

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

\*\*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, Raymond Mital, on the above date, time and place.

Chairman called for the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Ms. Eisen, Messrs. Brouwer (8:05), Mesiano, Mital, Oppelt, Councilman Maguire  
Absent: Messrs. Browne, O'Donoghue, Saluzzi, Von Bradsky  
Also Present: John Ten Hoeve, Jr., Board Attorney  
Eve Mancuso, PE, Board Engineer  
Brigette Bogart, PP, Planning Consultant

**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 15, 2010, setting forth a schedule of regular meetings, by mailing of said schedule to the Record and The Review on January 15, 2010 and by posting of said schedule on the Municipal Bulletin Board and the continuous maintenance thereof and by filing the said schedule in the office of the Borough Clerk.

**ANYONE PRESENT WISHING TO BE HEARD:** (non-agenda items)

There was no one

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**MICHELLE MITCHELL/PASCACK DUTCH REFORM CHURCH** –  
18 Wampum Road                      65 Pascack Road  
Lots: 2,3,4    Block: 1602

Michelle Mitchell and Butch Servilio came forward...they had been sworn in at previous meeting.

MITAL: We received the updated survey and would you like to tell us about it.

MITCHELL: We were here the last time and Gail Schaeffer from Sulak Lane said there was a dry well that was preventing water from pooling in her neighborhood and we were asked to locate that on this plan. We had the engineer come out and with the help of representatives from the church; we had located on this plan, not on our proposed property line, what is labeled as a *gravel bed*. Mrs. Schaefer referred to it as a dry well but on the plan it is listed as a gravel bed.

So it is not on our property.

MITAL: And that was designed there for picking up specific drainage coming off that property? Like a catch basin?

MITCHELL: That is what Mrs. Schaefer said...that when it rained very hard that she would get pooling in her back yard. And she complained to the church. If you remember the last time, she said there was something about gutters and leaders. I don't know anything about that, so I can't speak to it.

This is what the church apparently did to alleviate the pooling in her yard.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

MITAL: Ok. Are there any questions from the board regarding the gravel pit?

Any questions from the audience?

MANCUSO: Mr. Chairman, may I?

I reviewed the plan submitted and it appears that the gravel pit is fully within the church's property and it is to the west of the proposed property line. So it is not on the piece of property that is intended to be transferred so there is no easement required.

MITAL: We will discuss it and you can call Mrs. Beer tomorrow.

(Mr. Brouwer arrived at this point)

**L.C. DEVELOPERS** – Grand, No. Fifth & Lafayette - R-20  
Lots: 3 & 28 Block: 1001

Bruce Dexter, Esq. came forward representing L.C. Developers.

DEXTER: Application is for a revised landscaping plan for a four-lot subdivision. The landscaping has been planted and what exists on the property today is equal to or better than that shown on the plan.

As a matter of fact, some 109 pine trees have been planted on the property whereas as the landscaping plan required 82 including shrubs. What's there now is all trees, pine trees, which are six to eight feet in height. The buffer is more than adequate. All the neighbors are satisfied with it. I have letters from five neighbors, three of whom own the new houses located on the subdivision. They all like what is there. They are all satisfied.

I would be happy to submit these letters to the board at this time, if appropriate, Mr. Ten Hoeve?

TEN HOEVE: You can but I'm not sure we are going to mark them into evidence. If anybody is here tonight and wishes to testify, they can do that, it is their opportunity to do that.

DEXTER: That's fine, thank you.

Mr. Chiellini, the developer, is here tonight and he has several color photographs showing the area, the landscaping and the buffer, if the board wants to look at them.

Lou Chiellini, 22 Ruth Place came forward and was sworn.

DEXTER: I don't know if we have to have all these marked, I would just like to submit them to the board.

We could mark them all A-1 – 24 photos – taken 5/26.

CHIELLINI: They are of Grand Avenue, the vacant lot. All three lots are developed, 110 North Fifth Street, 3 Sayers Court, 1 Sayers Court, Mrs. Van Overloop's property, which is on North Fifth Street, who had an issue with the drainage and the screening...so there are shots of her yard on both sides. She is one of the people who signed the letter, she could not make it down here tonight. I've taken them at all angles...the shade trees as well as the plantings that I did. Half of it was shrubs...there was 21 evergreens and 3 ornamental trees and I did a variety of spruces, pines, three different variety of pines and staggered throughout the entire subdivision.

TEN HOEVE: For the record...the photos have been marked A-1, 24 photos, 5/26.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

DEXTER: And they accurately depict the property and landscaping that is there now?

CHIELLINI: Yes.

MITAL: You mentioned the owners in the development are happy with that...

CHIELLINI: And the surrounding neighbors.

MITAL: And the surrounding neighbors?

CHIELLINI: Yes, and they have all been notified. We had to notify everybody. It worked out pretty good.

TEN HOEVE: Was there a revised plan submitted showing the landscaping that was put in as opposed to what was required in the approved plan?

CHIELLINI: No. I met with Ed from Brigitte's office a year and a half ago when I got my initial bond release and I have, maybe, \$20,000 left on the bonds. I met with Eve multiple times there also and the only thing left on the list are two seepage pits for Grand Avenue. I spoke to Eve and I think we are going to treat it as its own application when we come in for a building permit. We will then show those last two seepage pits, I can't put them in now not knowing the house or what I am actually going to do there.

My expert environmentalist was supposed to show up tonight...I didn't know I would be called this quick...but the last thing required was one last well test on Grand Avenue and that was satisfactory and that paper work from the State should be out to us in a couple of weeks.

Everything is complete as far as the environmental. They gave me a C.O. on 3 Sayers Court and then I heard there was mention of my not getting a building permit for 112 Grand Avenue until I get a satisfactory back from the well test. There was no lead or anything in the samples, they were all good.

DEXTER: You're getting ahead of yourself. We are here for landscaping.

MITAL: Any questions from the board?

BOGART: With regard to the landscape plan..just to summarize why the applicant is here tonight. We did do a couple of site inspections and the applicant had provided more plantings than was originally anticipated but there was a buffer area that was the subject of significant discussions at the Planning Board hearings that was under planted. I just wanted to ensure that the adjacent property owners had an opportunity to comment on the revised plan but from the landscape perspective, I think the plantings done were significant and satisfactory as long as the adjacent property owners don't have an issue with it.

MITAL: I visited the site and not having a plan in front of me, I did find a picture that if you were describing straight ahead at the cul-de-sac, to the left...the house all the way in the back, the adjacent existing home, there was that one area where there was no planting. There was a lot of brush there, there was an existing buffer but it did seem that....

CHIELLINI: To the left of Sayers Court, left of the house...

MAGUIRE: In between the house on North Fifth and Sayers....

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

CHIELLINI: 110 North Fifth is loaded with trees.

MAGUIRE: It is this area between the house....see this is North Fifth and this house faces North Fifth...

CHIELLINI: This is totally treed...this entire run....tree, tree, tree, tree. Instead of four trees here; there are 20 trees in here, there's 30 to 40 trees all through here and there's trees along the driveway here and we came up to where the drainage is and stopped before the drainage because we wanted the water to go into the drainage. There is a huge retention area there. We didn't want to block off that retention area and I put arborvitae up in here, on the other side to screen off her house.

MAGUIRE: And these trees are all evergreens?

CHIELLINI: They are all in those pictures there.

MITAL: Actually it did fall short and unless you planted something since...we were out there in the winter, mid-January.

CHIELLINI: Don't be confused by along the driveway, there is a buffer...

MITAL: I would have to point it out....

BOGART: What the board members are looking at, is the copy of the approved plan you submitted and when we did a site inspection we noted what was modified and changed....I think, if the board were to approve what is currently there, we would need as As-Built.

MITAL: This area right here...the existing home...

CHIELLINI: Only up in here...it goes here and this part right here is Arborvitae...

MITAL: Existing

CHIELLINI: No, we put in about six or seven here and there is all Forsythia and stuff here. Most of this is lawn for these people, so the water comes around the corner and goes down and drains toward the street. There's a whole detention area and here, six or seven feet long underground. So the water swirls all towards that.

OPPELT: Those trees are on the developer's property?

CHIELLINI: Yeah, I don't have all the trees that are on that particular spot right there.

MITAL: So we will need revised Landscape plan?

BOGART: You would need an As-Built on file.

CHIELLINI: So you want an As-Built on trees? Is that what you're saying.

BOGART: Yes.

TEN HOEVE: Just because there's an approved plan and what is there is totally different, so if the board approves it as you've planted it, it needs a plan that shows what's there.

CHIELLINI: Ok.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

BOGART: I think technically, the board would have to approve an amended Landscape Plan so it can be placed with your subdivision approval plan.

DEXTER: Will this be acted upon at the next meeting?

MITAL: I'm sure we can consider that.

TEN HOEVE: If you client gets the plan in before a resolution is prepared we can do it.

CHIELLINI: Is it the trees that you are looking at between (?) or the entire site? You want me to locate all those plants?

BOGART: The most significant portion is that buffer, that has changed considerably.

MITAL: The one I was pointing out before.

BOGART: The reality is for the remainder of the site it has more trees than the original plan was approved for...I am not asking for that...

CHIELLINI: So it's between 1 Sayers Court and 110 North Fifth?

BOGART: And the southern property line as well.

CHIELLINI: Between Grand Avenue lot, we had a buffer there...that one?

BOGART: I think we are really talking about the southern portion of the site, so around 110 North Fifth, Lafayette....that area in there. Grand Avenue, while it's changed, there's been more trees planted there than was originally planned.

CHIELLINI: They charge for every tree they locate; so you want to know what I have in the back of 110 No Fifth and the back of 1 Sayers Court...where the berm in question .... this one here on this....

(planner gave developer a plan to show what was wanted)

BOGART: This one in here....

CHIELLINI: Ok, so that area and what is along this area and that area...Ok.

BOGART: So you can just put this on that plan....

CHIELLINI: Ok, do the yellow area and you're not particularly concerned with what's through here and what's behind....pretty much the whole thing.

BOGART: Yes, all this is additional plantings.

CHIELLINI: Ok, just this yellow area.

MITAL: Any questions from the board?

OPPELT: We've walked the property a couple of times and we noticed you've cleaned up and graded off the front but I noticed there's a truck there.

CHIELLINI: People dumping there, I had three full dumpsters to clean it up. They come by at night and just dump and I did put up some screening today...that's my work trailer, I have my tools in there...

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

MITAL: It's a truck?

CHIELLINI: Yeah, it's a storage trailer.

TEN HOEVE: It's a storage trailer or is it a truck?

CHIELLINI: It's a truck but I have my....

TEN HOEVE: Unregistered...not registered to be operated on the streets?

CHIELLINI: I don't put it on the street.

TEN HOEVE: There's an ordinance that prohibits that...there is a specific ordinance in town that prohibits parking unregistered vehicles on property. That has to go.

MITAL: Anything else from the board?

MAGUIRE: Yes, not landscape related but maybe it's a question for the engineer. I had one of the residents approach me saying that at one point the fire trucks tried access to the street and had trouble making the turn...

MANCUSO: It is a narrow road...that was part of the site constraints...the access to the subdivision but the testimony at the time was, that since it was an emergency vehicle they would have the ability to cross over and straddle the center line of the road and just get in and out.

CHIELLINI: Plus there's a fire hydrant on Grand but they made me add one on our side of Grand and there's one on Lafayette and one on the cul-de-sac.

MAGUIRE: The point was made about the two telephone poles that restricted them from mounting the curb and pulling in.

BEER: The curb was redone as a result of a prior fire chief's comments so the original design was redone in order to have a truck pull in and out and they acknowledged that it was tight. This is not the original plan, it was redone at the request of the Fire Department.

MAGUIRE: So this is not the original plan? Ok, thank you.

MITAL: Anything else from the board? Any questions from the public?

Burton Hall, 98 North Fifth Street came forward.

HALL: Just curious...this is a nuance to the existing plan that he is requesting...on the letter I got it was talking about waivers and variances, is that what this would come under?

TEN HOEVE: I'm not sure what the letter said but I'm guessing that the attorney was being a little bit more broad...

HALL: Inclusive?

TEN HOEVE: Yes, than necessary to avoid having any problem. This is just a hearing to provide a modification to the approved landscaping plan.

MITAL: Anyone else? No, Ok we'll go to the next hearing.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

TEN HOEVE: This board generally discusses the hearings at the subsequent work sessions that take place the second Wednesday of the month. I know there is another hearing that will probably take the balance of the evening so my guess is that this won't finally be resolved until June 9<sup>th</sup>.

DEXTER: Thank you.

**MARK PRUSHA** – 82 Rivervale Road                      R-15  
Lot: 1 Block: 2007

Antimo Del Vecchio, Esq., Beattie Padovano came forward representing the applicant.

DEL VECCHIO: Just a few housekeeping items...I think the last time we marked an exhibit was A-6, the R&L Permit Plans...I believe those were the same plans and we made additional copies. I did not pre-mark...

With that said, unfortunately Mr. Aubin was not available to attend this evening's meeting and we understand from a communication we received from Mrs. Beer this morning that there was a request to have Mr. Aubin appear this evening for the board to supplement his testimony now that the board professionals have had an opportunity to review the permit plans, and we will accommodate that request but unfortunately he was not able to be present this evening. Mr. Aubin is coming next time.

With that said, I propose to continue our application by presenting Rick Eichenlaub, our project engineer, this evening and we can commence the engineering portion of the testimony. Initially I would ask that Mr. Eichenlaub be sworn.

Richard Eichenlaub, PE, R&L Engineering, 24 Wampum Road, Park Ridge, NJ.

DEL VECCHIO: I know Rick has previously been accepted and qualified before this board and I would, with the board stipulation, submit him as an expert in the field of professional engineering.

Mr. Eichenlaub, if you can, first of all provide the board with a general overview of the property as it exists today and the improvements that are there as well as how sits within the neighborhood in which the property lies.

EICHENLAUB: Sure, the property in question is referred to on the Tax Map as Block 2007, Lot 1. We have frontage along Rivervale Road and we also have 50' frontage at the end of Local Street, which basically is a dead end.

The property is located in the R-15 zone and the zone line is actually the northern property line with our neighbors to the north. To the north is R-10 and our property to the south is R-15.

We have 187' linear feet along Rivervale Road. The property consists of an existing principal building, a second principal building located to the middle-rear of the property. There are accessory structures by way of garages and a screened-in porch. There is also a stone foundation from an old barn.

The property slopes from Rivervale Road in a westerly direction to a drainage swale that runs pretty much the rear third of the property in a north to south direction. That swale collects runoff from Rivervale Road and basically provides the drainage from the properties to the north of us. I indicated that swale runs in a southerly direction and discharges at the southwest corner of the property and enters a buried conduit, which conveys the water in a southerly direction. It's a 42" RCP pipe.

We also have water contributing to that swale through a drainage system coming off Local Street. There are two catch basins at the end of

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

Local Street, which feed a 36" corrugated metal pipe. It runs down Local Street, picks up those two basins and then runs through an easement that was granted to the borough years ago where that 36" pipe discharges to an open swale. So there is approximately 80 feet of open drainage here between the 36" pipe and the 42" pipe.

The rear corner of the property, which is basically on the west side of that swale, rises approximately 5 to 6 feet to an area outside of the wetland area and that portion of the property drains in a east/southeast direction from that swale.

What we are proposing is that all the structures located....

DEL VECCHIO: Two follow-up questions on your existing conditions description.

First, with reference to the existing home located in the center of the property, can you give us an approximate distance of that home from both Rivervale Road and Local Street?

EICHENLAUB: From Rivervale Road we have 150 feet along the southerly side property line and from that corner, the northwest corner of our neighbor on Lot 2, we're offset approximately 26 to 27 feet, so somewhere in the neighborhood of about 175 to 177 feet from Rivervale Road.

From Local Street the dwelling we are talking about is located approximately 155 to 160 feet from Local Street.

DEL VECCHIO: The driveway that comes off of Rivervale Road, primarily services the home that is located towards the front of the property along Rivervale Road, correct?

EICHENLAUB: That is correct. That is the driveway located in that area there. It is located in the south/southeast corner of the property,

DEL VECCHIO: And that driveway terminates at the existing garage which is a free-standing, pre-existing accessory structure (maps on dais hitting microphones)....approximately midway between the two homes that exist on the property?

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

DEL VECCHIO: Can you tell me the approximate distance between the terminus of the driveway that I just described and the second home located in the center of the property?

EICHENLAUB: I can tell you exactly what that is. Just a little over 50 feet.

DEL VECCHIO: And that distance of 50 feet is an unpaved area between the driveway and the front of that existing home in the center of the property.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. From the driveway to this dwelling, we have a sidewalk that allows access.

DEL VECCHIO: What is the approximate width of the driveway that exists as you just described it?

EICHENLAUB: It varies. There is a portion that is paved and there is also a graveled area, it varies anywhere from 11' to about 12 to 13'...the paved section. There is an area towards Rivervale Road that widens out for a parking area, where there is an additional 24'.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

DEL VECCHIO: With regard to the easement area and the drainage that gets conveyed, generally in a southerly direction from Local Street towards the southern corner of the subject property... you described an easement with some piping located in it, is that correct?

EICHENLAUB: That's correct.

DEL VECCHIO: Is all of the drainage improvements, the physical improvements, located within the granted easement?

EICHENLAUB: It's not really in the center...there is a portion as it comes off of Local Street, the first 40 feet that actually falls outside of that easement. The easterly easement line is right here, the drainage line is to the east of that and then at a point maybe 40, 45 feet into the site, that's where it enters the easement.

DEL VECCHIO: Does it exit the easement later on below the easement area as it heads towards that 42 inch pipe?

EICHENLAUB: There's a portion where it actually falls right on the easement line and that would be the westerly easement line where there is an actual bend in the easement, where it runs more or less in a southerly direction and then it breaks off in a southwesterly direction. At that break, which is approximately 121 feet into the site along that easement, the line itself shows up right along that southerly westerly easement line.

DEL VECCHIO: Those were the questions I had. I wanted to supplement existing conditions and you can proceed and describe the proposed application for the board.

EICHENLAUB: Ok, just again as a refresher for the board...I know John had gone over it last week. He talked about the wetlands area and you can see that is highlighted on my map in blue and then the buffers that are attached to that, the 50' buffers, are shown here in green, just to give you an idea of where they fall on the site. We had to take that into account in our layout of the site.

I am going to our Sheet 3 of 6, which is basically the general layout of the site, which shows all the buildings that are being proposed, the driveways, the lots and the required setbacks. The intention here wasn't to show the board the actual bulk requirements and bulk configurations on this particular map, it was more or less just as layout. This particular map was also used for DEP for landscaping. We provided for additional landscape within the wetland area.

As John Auben had testified to in April when the State came out and did their review, they noted there had been vegetation that had been disturbed and they wanted additional vegetation planted within the wetland area and that's what this planting is here to satisfy their requirements. Again, this is all under review by the State at the present time. I will come back to this map after I actually go through our site layout and coverages.

Two of the proposed lots will have frontage along Rivervale Road.

DEL VECCHIO: Are you now referring to Sheet 4....

EICHENLAUB: Yes, Sheet 4 of 6, referred to as the Grading, Drainage, Utility Plan.

Again, I highlighted the wetland area in blue and I highlighted the buffer limits in green as you saw on Sheet 3.

I indicated two of the lots will be fronting on Rivervale Road, one of the lots will have a frontage of 87', the southerly lot will have a frontage of 100'. As I indicated earlier we are within the R-15 zone and in the R-15

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

zone we require a frontage along a street and a lot frontage of 100', therefore the northerly lot, that has the lesser of the two frontages, we will be seeking a variance for that. The reason we are seeking a variance and providing for the 87' on the northerly lot is because that is adjacent to the R-10 zone and it more or less buffers us and works us into the R-15. We know we need at least the one variance for the two lots on Rivervale Road and that's why we placed the lesser of the frontages on the northerly lot.

With regard to the rear portion of the property, we are looking to subdivide that into two lots with a line running basically from the center of Local Street straight back in a southerly direction to where it intersects the southerly lot line, creating two new lots. We indicate them as Lot 1.02 and Lot 1.03. Again, as you will see, we are looking to maintain 90% of the existing structure that presently exists on what we are looking to create as Lot 1.02 and we are adding a garage area to the north side of it and we are adding additional living space to the south side of it. There is a small portion off the east end of that building that will be removed so we can satisfy the required side yard setbacks.

The most westerly lot at the rear of the property, we are proposing a dwelling located at the northwest corner of the site, and that particular dwelling will fall outside of our buffer area. The driveways will fall within the buffer area and there's a small isolated wetland area here, that the State wanted us to designate as an isolated wetland area, which we are looking to fill. We've maintained the drainage on our site. The drainage will remain draining in a westerly direction for the easterly portion of the lot. The rear lot will continue to drain in a south to southeast direction as it presently flows and the middle lot, which is Lot 1.02 will continue to drain, the way we graded it, in a south to southwest direction. All of which will end up back in that drainage swale.

For the most part we are maintaining the existing grades. If you visited the site you'll notice that probably 70 to 75% of the lot from approximately the swale to an easterly direction is already developed. It is all lawn area, that's where the bulk of our buildings are located. So we are not looking to redistribute in that area. The only grading that will be done is around the proposed dwellings, grade the runoff away from the dwelling. Same thing with Lot 1, we're just looking to create a swale along the southerly property lines where the water drains. All of the drainage is maintained on the site and the only place where we are really proposing fill is in the area of the dwelling on Lot 1.02 and for the crossing of the driveway to gain access to Lot 1.02, which crosses the wetland area. The bulk of our fill is in that area there, within the driveway and within the grading along the westerly side and the northerly side of that building.

With regard to the drainage and runoff from the building themselves, each lot will be constructed with seepage pits to control roof runoff. The driveways will be curbed and there will be a curb cut at each driveway to allow the water to run off into the lawn area and it will be these grass swales that will treat that water as it comes off of the driveways.

Same situation exists on the two rear lots. We do provide for drainage within the driveway. That drainage will drop directly into the swale. Water will be shed (?) around the rear of the south of the proposed dwelling on Lot 1.02 and as I indicated earlier, the runoff from Lot 1.03 will continue to drain in a south to southeast direction.

DEL VECCHIO: A couple of follow-up questions. Let's start with the two lots along Rivervale Road. Those two lots in terms of the lot conventions will fully comply with the borough's code except for a lot width requirement and a lot frontage requirement that you described for proposed Lot 1.01, is that correct?

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

DEL VECCHIO: Further, the proposed homes that you depicted on those two lots, the two fronting on Rivervale Road as they are depicted conceptually there, fully conform in all respects with the current zoning standards for this property.

EICHENLAUB: They do.

DEL VECCHIO: Let's now jump to the back two lots, proposed Lot 1.03 and Lot 1.02. Those two lots require a variance for frontage, do they not?

EICHENLAUB: That's correct. As I indicated our frontage for these two lots, 1.02 and 1.03 is off of Local Street. Local Street is 50' wide. We've taken the lot line, the dividing line between the two lots right at the center of Local Street, which gives us 25' for each of those lots by way of frontage.

DEL VECCHIO: Practically speaking, the lot frontage really isn't changing for the better or worse with regard to the existing home located in the middle of the property by virtue of the subdivision.

EICHENLAUB: No.

DEL VECCHIO: And the home that is proposed for Lot 1.03, approximately what is the travel distance along the proposed driveway from the current terminus of Local Street to the proposed home on Lot 1.03?

EICHENLAUB: Distance is about 30'. You turn into the driveway that is solely for that dwelling.

DEL VECCHIO: With regard to the lot width requirements for those two lots...do these lots comply or do they require variance?

EICHENLAUB: With regard to 1.02...with regard to the lot width on 1.02 we require 100' and we've got 79.26' and for proposed Lot 1.03, we require 100' for lot width at the setback and we've got 96.94'. So both of those would require lot width variances.

DEL VECCHIO: With regard to proposed Lot 1.02, as you get further beyond the setback line, that width does widen, does it not?

EICHENLAUB: It does.

DEL VECCHIO: Show the affected lot width where there is a jog in the property line.

EICHENLAUB: The jog we're talking about...our measurement was taken at this point here, 30' off of the northerly property line, which would be the frontage off of Local Street. At a point 87' into that lot, we've got an additional 22.9' of lot width. At that point we would be upwards of about 108, 109' in our width.

DEL VECCHIO: In terms of lot area, we're going to direct your attention back to the front two lots, Lot 1 and Lot 1.01. There is a proposed roadway dedication for additional right-of-way for Rivervale Road. Can you explain to the board how you came up with the proposed dedication amount, if you will, and whether or not you made the appropriate adjustments in your calculation of lot area if that dedication were to be granted.

EICHENLAUB: Right. Rivervale Road in front of our lot as it exists today, is 33' wide. So what we do is from centerline of roadway we've got 16 ½ '...required width of roadway is 50', which means that the property should

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

be 25' off the centerline so what we're proposing is to dedicate the additional 8.5' along the frontage of Rivervale Road to the borough. Now that 8.5' that area would not be available to us.

DEL VECCHIO: Meaning it would have to be deducted from your calculation of lot area.

EICHENLAUB: From the gross area, correct, as it exists today under the proposed subdivision. We have subtracted that out and if you look at the bulk table, we've so indicated that...that the areas for Lot 1, Lot 1.01 with an \* next to it. Lot 1 would be 15,007 sq ft and Lot 1.01 would be 15,047 sq ft and that is minus that 8.5', which would be dedicated to the borough. So both of those lots, after these areas have been removed....

DEL VECCHIO: Let's go back and spend a little more time talking about the grading. As part of your drainage plans and review and preparing for the development of this site, did you undertake any analysis of soil conditions that may exist on site and take those into consideration in your design.

EICHENLAUB: Yes, we actually did do test pits on site. There was a test pit done basically between where we're proposing the seepage pits for Lot 1 and Lot 1.01 to be located just about along the common property line that we are creating at about 2/3 of the depth of the lot. There was a second test pit done to the south of the existing building that we are looking to expand on, which is on Lot 1.02 in the vicinity of where we are showing the seepage pit now off of the southeast corner of the building and there was a third test pit done for Lot 1.03 and again that was located in the vicinity of where we're showing the proposed seepage pit to the front southeast corner of the proposed dwelling.

I have the results of those tests. We did take soil samples and had permeability tests run on them and based on that we were able to size up our seepage pits. Now again, once the actual dwellings for these lots have been provided, when the individual plot plans are presented, the final design on those seepage pits will accompany those plot plans.

DEL VECCHIO: Generally speaking, what did the permeability results indicate once they were tested?

EICHENLAUB: That we've got decent soil in the way of permeability. I have copies for the board.

DEL VECCHIO: I am going to hand to the board four copies of a document titled Test Pit Logs and Permeability Test Results, dated April 13, 2010, which are signed and sealed by Mr. Eichenlaub and I would propose that we mark them A-7.

EICHENLAUB: With regard to that, as I indicated we took soil samples at each of the three test pit locations. They were sent to a lab to have a permeability test run on them and what that permeability test does, is it tells us the percentages of clay, silt and sand in the sample. Based on those percentages, there are percolation rates associated with the various percentages. What we found is we came up with what is referred to as a K3 value, which has a permeability of 2 to 6...for every inch of percolation it takes 2 to 6 minutes, which is right in the middle...it's a relatively fast percolation and the percentages of clay and silts in a K3 are low enough to allow that type of permeability.

DEL VECCHIO: Any issue with ground water encountered in your test pits?

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: Yes, and again that is shown on our tables within this handout. On test pit #1, which is located on Lot 1.03, again in this area here, we went to a depth of 8' and we encountered seepage into the excavation. On test pit #2, which is on Lot 1.02, again located off of the southeast corner of the proposed building, we dug to a depth of 6.7" and encountered seepage and on test pit #3, which again is located between Lots 1 and 1.01, in this area between the two seepage pits, we dug to a depth of 7.4" and encountered percolation. The results from that particular test pit actually gave us the results of a K4, which has even a faster percolation rate but because two out of the three were K3, that's what we went with.

DEL VECCHIO: Obviously there is going to be some question raised about the seepage percolation at the depth that you've identified in the test holes to prevent the property from being developed for single-family homes or single-family homes being properly constructed on.

EICHENLAUB: No, not at all. In fact the dwelling located on 1.03, the depths of the water should not be a factor at all.

DEL VECCHIO: Why do you say that?

EICHENLAUB: Because the proposed basement would be above that water table.

DEL VECCHIO: The finished floor level of the basement would be higher than the point you encountered seepage in the test pits.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. With regard to 1.02, we encountered water at a lesser depth. That particular dwelling will either have to have a crawl space of the basement floor brought up. That's going to be a special case because whatever additions are placed on this, are going to have to be incorporated into the existing house. That is all going to have to be worked in the architectural plans of that dwelling.

The dwellings on 1.01 and 1, the percolation seepage was low enough that we should have no problems getting basements in either of those homes.

Now, certainly any dwelling built today always have sump pumps in the basement, so in this particular area it will not be any different here. I am sure all of these homes will have sump pumps in the basements.

DEL VECCHIO: With regard to the drainage, we are obviously are subject to the RSIS requirements for stormwater quantity and quality controls on any proposed subdivision. How does your drainage design match up with the requirements of the RSIS on both stormwater quantity and quality?

EICHENLAUB: We are providing for the necessary seepage, we do that anyway but with regard to the standards of an additional quarter acre of impervious area and an area of an acre or greater of disturbance, we are less than that. So actually we are not held to that standard. In fact, as part of the review down at State, this is under review.

DEL VECCHIO: Is it your opinion if it is deemed applicable, that we have sufficient quantity and quality controls in place?

EICHENLAUB: Yes.

DEL VECCHIO: So, even if the standards were found to be applicable, your design would potentially meet the standards.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: Yes, the only place it wouldn't be in this particular instance would be for the driveway...we would have to do something with the catch basins we have here...either the runoff would have to be redirected through a grass swale or through some other means of filtration, but at this point, my understanding is that the State has reviewed this and the way we proposed this with the catch basins on either side of the driveway to drain just the driveway itself, is acceptable at this time.

DEL VECCHIO: And if a stormwater quality (?) were required, you could put filters in those catch basins?

EICHENLAUB: Filters, yeah...it would be a little bit more than just a filter, like a screening but the way we have worked with Lots 1 and 1.01, we've got our grass swales built in, which is the preferred way of handling filtration in runoff and as I indicated, all of the roof areas will be discharged into seepage pits and what we would have to do is work out something with regard to the driveway itself.

DEL VECCHIO: Let's jump to a related topic of grading. You described the areas where the site would need to be regarded, could you generally describe the nature of any tree removal that may be required in connection with the improvement as depicted on your drawing?

EICHENLAUB: The bulk of the trees going to be removed from site are located within the northwest area of the site. That's the area presently that's on the east side of the wetlands area that is the wooded area on the subject site. We will have to remove trees to accommodate the placement of the dwelling, the driveway and improvements off of the south side. There is a stand of trees located within the middle of proposed Lot 1.01, which fall within the proposed dwelling itself. Those trees will have to be removed and a couple of associated trees up along Rivervale Road that will have to be removed to accommodate the driveway.

There are trees that have to be removed to accommodate the driveway servicing 1.03 and 1.02 but again, the majority of those trees are either within the footprint of either the building or the driveways themselves. All the other trees we are looking to save on site. They will be property fenced and screened off during construction. We've indicated that on our plans. We haven't shown it on each of the trees but we've shown it as "typical" of those trees that remain; they will have construction fence placed around them so there's no disturbance to the root system or the trunk of the tree itself.

DEL VECCHIO: Since we are talking about fencing at this point, can you either run your highlighter or your finger as it reflects the limit of disturbance line on your drawing.

EICHENLAUB: The limit of disturbance...I am going to refer you to Sheet 5 of 6, which is our Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan...it is on that drawing that we actually show the limit of disturbance and silt fence. With regard to Lot 1, which is the southerly lot fronting on Rivervale Road, we show a silt fence around the entire perimeter of the property and the reason being is there is a lot of existing structures, walkways, the driveways, the screened-in porch area...those are all being removed and there will be disturbance of soil associated with that removal. That's the reason we show the silt fence around the entire perimeter of the property and that silt fence depicts the limit of disturbance.

With regard to Lot 1.02, we have a much lesser area of disturbance. Approximately 2/3 of the site, the rear 1/3 of the site we are looking to remain in its present condition, so we show the silt fence located about 2/3 of the way back. The silt fence will run up along the drainage swale that

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

runs down the north side of the property, it will extend up to Rivervale Road, across Rivervale Road and down the south property line.

With regard to the middle lot or the easterly lot coming off of Local Street, the limit of disturbance will be across the rear of the building and just to the south of where we are proposing the seepage pit and will run up in a northerly direction to the intersection of the side lot line of Lot 1 and then we pick up the silt fence that runs across the back of Lot 1 and then just prior to its intersection with Lot 1.01 we then run in a westerly direction down towards the wetland area.

So basically it's the middle third of the lot which will be surrounded by a silt fence. There's also areas of disturbance up in the vicinity of the wetland area and that's just to accommodate the grading that's going to be necessary along the proposed driveway.

With regard to Lot 1.03, which is the rear westerly lot, our limits of disturbance and our silt fence will be located in the front 40% of the lot, again running down along the northerly property line along the side westerly line and then up to where it intersects with the proposed driveway. So it's the front or northerly 40% of that lot which will be disturbed and fenced off with silt fence. The rear 60% of the lot will remain undisturbed.

DEL VECCHIO: The limit of disturbance as you have laid out, do you believe they will comply with what DEP will permit to occur on site based upon the permitting activity that John Aubin described at the last meeting.

EICHENLAUB: I do. In fact, we actually were asked to make a couple of changes. John had requested that we make a couple of changes to accommodate some feedback that he got. So this has been reviewed. It has not been approved but it has been reviewed by the State.

DEL VECCHIO: The driveway that is proposed to serve proposed Lots 1.03 and 1.02, can you quickly just give us an overview of the dimensions, length, its topography and how it will service each of those two lots.

EICHENLAUB: I'm going to refer back to Sheet 4 of 6. Coming onto the site off of Local Street, the width of the driveway is 14'. As I indicated, at a point 30' into the site the driveway breaks off in a westerly direction to service the proposed dwelling on Lot 1.03. That particularly driveway width is 20'.

The driveway as it extends in a southerly direction to service Lot 1.02, that 14' is from curb to curb. We have pushed the retaining wall far enough off that we provide for a grass paver area on either side outside the curb line in the event that a fire truck needs to get in here with outriggers. The outriggers can be extended and placed on those grass pavers. But the 14' extends all the way across the wetland area, widens out for a turnaround area just to the north of the proposed dwelling expansion and the driveway in front of the garage area dwelling on Lot 1.02 is 20' wide.

DEL VECCHIO: The turnaround area that you described closest to the home that exists in the center of the property seems to be pretty generous in width for an automobile, what's the thought behind that?

EICHENLAUB: Well it is generous for an automobile but in the event that an emergency vehicle has to get in here, an ambulance, a police car or one of the smaller fire trucks, they can actually make a maneuver and turnaround on site and as they pulled out, would pull straight out from the site. That's why that turnaround is so generous as we show it.

DEL VECCHIO: What is the general topography and grade of that proposed driveway.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: It's relatively flat. We've got a grade of approximately 2 ½% in the middle portion. As you come onto the site we've got a grade of approximately 4 to 5% and then in the vicinity of the dwelling on Lot 1.02, the grade is somewhere around 1 ½ to 2%.

DEL VECCHIO: As you generally stated, it is relatively flat ground.

EICHENLAUB: For the most part, except for, as I indicated when you come in directly to the site, there's a portion that is about 4 to 5%.

DEL VECCHIO: And even with that 4 to 5% in that limited area, do you envision any problem for either passenger vehicles or emergency vehicles transversing the driveway in a safe manner in all types of weather?

EICHENLAUB: None at all, none at all.

DEL VECCHIO: Can you tell us the general length of the driveway from Local Street to the proposed turnaround area on proposed Lot 1.02.

EICHENLAUB: From Local Street as you come in to the point where the radius bends back into the turnaround, you're talking about 160' ...from Local Street to that garage is just about 200'.

DEL VECCHIO: Based upon the layout and design of the driveway and the features that you described, do you envision there being any problems for emergency vehicles providing service to the home in the middle of the lot?

EICHENLAUB: No, not at all. That's why we laid the driveway out the way we did.

DEL VECCHIO: And with regard to the home on proposed Lot 1.03, I would assume given the very close proximity to the existing terminus of Local Street that emergency vehicles would have no problem providing service to that home.

EICHENLAUB: I do not believe they would have any problem at all.

DEL VECCHIO: And we saw this question in one of the review letters and I'm sure will be asked here, why not a cul-de-sac at the terminus of Local Street as opposed to the driveway that you've proposed as a design feature?

EICHENLAUB: If we were to bring a cul-de-sac in off of the end of Local Street, a cul-de-sac would have a radius of 50', 48', which would extend into the site in this area here...basically you can see the impact that would have with regard to the wetland area. On this particular dwelling, as we show it here, we could slide the house a little bit further to the south but our 30' setback...a portion of that lot would probably be in the front yard setback. That is less of a concern than that of the cul-de-sac extending well into the wetland area, as I show it here.

DEL VECCHIO: And in your opinion, from an environmental standpoint, is it more or less environmental friendly, in terms of tree removal and impact to the wetlands, to provide the driveway as opposed to a cul-de-sac design for the layout of Lots 1.02 and 1.03.

EICHENLAUB: Well, you would still have the same number of trees to be removed as we've indicated now, however, the total would be far increased because all of the trees that are now indicated in this wetland and buffer area, 1,2,3,4,5,6 would all have to be removed. And to get a cul-de-sac in this area here, would necessitate quite a bit of fill.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

DEL VECCHIO: Would that also impact the wetlands restoration requirements that are shown on earlier sheets of the plan being requested by the DEP?

EICHENLAUB: We would not be able to provide them in that restoration, that would fall in the middle of the cul-de-sac.

DEL VECCHIO: And finally, in your opinion as an engineer, do you believe that a cul-de-sac is required to service these two lots or will they be adequately serviced with the design you've proposed?

EICHENLAUB: I think they can certainly be adequately serviced based on what we are proposing. I know there was a question that came up in one of the review letters with regard to snow removal...we could provide for an extension and a turnaround, more in the shape of a hammer head turnaround, which would accommodate vehicles coming down Local Street and would accommodate snow removal so the snow removal wasn't plowed right in front of the driveway. An easement could be granted for that but that would have far less impact and far less disturbance than providing for a cul-de-sac.

DEL VECCHIO: You would propose to provide a pad area behind the curb line where snow could be stored?

EICHENLAUB: That's correct.

DEL VECCHIO: With regard to the proposed homes on Lot 1.02 and 1.03, they would fully comply with all of the applicable zoning restrictions for those two homes as well?

EICHENLAUB: They would have to, yes. As we show here, and we do show generous footprint in full compliance with coverage and again, when the architect were to develop the plans for the actual houses, he would make sure the building heights would be within the required limits as well.

DEL VECCHIO: Would you next review for us the utility service to and from this site, how you propose to get the necessary utilities in to service the proposed subdivision.

EICHENLAUB: Utilities for the dwellings on Lot 1 and Lot 1.01 will come directly off of Rivervale Road. We have gas, we have water for both of these. The electrical as it presently exists is a utility pole located on the east side of Rivervale Road. Originally we were proposing aerial for these two lots and one of the review letters indicated that the utilities should be underground, we could accommodate that by running an aerial across Rivervale Road to a pole located on the west side of Rivervale Road. At the proposed property line the lines would come down that pole and service both of these with regard to electric and telephone, cable...so all of those as well could be buried.

DEL VECCHIO: There would be underground service for those two lots as you've just described.

EICHENLAUB: Correct.

DEL VECCHIO: And the balance of the two lots in the rear of the site.

EICHENLAUB: Again, those two lots ...all of the utilities, gas, water, electric, telephone, cable would all be run underground off of Local Street.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

The service lines for 1.03 would simply come in and run down the north side of the lot into the north side of the building. The utilities for the dwelling on 1.02 would run along the proposed alignment of the driveway, cut across the driveway and service the dwelling. Again, all of those being underground as well.

The dwellings on 1.02 and 1.03, the sanitary for those two would be ejectors. The sewerage would have to be ejected under pressure up to the sanitary terminal manhole on Local Street.

The sanitary servicing on 1.01 and Lot 1 that would be gravity and that would simply run out to Rivervale Road.

DEL VECCHIO: In your opinion, can these four homes be provided with adequate utility service?

EICHENLAUB: Yes. All of the utilities are presently in place.

DEL VECCHIO: Is there any off-site utility work that is envisioned or anticipated by virtue of this subdivision?

EICHENLAUB: As I indicated, there is not...the water and gas lines presently come down Local Street and we would just tap off of those. Same thing on Rivervale Road. The greatest disturbance would be at the end of Local Street with the extension of the sanitary lines out to the manhole that's located about 80 to 90' to the north of the property line.

DEL VECCHIO: One of the review letters suggested an alternate location for a fire hydrant from what we proposed. Did that envision any off-site work?

EICHENLAUB: Well, it would. We had originally proposed the new hydrant just to the north of the property. It has been requested that the fire hydrant be located to the north end of Local Street at its intersection with Morningside. The improvements there would simply be the excavation and the roadway opening to get the new line in, tap the existing main and run the line to the new fire hydrant at curb.

DEL VECCHIO: Does the applicant have any objections to accommodating that request?

EICHENLAUB: No, basically what we proposed at the south end we would be doing at the north end of our section of Location Street.

DEL VECCHIO: You were provided by me, with a copy of the water and sewer report sent to the Planning Board by William Hahn, the Supervisor of that department with a list of approximately eight comments. Do you recall seeing that?

EICHENLAUB: I do.

DEL VECCHIO: And based upon your review of the document is the applicant willing to comply with the requests in that report?

EICHENLAUB: I see no reason why we can't.

DEL VECCHIO: I am going to direct your attention back to Sheet 3 of your drawings. In describing your proposed layout, you made a general reference to the wetlands restoration plantings located at the elbow of the driveway that will service Lots 1.02 and 1.03. There is significant other landscaping proposed on that drawing...first of all, is that landscaping required based on any ordinance or RSIS provision that you are aware of?

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: No. The landscaping you are talking about...the restoration area again is located to the north/northeast side of the driveway servicing Lot 1.02. The additional landscaping you are talking about are shade trees along Rivervale Road and we have plantings along the side lot line, the north property line of 1.01...again, we have it further to the west, again along 1.01 and the front property line of 1.02 and we've provided for additional plantings along the northerly and westerly property line of proposed Lot 1.03. The reason we did that is if you note, those lines of plantings buffer the proposed dwellings to our neighbors to the north. Again, it is not something that is required of us, we took that into consideration that the location of the house with respect to our neighbors to the north and our neighbors to the west. That's why we've provided for these rows of landscaping along the west property line and up along the northerly property line.

DEL VECCHIO: Generally speaking, what is the nature of that landscape material?

EICHENLAUB: Evergreen buffers...on Lot 1.01 we've got Norway Spruce lining the northerly property line, extending from Lot 1.01 to Lot 1.02 we have Colorado Blue Spruce to provide significant buffer and screening for the resident of Lot 7 and along the northerly and westerly property lines of proposed Lot 1.03, we have Norway Spruce, Blue Spruce and Norway Spruce.

DEL VECCHIO: Would you also review soil moving quantities for us as we have filed a soil moving permit application.

EICHENLAUB: The quantities of soil movement are really associated with the excavation for the proposed dwellings. We simply took the area underneath the footprint of the first floor living quarters minus the area of the garages and we took a depth of excavation and came up with quantities for those two dwellings. We have a quantity for Lot 1.02 for excavation for the proposed expansion off the south side and the dwelling on Lot 1.03, same thing, the excavation for the basement area underneath the first floor living quarters.

We provided for our soil quantities on the sheet...you see it is broken into the four lots. We have cut figures which total 1,124 cu yds for the four lots. We have a fill quantity of 1,127 cu yds for the four lots and that leaves us with a net import of 3 cu yds.

We basically balanced our cut and fill and the majority of the fill for Lot 1 and 1.01 are really for the foundation area just to shed the water off, away from the foundation. The bulk of our fill is associated with the driveway and associated grading on the north and west side of Lot 1.02.

DEL VECCHIO: I'm sorry, I may have missed it but how many truckloads to the site does that amount to?

EICHENLAUB: One truck. Again, we have to understand that's a quantity...there may be unsuitable material that we dig out, soft material that we have to export and other soil imported but basically, to accommodate what we are proposing here, in the way of four dwellings and the grading we show, we balance our cut and fill.

DEL VECCHIO: Are there any retaining walls proposed as part of this project?

EICHENLAUB: There are.

DEL VECCHIO: Where are they located?

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: The walls are along the proposed driveway, servicing Lot 1.02. They are both along the south side and the north side of the driveway. The reason for those is to minimize the fill and disturbance within the wetland area and the associated buffers on either side.

The grade of the wall itself at the driveway is 134, the center of the driveway and the grade at the invert of the proposed pipe that's running beneath the proposed driveway to pass water from the north side of the wetland to the south side of the wetland is at an elevation of 129. So basically we have a depth of fill of about five feet. The walls themselves will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 4'.

DEL VECCHIO: Does a 4' retaining wall require (?) protection in terms of a fence?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, it should have and we would propose to put a guide rail...I believe the engineer's letter indicated there should be some sort of a protection in the way of a guiderail and we are providing.

DEL VECCHIO: What type of guiderail are you proposing.

EICHENLAUB: Because it is residential, I would propose a heavy timber guiderail.

DEL VECCHIO: I believe I also saw in one of our review letters that we received, a request that the drainage structures within 500' of the site be provided. Has that been done?

EICHENLAUB: That was submitted back in March when the package was submitted. It was an individual package along with our plans showing drainage within 500'. So that was submitted.

DEL VECCHIO: If this project is constructed as the details on your drawing indicate, do you believe it will have any negative, adverse impacts to the neighborhood or the surrounding neighbors in terms of the typical areas of concern, such as drainage, access etc.

EICHENLAUB: No. To be perfectly honest with you, we certainly understand that the properties to the north of us are draining toward us. Under this proposal we are not preventing that from occurring. We are maintaining the existing drainage swale that runs along the northerly side of our property. That drainage will still be allowed to run in a southerly direction. It will be picked up by this swale. We understand that there is drainage on Local Street which comes in through the existing drainage easement and discharges onto the property. We are not looking to alter that in any way and we are allowing that to be maintained. In fact, if anything, the amount of runoff from our site and the existing structures and impervious area, is being reduced by the fact that the new proposed dwellings runoff will be brought into seepage pits.

We are actually reducing the amount of flow from our site into the wetland and drainage swale that runs across the rear of the property.

DEL VECCHIO: Is there any way that you can conceive, based upon the design as was mentioned in your drawing, that drainage from this site can head in a northerly direction off our property and impact our neighbors.

EICHENLAUB: Absolutely not.

DEL VECCHIO: Essentially that would mean that water would have to flow uphill?

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: Correct. A steep uphill also. All these properties along the north side of our property are on a higher elevation than the swale on our property. That's why that water all runs off in a southerly direction onto the subject property.

DEL VECCHIO: Based upon your drainage design, you're not changing the patterns of the flow areas that contribute to this drainage by altering the site.

EICHENLAUB: Not at all.

DEL VECCHIO: Do you have any doubt that the driveway as you have proposed for proposed Lots 1.02 and 1.03, if constructed as shown, would provide a safe means of ingress and egress for the owners and visitors of the proposed homes and/or emergency personnel as opposed to the use of a cul-de-sac?

EICHENLAUB: I feel we certainly can and we have designed it to accommodate, certainly visitors...each of the dwellings have two-car garages, they have enough of a driveway stem to accommodate two to four additional cars. The dwelling on Lot 1.02 same thing, two-car garage; we have additional parking and stacking available for vehicles behind that garage. We made the driveway 14' wide curb to curb to accommodate emergency vehicles, the only vehicle that would not be able to make the turn in an easterly direction is that of the hook and ladder truck. Any of the other trucks would be able to make that turn.

DEL VECCHIO: How close could the hook and ladder truck get before they might not be able to go further?

EICHENLAUB: The front of the cab end could probably pull in and swing and just point itself in a southeast direction so the ladder section of the truck would remain in the straight run of the stem. And again, just as it would on Local Street, if a fire truck of that size came down Local Street they would have to back out of Local Street, they would have to back out of our driveway and back out in a northerly direction out to Morningside.

DEL VECCHIO: That condition currently exists on Local Street today.

EICHENLAUB: That's correct and there are four driveways for the dwellings located along Local Street, which are serviced by Local Street.

DEL VECCHIO: If a cul-de-sac, despite all the environmental restrictions you mentioned earlier, were to be constructed on the site, would the edge of the cul-de-sac bring the hook and ladder truck any closer to the house than the point you just described in the driveway?

EICHENLAUB: No. It would not because if a hook and ladder truck came down; we're talking about the bulb of the cul-de-sac being here...they actually would probably be further away.

Again, our driveway would come off of that cul-de-sac to service Lot 1.03, probably somewhere in this area here, so they could pull down the cul-de-sac and possibly a portion of that driveway, so they might end up a little closer but with regard to the cul-de-sac, if they were in the cul-de-sac they would be no closer.

DEL VECCHIO: At this point, I have no further questions of Mr. Eichenlaub and I make him available to the board.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

MITAL: Ok, we will open up questions to the board to start off.

MAGUIRE: Mr. Eichenlaub, you mentioned that you wouldn't be interfering with the flow...we heard testimony at the last hearing that there was flow coming off of the property to the north.

EICHENLAUB: In this area here...these properties to the north of us?

MAGUIRE: Yes.

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

MAGUIRE: And I asked where this water was coming from and it was off Rivervale and off of that driveway...

EICHENLAUB: There's a driveway...

DEL VECCHIO: Why don't you do this...use the highlighter and put an arrow, if you will, from the adjacent area where the water contributes to the swale that you're identifying.

EICHENLAUB: There's an existing driveway right now on Lot 6, that's located in this area right here. The driveway for Lot 7 is located in this area here on the south side of the dwelling. Those properties drain in this direction, that would be in a southwest direction for Lot 6 and on Lot 7 along the southerly side of the dwelling, the water drains in a southerly direction toward our site.

The driveway for Lot 7 drains out to Local Street and down into the catch basin located at the southerly terminus of the roadway, and again, that drainage is all picked up in the catch basins, piped to the 36" line which actually discharges onto our property further to the south.

So the dwellings located to the north of us drain in a southerly direction and if we go to the west side of Local Street, to Lot 3, that lot as well drains off the back of the house and drains in a south/south direction. That water or a portion of that water drains onto our property.

MAGUIRE: So the back of the property, I guess it's Block 1918, Lot 6...that property, with that driveway...you mentioned that you were going to be putting plantings along the edge of that property.

EICHENLAUB: Right. They would not be put up on a berm. We are not going to put the on a berm where we are going to restrict anything. We understand that it goes there now and that there's a concern by most of the neighbors north of us. That's why that swale is going to stay. That water naturally drains onto the site and has probably done it for 50 or 60 years and it will continue to drain into the swale and down into the wetland area in a southerly direction.

We are not looking to create a berm that would restrict the flow of water onto our site.

MAGUIRE: Would the plantings be put on the southerly side of the swale?

EICHENLAUB: No, they would be on the north side of the swale.

MAGUIRE: They would be along the property line.

EICHENLAUB: Yes, that would be between the swale and the property line.

MAGUIRE: But they wouldn't impact the flow of water?

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: Not if we plant them at grade. The way the water comes in now, the plantings are going to be in this area here to screen the house from our neighbor to the north....that water comes down and drains and you can see it by the contours, it comes off the driveway and drains in a southwesterly direction. The plantings are in this area here. That water will continue to drain in that south to southwest direction.

MAGUIRE: And that's my concern...if it is blocked, it's going to now flow into Lot 7, to their backyard.

EICHENLAUB: It is not our intention to raise that grade there. We are going to be planting those plantings at grade.

MAGUIRE: You mentioned that you are actually going to be improving the drainage on this property, so with that driveway and ... the two houses fronting on Rivervale with the seepage pits, I can see that....but with the addition of that driveway and the piping in from Local Street, you are not going to see an increased flow coming out of that southerly side of that property?

EICHENLAUB: You mean within the swale here?

MAGUIRE: Right and where does that swale go?

EICHENLAUB: There's a pipe at the southwest corner of our property and it is off our property onto the adjacent property, as shown here. There's a 42" line that then conveys the water in a southerly direction, so it is all piped. Once it leaves our property, it is all piped.

TEN HOEVE: Where does that go?

EICHENLAUB: It runs...I'm just going to refer to Sheet 1, our area map...it comes off of the southwest corner of the property, runs through Lot 5, out to Lillian Street, underneath Lillian Street and then continues in a southerly direction along borough property and Lots 6 and 5, again off of Lillian and Braun.

TEN HOEVE: It is piped that whole area?

EICHENLAUB: It is piped.

TEN HOEVE: And where does it ultimately end up?

EICHENLAUB: Actually it goes down to a stream in Hillsdale...I think it is called Brookdale Stream...it eventually gets down to Hillsdale.

TEN HOEVE: How does it get into that 42" pipe?

EICHENLAUB: This actually runs down toward Wooddale Park.

TEN HOEVE: And how does it get into that 42" pipe at the corner of your property?

EICHENLAUB: There's a headwall located just off of our property, right here there's a headwall, so that swale runs right into that headwall and into the pipe.

TEN HOEVE: Who maintains that?

EICHENLAUB: The borough.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

TEN HOEVE: On your property? On your client's property?

EICHENLAUB: You mean the drainage swale itself?

TEN HOEVE: Well, how does it keep from every getting clogged up or blocked up?

EICHENLAUB: Again, if this headwall were to get clogged, I'm sure the borough would get called because that's the borough....this whole easement is to the borough.

TEN HOEVE: Ok, and it is all within the borough easement?

EICHENLAUB: Well, right...like I said, that headwall is off of our property so it's on an easement on the other property.

MAGUIRE: You mentioned when they did the tests, they encountered water and 6 ½'?

EICHENLAUB: Correct. Again, the shallowest was at 6'7" and that was on test pit #2 on Lot 2, so that would be located right here.

MAGUIRE: You testified that the basement would be higher?

EICHENLAUB: We'll do the math on it. We're proposing a basement for 128.5, the grade in the vicinity of where that test pit was done is 131 ½...and the water was then at 125...we are about 3' above that with the basement.

MAGUIRE: So the basement would be 3 ½' but you would still be putting footings in....

EICHENLAUB: Footings go three feet below grade. The grade around the perimeter of that building is at 131 so we would be down at 128, say 127 ½ because we have to be probably a foot below....the bottom of the footing would be about a foot and a half below basement floor. So that would be at 127. That would still be out of that water table.

MAGUIRE: So you would hit water around 122?

EICHENLAUB: We hit water around 125.

MAGUIRE: The ejector pumps on the sewer...what kind of an ejector pump is able to pump that up seven feet 200' down the road to the Local Street manhole?

EICHENLAUB: They're referred to as a *grinder pump*...We've put them in before. We have pumped up over a larger head than this vertical rise. The existing structure has one in it now.

MAGUIRE: Why wouldn't you put the house in a slab, why are you putting basements in?

EICHENLAUB: I don't have the actual homes here, especially in this house...this is going to be a special set or architectural plans because they are going to have to marry everything to the structure that is there.

They may decide they don't want a basement in that house. We're just showing the feasibility of putting one in. Underneath the proposed

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

addition, which is off of the south side of the building, we've just shown that it is feasible that one can certainly be placed in there.

MAGUIRE: And the existing basement finished is 128?

EICHENLAUB: You're talking about in the existing house?

MAGUIRE: Yes.

EICHENLAUB: Yes.

MAGUIRE: And are you filling in there? It looks like you're grading it to 134...

EICHENLAUB: There is fill being placed along the west side of the building. I think there was a comment by one of the professionals about there being some basement windows...on those basement windows if they are below grade they are either going to have to be blocked up or a window well provided.

MAGUIRE: Thank you. The other question I had was the driveway. You mentioned for the fire truck access that there were going to be grass pavers along the edge of the driveway?

EICHENLAUB: What I am saying is in the area on either side of the curb, between the curb and the retaining wall, we are proposing grass pavers so if the ladder truck had to pull in and have to put their outriggers out, they would extend beyond the curb line and they would have something solid to extend their outriggers onto. That's why we would propose that.

MAGUIRE: And along the lines of emergency services...some of the things we see and in particular when it snows with these long driveways is getting the emergency service into the home.

EICHENLAUB: During a snow storm, after a snow storm?

MAGUIRE: Right after the snow storm...there was one case reported by the Police Chief where they couldn't access the home because of the length of the driveway...they had to call the DPW to plow the driveway so they could get the ambulance in.

EICHENLAUB: And I understand that. If it was during a snow storm...it would be no different for this house than it would be for any other house, short or long driveway...if they hadn't gotten out and plowed or shoveled their driveway, it would be difficult.

MAGUIRE: Tell me more about the snow removal. Today the snow is plowed down Local and just ...

EICHENLAUB: It is plowed and dumped at the end of Local Street.

MAGUIRE: And what is proposed here?

EICHENLAUB: Again, we don't show it on here but what we could do, is provide for on either side of this driveway, a paved area where that snow could be plowed and pushed off so it is dumped in front of the driveway.

MAGUIRE: So the borough would have to come down Local and push it to either side of this driveway?

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

EICHENLAUB: For the most part, yes. But the area that would be provided would be right at the end of Local. In this area here and in this area here. Basically what we are providing for is the extension of the driveway in that area there, so instead of plowing directly here, they would plow in this area here and plow into that area there.

Now, again, there may be snow piled at the end of that driveway just as this is along any driveway, along any street. When a snow plow goes by you get two to three feet of snow plowed up at the end of your driveway. What we are looking to do by doing this is create an area where they are not piling up five to six feet of snow at the end of that driveway.

MAGUIRE: And along the same lines, the garbage pickup...that resident would have to drag the garbage cans the length of that driveway and put it out on Local Street?

EICHENLAUB: If the garbage pickup is at curb side, yes. Absolutely. Just like all the other residents who have longer driveways.

MITAL: As things move along here, we're going to have more business that we have to take care of tonight...I'm sure the board and professionals are going to have a lot of questions, so at this point I would like to open it up to the public in case they are not going to be here or can't make it to the next meeting.

TEN HOEVE: This is an opportunity only to ask questions, not to make any statements. You don't have to be sworn in, all you have to do is identify yourself by stating your name and address and then ask your question.

Diane Manzione, 81 Lillian Street came forward.

MANZIONE: You mentioned that you took soil samples...can I ask when those were taken?

EICHENLAUB: April 13, 2010.

MANZIONE: Would the soil samples be affected by soil being brought onto the property at any time?

EICHENLAUB: The area where these soil samples were taken was all virgin material. They weren't taken from fill.

MANZIONE: If the fill was brought in two years ago, would that still be considered virgin material?

EICHENLAUB: Not necessarily, no..but the areas that we excavated, we didn't see that, we didn't see any indication of fill.

MAZIONE: You mentioned retaining walls around the driveways? What is the purpose of the retaining walls?

EICHENLAUB: The retaining walls we are talking about are located along this driveway servicing Lot 1.02..they are located on the north side and the south side and the reason for that is to minimize the amount of fill we are placing in the wetland area.

MANZIONE: Would they not affect the flow of water on the property?

EICHENLAUB: Not at all. The flow from the north side of the wetland area to the south side of the wetland area is in a conduit and large pipe...so there

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

is a direct connection between the two. If it was all fill and there was no pipe provided it would create a ponding effect.

Steve Manziona, 81 Lillian Street came forward.

MANZIONE: First question is kind of a fundamental question...why is there a need for a variance?

EICHENLAUB: The variance we are seeking has to do with the width of the lot and the frontage along the street. In the particular zone that we are in, we require 100' and we are shy of that by 13' for Lot 1.01.

The back lot here, our width is taken at the setback line, which is 30' at the north property line and we do not have the 100' width to the lot at that setback line, which is why the variance is necessary.

MANZIONE: Why don't you develop the land with the lot sizes that meet the existing zoning laws?

EICHENLAUB: The lots themselves, the lot areas are in excess of what is required.

MANZIONE: How many dwellings could you put up that would not require a variance on Lot 1?

EICHENLAUB: Lot 1, we're Ok, it's fully conforming.

MANZIONE: Let me restate my question. In this area here, how many dwellings could you put in without requiring a variance?

EICHENLAUB: Without requiring a variance we could probably get one along Rivervale Road and one off of Local. With the possibility of running a cul-de-sac in, we could get three conforming lots...we looked at that but again the cul-de-sac would extend back into the wetlands area. We'd probably be able to get three lots.

MANZIONE: Is that going to be considered?

EICHENLAUB: No, this is what is being considered right now.

MANZIONE: You talked about the emergency vehicles getting in on the driveway on the two lots on the west side...you say that all fire trucks except for the hook and ladder would be able to get in there?

EICHENLAUB: Would be able to make the turn.

MANZIONE: And how did you verify that? And the fire department blessed that off?

EICHENLAUB: I haven't heard otherwise.

MANZIONE: Did you ask?

EICHENLAUB: It was sent to the Fire Department.

MANZIONE: And how much weight is that driveway going to be able to carry?

EICHENLAUB: The driveway has been designed to carry truck traffic.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

MANZIONE: And with the 36" lines that run underneath it now from Local Street?

EICHENLAUB: The amount of fill that is on top of this...we had to crawl through to look for the addition to the 36" line...we certainly have enough fill on top of that to distribute any load, any surcharge load from any vehicles over the top of that pipe.

MANZIONE: If that pipe was to fail, what would happen to the drainage plan?

EICHENLAUB: If that pipe were to fail, what would happen to my drainage plan? The drainage off of Local would be backed up. It would probably come out of the catch basins and flow across our property to the wetlands via the driveway or overland...but if that pipe were to fail there, anywhere in that stretch of driveway, it would back up and come out through the grates.

MANZIONE: It would just pool by the grates?

EICHENLAUB: No, it would go down on our property.

MANZIONE: You talked about the seepage pits and your drainage plan...explain how the seepage pits work...are they naturally flowing, do they need any mechanical means for them to work?

EICHENLAUB: No, what they are is the roof leaders from the dwellings are tied to those seepage pits and is all underground. You don't see them. It flows from the roof leaders right into the ground.

MANZIONE: The sump pumps being proposed for the houses...would those drain into the seepage pits?

EICHENLAUB: They could be.

MANZIONE: They could?

EICHENLAUB: Yes.

MANZIONE: If the seepage pit were to become clogged or inoperable, what would that do to your drainage plan?

EICHENLAUB: Right where the roof leaders go into the ground, there's a failsafe where if the line were to back up, it would come up the leader and discharge onto the splash block. And the purpose of that is in the event these lines were to clog, it would simply back up and come out at the foundation. Most of the houses that were built in the 50's, 60's and 70's do now.

MANZIONE: So the drainage would still find its way southwest on the property?

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

MANZIONE: The perc test that you did, you said that the soil was good; I don't know if that was the exact phrase that you used...

EICHENLAUB: The soil was capable of accepting the water, yes. We got percolation.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

MANZIONE: My question to that is, have you been on this property when there is a moderate to heavy rain, right afterwards?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, I have.

MAZIONE: And what did you see?

EICHENLAUB: I saw that there was a considerable amount of water flowing through this drainage swale in the wetland area across the back.

MANZIONE: Did you see any large puddles or small lakes back there?

EICHENLAUB: I would say that the water was flowing through it. I've been out there after the rain had stopped and there are low points along this wetland area where there are small pools of water, yes.

MANZIONE: And with the dwellings going in, and all those foundations, your drainage plan is going to accommodate all that? My biggest concern is I live on Lot 5, which is at the southwest corner...I've been in the house 20 years and haven't had a drop of water in my basement. I'm one of the lucky people who do not need a sump pump. What assurances are you going to give me that this construction will not impact my property?

EICHENLAUB: What I'm going to assure you is that we have taken all of the necessary precautions to make sure you don't get water in the basement and that water from these houses here, is not going to contribute to the flows and will not impact you. It's just not going to happen.

MANZIONE: So this is just a handshake and I'm supposed to trust you, right?

EICHENLAUB: I hope so.

MANZIONE: Thank you very much.

Xandra Wilhovsky, 74 Rivervale Road came forward.

WILHOVSKY: You talked about the 36" main and the maintenance of that pipe..it has failed in the past. The people that live at the end of Local Street, on the left hand side, have two grates in their back yard...and they have been working lately only because perhaps Mr. Prusha had Park Ridge clean out the 36" pipe. I'm not sure of that. When it doesn't work a waterfall goes up on those people's property right there and has nowhere to drain except backwards into what used to be a brook. Eventually it will go on to Prusha's property. So what we are looking for is reassurance that that 36" pipe will be maintained for sure.

EICHENLAUB: That 36" pipe is not our responsibility and what I can assure you is that the 36" pipe under this proposal is not going to be altered. We are not proposing any altering. We are not going to restrict any flows through it. The flows that presently go through from Local Street will be maintained.

We can't alter it, that's Park Ridge's drainage system and way back, that easement was granted...the rights to that easement were granted to Park Ridge to have their line in there.

WILHOVSKY: The brook that used to flow behind my house actually took into consideration pipes that were under. Charlie Forino, who was next door to me, had his (?) down and the pipes just destroyed it. He had a sophisticated pumping system and when we had heavy rains in March, his

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

system worked so much that the people on Local Street that had the two drains were getting water from Charlie's property and mine. I have a pipe that goes under my house, comes down to the back, Barry Stein dug is out, and you can see the water flowing out of it. So the pipe that you're going to put under the driveway with the fill, is that pipe going to be accessible for cleaning it out?

EICHENLAUB: Yes. It's going to be open on the north side and it will be open on the south side. You will be able to see right through. That's the drain on the north side of this wetland area. That north side of the wetland area is what drains all these properties to the north of us. That accepts the drainage from those properties and your property.

WILHOVSKY: My property and Charlie's.

EICHENLAUB: Yes, and I testified to that. Those properties do drain onto us.

WILHOVSKY: And all of that water that we see now on Prusha's property when it rains heavily and creates a small lake, is that going to be going into this pipe?

EICHENLAUB: Yes.

WILHOVSKY: And that swale will just go down...it will not go out anywhere?

EICHENLAUB: When you say the swale?

WILHOVSKY: The swale...that area that holds water.

EICHENLAUB: This area will drain to the south as it does now. It will continue to drain to the south.

WILHOVSKY: That grading won't be touched at all?

EICHENLAUB: We can't...there is a little bit of grading in here and again, that's to accommodate the retaining walls and the new pipe. We're not raising the grades any, we're keeping them the same so the water does continue to flow in the direction it does now.

WILHOVSKY: The retaining walls will be built on the ground as it is right now?

EICHENLAUB: Correct. It will be built up behind the walls to accommodate the driveway but the front of the walls and the wetlands area, no, it will be as it is now, low.

WILHOVSKY: So the swale that is there will be pretty much around 1.03 or 1.02?

EICHENLAUB: We're really not looking to bring any soil in. The excavation for the dwellings and everything and the fill on the site have pretty much balanced themselves out. I did indicate that if we were to hit some unsuitable material, we may have to truck that out...clay or some organic material...I don't want to use it as fill. I don't anticipate us having much of that but what we are talking about is less than a truckload of material.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

MITAL: Mr. Eichenlaub, in order for us to finish our regular business tonight, we're going to have to stop taking questions now and you'll have to pick this up in June.

MAGUIRE: Before we wrap up, one quick question on that pipe...so the borough has an easement for that pipe?

EICHENLAUB: Which one? The 36" corrugated metal pipe.

MAGUIRE: Yes.

EICHENLAUB: That pipe right there, the borough has an easement for, yes.

MAGUIRE: And the borough maintains that?

EICHENLAUB: They're supposed to. That's not the responsibility of the property owner.

OPPELT: What about the pipe underneath the driveway itself?

EICHENLAUB: This pipe...there are two different pipes. We've got the 36" pipe that's now in place that drains Local Street and our pipe, which will be our responsibility, that runs beneath the driveway. That will be the homeowner's responsibility.

OPPELT: And that will be in the deed.

EICHENLAUB: That they have to maintain it, yes.

MITAL: I'm sure that 36" metal corrugated pipe will be inspected before and after construction to make sure it is working.

EICHENLAUB: I believe your engineer has brought up that they would like to see it inspected.

MITAL: It wouldn't be the worst thing in the world.

MAGUIRE: Are you familiar with that borough easement.

EICHENLAUB: Am I familiar with it?

MAGUIRE: Yes, the one coming off Local...

EICHENLAUB: In what respect?

MAGUIRE: Is that for the maintenance of the pipe?

EICHENLAUB: Well, anytime a drainage line owned by the municipality runs through a private property, they seek an easement so that entitles them to go in, if a section of pipe has to be replaced or the pipe has to be cleaned, it allows them to come in and do it freely without the permission of the property owner. That's the right of the easement.

BROUWER: To follow up on that...so say the pipe is damaged underneath the driveway, you did up the driveway and repair the pipe...whose responsibility is it to repair the driveway?

DEL VECCHIO: I'll answer that. It would be the property owner's obligation to restore the driveway. If the borough came in to do a repair, they would be required to repair the pipe and bring the property back to essentially where

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

it was and the homeowner would be responsible for doing the driveway. That's the risk the property owner takes.

BROUWER: So any improvements on the easement...

TEN HOEVE: If this were approved it would have to include a condition that the easement so provide and the form of the easement would have to be reviewed by me and the board engineer.

OPPELT: What is that driveway made of?

EICHENLAUB: Asphalt.

MAGUIRE: Will Mr. Eichenlaub be coming back?

MITAL: Yes, absolutely.

TEN HOEVE: For the public, this will be continued on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June and Mr. Del Vecchio; I think we need a time extension.

DEL VECCHIO: Is the 23<sup>rd</sup> of the June the next available meeting?

BEER: Yes.

MITAL: Yes.

DEL VECCHIO: So we'll reserve time at the first meeting in July now as well so we don't bump another month.

BEER: It depends on what we do on the second week of June. We are still doing a lot of COAH work. So our second week meeting is entirely devoted to COAH.

TEN HOEVE: As you well know. You are well aware of the COAH litigation that is taking a lot of the board's time.

DEL VECCHIO: So June 23<sup>rd</sup> is the next available.

TEN HOEVE: And I don't know if you want to give meeting by meeting time extensions...

DEL VECCHIO: Obviously I will carry the time through the June 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, that's a given. I would like to request placement on the first meeting in July as well because I know Mr. Preiss has a conflict with the evening of the 23<sup>rd</sup>, so even if I am lucky enough to get Mr. Eichenlaub back and one and Mr. Auben back and redone and get Mr. Preiss...

TEN HOEVE: I don't think that is likely.

DEL VECCHIO: I don't think it is likely, which is why I am guessing that we will be back on the first meeting in July.

BEER: We would know on the 23<sup>rd</sup> after we've had our June work meeting. We will know what has to be carried over to the next work session and part of that has been mandated by the governing body, they have been giving us things to do.

DEL VECCHIO: Just asking early so I can reserve a spot.

BEER: Can't give an answer.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board  
Meeting of May 26, 2010

DEL VECCHIO: I understand. What is the first meeting in July?

BEER: The 14<sup>th</sup>.

DEL VECCHIO: And there's no new Notice?

TEN HOEVE: Yes, there is no new Notice that will be provided to the public...this is your Notice that it will be continued on the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion made by Councilman Maguire and seconded by Mr. Oppelt to confirm to approve the April 14, 2010 minutes as written.

AYES: Ms. Eisen, Messrs. Oppelt, Councilman Maguire

ABSTAIN: Messrs. Brouwer, Mesiano

Motion made by Councilman Maguire and seconded by Mr. Oppelt to confirm to approve the April 28, 2010 minutes as written.

AYES: Mr. Oppelt, Councilman Maguire, Mr. Mital

ABSTAIN: Ms. Eisen, Messrs. Brouwer, Mesiano

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Ms. Beer reported on her conversation with Montvale with regard to having a joint board meeting as requested by Councilman Maguire at the behest of Borough Attorney Mancinelli. Any meeting to be held according to the Montvale Planning Board Attorney will be with the Mayor and our borough attorney, no need for the planning boards to get together.

Motion made by Mr. Mesiano and seconded by Mr. Oppelt to confirm that the board go into closed session to discuss litigation. Board went into session at 10:25pm.

Carried unanimously.

**ADJOURN:**

The board came out of closed session and as there being no further business to come before the board a motion was made by Mr. Oppelt and seconded by Mr. Mesiano that the meeting be adjourned.

Carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,



Helyn N. Beer  
Secretary

(10:43pm)