Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board
Meeting of December 2, 2009

These minutes have not been approved and are subject to change by the public body at its next meeting.

The regular meeting of the Park Ridge Planning Board was called to order by the Chairman, David Mesiano, on the above date, time and place.

Chairman called for the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Messrs. Browne, Brouwer, Maguire, Mesiano, Mital, O'Donoghue, Oppelt
Absent: Messrs. Sandler, Saluzzi, Councilman Wells
Also Present: John Ten Hoeve, Jr., Board Attorney
Brigette Bogart, PP, Planning Consultant
Eve Mancuso, PE, Board Engineer

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The Notice for this meeting required by Section 3(d) of the Open Public Meetings Act has been provided by the adoption of a resolution by the Park Ridge Planning Board on January 28, 2009, setting forth a schedule of regular meetings, by mailing of said schedule to the Record and The Review on January 29, 2009 and by posting of said schedule on the Municipal Bulletin Board and the continuous maintenance thereat and by filing the said schedule in the office of the Borough Clerk.

ANYONE PRESENT WISHING TO BE HEARD: (non-agenda item

MESIANO: (to woman in audience) Since we spoke in the hall, you indicated you were interested in the streetscape and the letter that was sent from the Chamber of Commerce. I suppose we will discuss the letter a little bit.

BEER: Copies of the email from the Chamber of Commerce were received this afternoon and forwarded to the chair, planner and attorney. Inasmuch as the writer was not able to be present, I left it to the attorney to determine if the email would be presented and/or discussed.

TEN HOEVE: We can certainly discus the contents that people are familiar with.

MESIANO: (to woman in audience) And you can ask any questions.

TEN HOEVE: Or the planner can respond as part of her presentation. (to the planner)....what do you want to do?

BOGART: I will be discussing the Circulation Element as part of my presentation so I will just roll it into that presentation.

MESIANO: (to woman in audience) So you can just stay and hear what the planner is going to say and then ask your questions.

PUBLIC HEARING:

REEXAMINATION OF THE MASTER PLAN

BOGART: As you are all aware over the past year we have gone through the Master Planning process meeting every two weeks, having tremendous

planning board input and we based it on the borough's Vision Plan, the Zoning Board's Annual report, the census data, a lot of tax records and a lot of our own knowledge about development in the borough. We have gone through a grueling process, step by step to identify all the issues with current development and identifying how to address those issues.

Just a little bit of history...the borough hasn't had a comprehensive Master Plan since the 70's and since that point, in order to satisfy our Municipal Land Use Law obligations, we've been reexamining that Master Plan from the 70's every six years. A reexamination report is merely taking those goals and objectives from the 70's, identifying if they are appropriate, if they still apply to the town, do we feel that there were solved, do we need to modify them at all and then identify those changes that we would like to see there...

...as opposed to a comprehensive Master Plan, which is what we've done, which is to identify all the new problems, identify all our new goals and objectives and identify our new solutions. So this is the first time in 30 years that the borough has done this.

We've combined our Open Space Plan element that was adopted in 2003, we've coordinated the Historic Preservation element that was adopted last year and we've also added a Green Buildings & Environmental Sustainability Plan element, which is a new plan element that was authorized by the Municipal Land Use Law last year...we've also modified the Open Space and Recreation plan slightly to be consistent with our Land Use Plan...we've created a new Circulation Plan element and we've also created a new Recycling Plan element.

All of those elements are now in your Comprehensive Master Plan. I am not going to go in detail, because as I said, we went through this for an entire year but I wanted to briefly touch upon some of the main components of each of the elements, particularly the Land Use element, which is the major part of the document.

The first step in the Land Use element is we identified seven (7) areas that we felt were important from a development prospective...

1) and most significant was the scale of single family homes and the continual struggle with the Floor Area Ratio and the volumes of the dwellings that are being built in the municipality. We've identified some conceptual solutions and we are hoping to propose actual regulations to implement those conceptual solutions in the near future.

2) the second element we talked about in detail was the B-3 district, which is the commercial district in the northern border next to Montvale. We've identified that those area and bulk regulations do not currently work for that area and we would like to see some modified area and bulk regulations.

3) the Affordable Housing issues we've identified and even though we have an Affordable Housing element we've identified in summary form in this document that we would like to see any new affordable housing be constructed within the downtown area, close to commercial areas where residents without vehicles could walk to their jobs or get on mass transit bus or trains and be able to live in the municipality without having a car.

4) the Park Avenue streetscape had significant talks about improvements to Park Avenue and we've identified that as our main pedestrian oriented street and we would like to see traffic slowed down making it a safer environment for pedestrians and vehicles and try to reduce the conflicts that occur there between the two.

5) the fifth item is the Green Streets that were identified in the Open Space plan and just how to coordinate them with our streetscape improvements and our downtown improvements and the Open Space Plan and Historic Preservation Plan elements.

6&7) the last two were relatively minor in nature but worth mentioning...one is Spring Valley Road corridor and how there are a number of different uses along that corridor that are currently residential zones and we've made a finding and conclusion policy statement that even though those uses exist

there, we feel strongly that we should monitor them and make sure they are not impacting the surrounding residents any further than they currently do and the last one is the Kinderkamack Road corridor, where we identified and recognized it as a vehicle oriented corridor and always will be but we would like to see some streetscape improvements...potentially a reduction in the number of curb cuts, some shared parking, some streetscape materials, some streetscape furniture and stuff of that nature to make it a more unified design.

So those were the seven (7) elements that we based the Land Use Plan on.

The map that I have to the left is what we started on in the very beginning to come up with those seven (7) issues. This is the existing Land Use Map and is identified and color coded from single-family homes in the yellow, all the way down to the parking, railroad and some miscellaneous issues and land uses there....it is taken from the tax records and has been site inspected and we worked off this map all year long...I'm sure you are all very familiar with it and from this map we created a land use plan, which has similar color coding, identifying single-family homes and then talks about the different densities within the neighborhood, commercial areas and two of the significant things about this land use plan is 1) we have now identified what we are calling a neighborhood business commercial area along Park Avenue and also along Broadway...these are the areas we felt are more pedestrian oriented retail and we wanted to modify the area and bulk regulations...currently it is Business -1 and we are hoping to promote more of a traditional element with shared parking, allow for a reduction in the parking requirements, increasing the impervious coverage requirements to really reflect the current development pattern in those areas.

The other significant issue is that there were a couple of neighborhoods, mostly on the west side, that we modified from the district boundary lines based upon existing development patterns and by that I mean, there were some lots currently zoned for R-20 that may be in the R-15 and some zoned for the R-15 that may be moved down to the R-10 and that is based on the currently lot width analysis.

This map reflects three recommended changes to the zoning map...1) is the neighborhood business zone 2) is the modifications to some of the single-home boundaries and 3) currently there is an affordable housing designation for the conservation area in the western part of the municipality by the Bears Nest and we would like to remove that and put it in the Conservation Zone.

So from this map, in the Master Plan we have some recommended zoning maps and that will replace your zoning map....not now...by adopting this document does not mean you have created a new zoning map, we would have to go through that process and actually adopt that as an ordinance.

In addition to the new zoning map we have a couple of recommended changes to the zoning regulations and all of them were reflected in the Zoning Board's Annual report that we reviewed pertaining to Floor Area Ratio, shared parking, reduction of parking requirements and lastly, the lot width review for undersized lots. It has come up that there are a number of lots that while they meet the area requirements for their respective districts they do not necessarily meet the lot width requirements, so we recommended that further review be taken on those lots to accommodate them to be redeveloped without needing a variance. In summary, that is basically your new Land Use Plan.

Just briefly, the Sustainability Element was newly authorized by the Municipal Land Use Law in August 2008 and we included and Environmental Inventory. One of the goals of the Sustainability Element is to establish a Green Team, do a natural resources inventory, encourage community outreach and then identify the number of environmental ordinances to be created including steep slopes, wetland ordinances and

things of that nature. While it doesn't suggest that they need to be adopted, it suggests that they should be reviewed.

The Circulation Plan is the next element...the circulation plan had three (3) main components. One is the Green Street design, which was established in the Open Space Plan in 2003 and basically talks about redesigning some of the main streets or some of the important streets in town that connect with open spaces, schools, certain downtown areas to a more pedestrian friendly environment and additional landscaping, buffers between vehicles and pedestrians and it talks about how we want to increase the sidewalks and make a lot of the sidewalks more ADA compliant.

The second major component in the Circulation element is we talked about the train station and the stop being moved further north to alleviate any traffic congestion on Park Avenue and as you are all aware, as part of this process we contacted N.J. Transit and they are currently looking into the potential of moving that further north.

The last important element in the Circulation Plan and we spent a lot of time on this, is the Park Avenue streetscape with a perspective to redesign Park Avenue or recreate it to not only allow for safer pedestrian environment but also alleviate some of the conflicts between the vehicles and pedestrians. As part of the recommendations to create this new neighborhood business district is to get a better streetscape design potentially adding to the streetscape medians and identifying parallel parking spaces and curb extensions and new ADA accessible dropped curbs. As part of designing this streetscape we met with the county a couple of times to discuss the feasibility of actually implementing a plan. There is a plan in the back of the document in the last couple of pages which looks at providing median and some parallel parking spaces. County has reviewed that plan and has suggested that it is conceptually viable and that they encourage continued talks with the county to implement something of that nature. While they haven't specifically agreed to the design in the back of the document and we've identified that, they have said that something similar would be acceptable. The plan as it is in the document shows landscaped islands, shows curb extensions...the county has suggested that if we were to implement any sort of streetscape improvement that it be done in a two-phase process. The first phase be striping the medians and the curb extensions and the new parallel spaces to identify how that would affect current circulation patterns, how it would affect businesses operating, how it would affect residents trying to get to those businesses. Once we have the striping laid out and we can determine the wear patterns and what needs to be changed, at that point we can determine if any of those medians could potential be curbed and landscape could potentially be added. The plans in the back of the document show landscape medians throughout the entire Park Avenue. I don't think anyone and I could be mistaken, but I don't think anyone feels that the landscaped islands could be implemented through the entire corridor. I know it raises a number of circulation issues particularly with the business community but I think that striping a portion of it or striping all of the corridors to identify traffic issues to see how current circulation patterns are laid out is appropriate and I think that is the goal of the document. To take it a step further and to add landscaping would be a bonus and would be only appropriate if we could identify that the painted medians are appropriately laid out.

I know there was a letter sent by the Chamber of Commerce with a concern about losing parking spaces and I understand that concern. With the landscaped medians there will be a potential loss of parking spaces particularly if they are implemented throughout the entire corridor but I don't think that that particular design with all those landscaped medians is the goal of this document. The goals in particular are to improve the safety of that corridor and in addressing that issue, we may potentially want to add to this document just the striped medians ... identify where they would

go without providing the landscaping if that is a concern to the board. Right now it just has the landscaping as the final phase of that plan. That's it for the Circulation Plan.

Lastly, the Recycling Element and basically it just recognizes existing recycling practices and identifies the current tonnage and how the municipality currently goes about their program. It encourages that a shared purchasing program be implemented and it also encourages that we make sure that the borough is consistent with the county's solid waste management plan and is only about two or three pages of this 200 page document, so there is not much to talk about.

I think I hit on all the important aspects of the document although I am sure I missed a couple.

The Historic Preservation Plan is exactly as was adopted last year so we have no need to discuss it again. It was a full presentation in and of itself, no changes are recommended here.

I believe that is it.

MAGUIRE: There is an Affordable Housing Plan ?

BOGART: The Affordable Housing Plan is not part of this document. The reason it is not is because it is under mediation with COAH and it is obviously going to change based upon mediation outcomes and I felt as though we had adopted it back in December originally and once that plan is finalized through the mediation process, we can add it to the document.

I do have wording in there in the introduction that says it should be considered as part of the Master Plan for the borough.

MAGUIRE: (microphone did not pick up his comments...but basically he was repeating that the plan did not reflect a Park Avenue streetscape design except in concept)

Dr. Donna Mandarino, 40 Park Avenue came forward saying she was here as a result of the Chamber of Commerce email.

MESIANO: I read the email also and the main concern seemed to be the elimination of parking if the plan as it was drawn with all the medians was implemented. I think the planner and Mr. Maguire addressed it pretty well. It is a design idea whose concept is to calm the traffic, make the pedestrians safer and that may be a "pie in the sky" idea but it might be nice to have Park Avenue landscaped if it fits in and if it was doable.

As the planner said, in the meetings with the county they felt we had to take smaller steps if something like this is to be done. Stripe it out and see how it affects turns and parking.

Motion made by Mr. Oppelt that the hearing on the Master Plan be closed.

Second by Mr. Browne

AYES: Messrs. Browne, Brouwer, Maguire, Mesiano, Mital, O'Donoghue, Oppelt

CORRESPONDENCE:

N.J. Planner	re: November 2009 – dist.
League of Municipalities	re: November 2009 – dist.

SOIL MOVING:

ANTHONY BARROS – 102 Maple Terrace
Lot: 1 Block: 1706

WHEREAS, ANTHONY BARROS, (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant"), being the owner of premises known as 102 Maple Terrace, in the Borough of Park Ridge, County of Bergen, and State of New Jersey, said premises also known as Lot 1 of Block 1706 on the Tax Assessment Map for the Borough of Park Ridge, has applied to the PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE, (hereinafter referred to as "BOARD"), seeking a soil moving permit to allow the movement of soil on the site; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has submitted to the BOARD a plot plan for the property illustrating the proposed construction of a single family dwelling on the site, said plan prepared by Richard Nusser, Licensed Professional Engineer of the State of New Jersey, being dated September 23, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has presented the testimony of Richard Nusser, Professional Engineer, with respect to the planned movement of soil on the site; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held in connection with the application before the PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE, duly convened on November 18, 2009, upon due notice as required by law;

WHEREAS, the BOARD has carefully considered the application and all evidence and testimony presented at said hearing.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE that the BOARD hereby makes the following findings of fact:

1. Applicant seeks to construct a new home at 102 Maple Terrace in the Borough of Park Ridge. Applicant has provided the BOARD with a plot plan illustrating the planned site improvements and has presented the testimony of an engineer to explain the soil moving aspects of the application.
2. Applicant's engineer testified as to the proposed oil movement and the amount of soil to be removed from the site. The Board Engineer also provided the BOARD with a report confirming the Applicant's soil moving calculations and approving the plans and calculations.
3. Applicant also indicated that it would comply with all customary soil movement controls generally imposed by the BOARD, including, but not limited to, advance notice as to times, dates, routes, destination and other concerns to the BOARD and to the Borough Police Department prior to the movement of any soil.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE, by virtue of the foregoing that the BOARD hereby grants Applicant's request for a soil moving permit to move soil on and from the site, subject to the following conditions:

A. That the Applicant not engage in any soil movement or construction on the site prior to the installation of all soil erosion control measures as shown on the submitted plan and as discussed at the soil movement hearing, including, but not limited to sediment fencing, the temporary construction of access drive and the installation of tracking pads and other requirements that

were noted on the plan or as may be required by the Board Engineer.

B. That the Applicant not remove any soil to the site without first submitting to the Board Engineer and to the Borough Police Chief a written plan detailing the manner in which soil will be brought to the site, the destination of all soil to be removed from the site, the dates of delivery, the times when soil will be delivered and the routes to be taken by vehicles removing the soil. No soil shall be removed from the site unless and until the Applicant receives approval from the Board engineer and the Police Chief for the Borough of Park Ridge with respect to said plan.

C. Applicant shall also comply with any and all conditions or requirements imposed by the Board Engineer with respect to erosion control, truck cleaning, or any other soil movement requirement she may deem necessary. These requirements may include specific conditions wit56h regard to the maintenance of the tracking pads or Geomats on the site and with respect to the cleaning of Borough Streets, if required by the Board Engineer. Applicant shall also be required to install not only silt fences but hay bales to prevent the spillage of soil from the site in the event of severe rainfall.

D. Applicant shall also deliver soil to the site in trucks filled to such weight as is deemed appropriate after consultation wit5h the Board Engineer. If the Board Engineer determines that delivery vehicles should not be filled to capacity so as to mini8mize the possibility of damage to Borough Streets, Applicant shall comply with said requests. In the event Applicant causes any damage to the street, Applicant shall provide repairs to same or compensate the Borough for the costs of any repairs.

E. Applicant shall also comply with any and all additional conditions or requirements imposed by the Board Engineer with respect to erosion control, truck cleaning, or any other soil movement requirement she may deem necessary. These requirements may include specific conditions w3ith regard to the maintenance of a tracking pad on the site and with respect to the cleaning of Borough Streets, if req2uired by the Board Engineer.

F. Applicant shall move no more soil on or from the site than described during soil movement hearings. In the event Applicant requires the movement of additional soil, Applicant shall return to the BOARD for subsequent hearings.

Offered by Mr. Mital
Seconded by Mr. Oppelt

AYES: Messrs. Browne, Mesiano, Mital, O'Donoghue, Oppelt
ABSTAIN: Messrs. Brouwer, Maguire

NEW BUSINESS:

37 PARK RIDGE, LLC – 37 Park Avenue

WHEREAS, 37 PARK RIDGE, LLC, 37 Park Avenue, known as Lot 4 of Block 1505, on the Tax Map of the Borough of Park Ridge, has posted a cash Performance Bond in the amount of $96,660.00; and

WHEREAS, the cash Performance bond was reduced to $80,910.00 in October 2009; and

WHEREAS, applicant has requested their Cash Performance bond be further reduced; and

WHEREAS, the Borough Engineer has reviewed and inspected the site; and submitted a report dated November 17, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Borough Engineer has recommended the Cash Performance bond be further reduced by $6,000.00 for the installation of street lighting; and

WHEREAS, a copy of the engineer's report has been attached.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the **PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE** that the Cash Performance Bond of $80,910.00 be reduced to $74,910.00.

Offered by Mr. Maguire
Seconded by Mr. Brouwer

AYES: Messrs. Browne, Brouwer, Maguire, Mesiano, Mital, O'Donoghue, Oppelt

REEXAMINATION OF MASTER PLAN

See public hearing

APPROVAL OF VOUCHERS:

Brooker Engineer, PE
G. Papas – soil moving $495.00

Motion made by Mr. O'Donoghue that the voucher be approved for payment.
Seconded b y Mr. Brouwer

AYES: Messrs. Browne, Brouwer, Maguire, Mesiano, Mital, O'Donoghue, Oppelt.

ADJOURN;

There being no further business to come before the board a motion was made by Mr. Oppelt that the meeting be adjourned.
Second by Maguire.
Carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Helyn N. Beer
Secretary

(8:37pm)