorizing the Governing Body to Enter into Closed Executive Session to discuss:

- A. Attorney-Client Privilege
 - 1. Massey v. Borough of Bergenfield
 - 2. PBA Local 309 Agreement
- B. Personnel
 - 1. Police Department Retirements
 - 2. Tax Assessor Agreement

Minutes will be taken of the meeting and released to the public at the time that the matter is resolved. After Closed Executive Session, the Mayor and Council will reconvene in the Executive Chambers to adjourn this public meeting.

On a motion by Council President Almonte, second by Councilperson Rivera, and all present voting in favor, the meeting was adjourned to the Closed Session in the Executive Chambers at 10:28 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Mayor and Council, on a motion by Council President Almonte, second by Councilperson Kornbluth and unanimously carried, to adjourn this meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 11:21 p.m.

Marie Quiñones-Wilson
Borough Clerk