

**ELIZABETH K. BAKER  
90 HILLSIDE AVENUE  
GLEN RIDGE, NEW JERSEY 07028**

October 16, 2013

The Honorable Peter Hughes  
172 Hawthorne Avenue  
Glen Ridge, NJ 07028

Dear Peter:

I am submitting to you my resignation from the Council, along with my Council-related positions on the Board of Health and the Planning Board, effective from the time you receive this letter. I feel I can no longer function effectively as a contributing member. In addition, family and too-long-delayed projects increasingly demand my attention. At this point, I would like to continue as a member of the Environmental Advisory Committee and the Shade Tree Commission, but only if that is your pleasure.

I hope you know that I wish you nothing but the best in the months and years to come. You are a wonderful mayor and Glen Ridge is indeed lucky to have you!

Sincerely,

*Elizabeth*

cc: Michael Rohal

*Michael,*

*I can only hope you know how much I appreciate  
all you've done for me - and the town - over the  
years.*

*all the best,  
Elizabeth*

# JONATHAN J. MOSS

October 21, 2013

Hon. Peter A. Hughes, Mayor  
and members of the Glen Ridge Borough Council  
825 Bloomfield Avenue  
Glen Ridge, New Jersey 07028  
(via email to [mjrohal@glenridgenj.org](mailto:mjrohal@glenridgenj.org))

Dear Mayor Hughes and members of the Glen Ridge Borough Council:

I am writing to encourage Glen Ridge to address an issue far more important than what is consuming all of us at this time -- the issue of school overcrowding -- and to use its borrowing ability to build additional classrooms. People do not move to, and reside in Glen Ridge for the sports, they do so because of the strong schools. Quite frankly, strong schools preserve the value of our homes, and currently, our schools have become overcrowded. Thus, it's in our self-interest to maintain and, perhaps, improve our schools. (I have also briefly spoken with BOE members in an effort to expand my understanding of the issue.)

As a result, I am confident a broad spectrum of Glen Ridge residents would back incurring debt, especially at today's low costs, to build extra classrooms for each grade. Doing so could reduce class size from 25 to fewer than 20, and therefore enhance the perception and reality of the quality of the education provided to our youth. (The BOE would have to staff and provide resources for these classrooms, a cost that would be difficult to cover, but Glen Ridge can, at least, pay for the facilities.) Admittedly, I am not an expert in any of this, and may not be sufficiently informed to understand the nuances of all that I suggest.

A real concern is whether we can afford the classrooms as well as the proposed turfing of Hurrell, especially since the latter will be a continuing concern, with Hurrell Field leading to other conversions (e.g. your discussions with Montclair about Washington Field, the possible turfing of Forest or Carteret without referendum), and with larger repair, removal and replacement costs potentially generating the need for recurring bond issues. If both ventures are affordable, then I would imagine many would consider such investment a success. If not, however, I urge you to focus on the classrooms. (Even if the referendum allows you to proceed, you do not have to do so.) Glen Ridge could cover its turf-related costs by charging necessary fees to those using the fields, even if grass, and/or curtailing usage by selectively dropping specific sports for specific grades. (For example, if Glen Ridge is not formally connected to the GRAA, as was made clear when an audit was requested by some residents, then charging sufficient fees to cover field usage and maintenance should not be a problem. Fees are certainly charged for the use of other Glen Ridge facilities.) Glen Ridge is a small town with limited resources, so perhaps we cannot have unlimited sports opportunities for kids starting in kindergarten.

As our actions reflect our values, I ask you to consider the interests of all residents and urge you to work with the Glen Ridge Board of Education and make investment in our schools a priority.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,



CC: Ms. Elisabeth Ginsburg, President, Glen Ridge Board of Education (via email to [eginsburg@glenridge.org](mailto:eginsburg@glenridge.org))

**122 STONEHOUSE ROAD  
GLEN RIDGE, NEW JERSEY 07028**

Elizabeth Soo Hoo Marnell  
7 Laurel Place  
Glen Ridge, NJ 07028

October 15, 2013

Glen Ridge Board of Adjustment  
c/o Municipal Building  
825 Bloomfield Avenue  
Glen Ridge, NJ 07028

Dear Sirs/Madam:

The Board of Adjustment made a decision in 2010 to approve a renovation/expansion on the house next to ours at 9 Laurel Place. That house has a garage about 4' away from our property line and the owner was allowed to build two stories above it. There are now 11 windows overlooking our property (including those now in the garage where there were none before) and it cuts off air flow and afternoon sun to our backyard. It also allows our neighbor to look directly down on us while we are using/working in our backyard. Our neighbor makes it a point to gain our attention whenever he sees us in the backyard which is totally unwelcome. In addition, his house remains in an unfinished state and this town has allowed this to go on for the last several years.

The Board's latest decision to disallow the renovation/expansion of a carriage house at 233 Baldwin Street seems to me to be a similar situation so the decision surprises me. Mr. & Mrs. Kim's building is also 4' away from the property line of 11 Laurel Place. The structure is already up so there would have been minimal construction on the outside compared with 9 Laurel Place. One of the complaints was that any resident in the carriage house would be able to look down on the backyard of 11 Laurel Place – how different is that from what has occurred between 7 and 9 Laurel Place. Yet you approved one and denied the other.

The main complaint of the residents on Laurel Place was fear of the carriage house eventually becoming a rental. How different is that from 9 Laurel Place – a property of 50x110 in which there are now four bedrooms with a full bath in each. Do you really believe this will not eventually become a rental – even though the owner denied he would do so? He was also questioned about whether or not he would take down the tree in front of his property and he said no. However, he had this tree cut down in October of 2010, just months after the Board meeting.

Moreover, one of the witnesses testifying against the Kim's never said she was the architect for 11 Laurel Place until she was forced to do so by Mrs. Pam Foster. Shouldn't she have said so at the beginning of her testimony when she gave a list of her credentials? For a professional not to mention this fact is highly suspect.

It seems to me that your rejection of our complaint against 9 Laurel Place and of the Kim's request at 233 Baldwin Street -- because the situations are so similar -- is really not based on the facts. Is it also a coincidence that both of us who were rejected are of mixed races?

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "E. H. Marnell". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the text "Yours truly,".

Cc: Glen Ridge Council