Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board
Meeting of August 25, 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: Messrs. Browne, Mesiano, Mital, O'Donoghue, Oppelt, Saluzzi, Von Bradsky, Ms. Eisen, Councilman Maguire
Absent: Mr. Brouwer
Also Present: John Ten Hoeve, Jr.,Esq., Board Attorney
Brigette Bogart, PP, Planning Consultant
Eve Mancuso, PE, Board Engineer (8:10pm)

**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 thereat and by filing the said schedule in the office of the Borough Clerk.

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

Monique Bliss, 7 Marti Road came forward and asked if the board had any information about the recent COAH deliberations involving the State and Metropolitan Homes. She said it was some sort of appeal.

TEN HOEVE: There isn't anything at this point. The litigation has been taking place and it is not over with. They are negotiations that are still taking place involving the board, the borough and the objector. Nothing has been resolved at this point so there is really no information that can be disclosed yet. If anything does happen, there will certainly be a public hearing with regard to either any changes in the ordinance or with respect to any application for the property.

BLISS: Thank you.

TEN HOEVE: If anyone is here in connection with another application that was possibly going to be heard tonight, Prusha, that application is not going to be heard tonight, it is going to be heard on September 15th. There will be no further notice that property owners will receive since we are announcing it at this meeting so if anyone is here in connection with that application, that will be heard on the 15th of September.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**70-72 PARK AVE. LLC** – (Krell Bldg) – 70-72 Park Avenue – N.B.D.Z.
Lots: 1 & 2 Block 1604

Gregory Meese, Esq., came forward stating he was the attorney for the applicant, 70-72 Park Avenue, LLC.

MEESE: Just a few quick housekeeping items. I do have the original affidavit of publication and proof of mailing together with two additional sets of plans that Ms. Beer had requested.

BEER: Thank you.

MEESE: This is an application to redevelop the site of the building that was burned back in March of this year. As you know the Krell Building had been there for decades and decades and it is pretty much a total loss. What the applicant is looking to do is to redevelop the site with retail and office building, which is what the use of the site, had been when Krell had occupied the site.

The property, as you know, currently has access from both Park Avenue as well as So. Maple. The Park Avenue access is on a piece of property that the borough actually acquired as part of the park property some years ago. That property always provided access to this lot. As part of this application we are seeking a subdivision of that parcel or a long-term lease of that parcel and we are also proposing to eliminate the access onto Park Avenue as that would not be consistent with the county's requirements for street access to this type of property.

Other than that, the layout as you will notice is very similar to what was there before in terms of the building being up front and the parking in the rear with access to So. Maple Avenue.

This application involves a Site Plan with some variances as well as a Minor Subdivision. The variances associated with this application include the following: a front yard setback to allow the front to be one foot rather than ten feet...the existing setback is 1.2', so it is not a whole lot different from what it there today and also to maintain the existing setback of 0.5' along So. Maple Avenue; building coverage 40% is required and we are proposing 41.55%; impervious coverage existing is about 100%, Code allowance is 75% and the proposal is 89.52%; front yard parking variance along So. Maple, where 20' is required and 4' is proposed to allow for 31 parking spaces where 37 are required and a variance from having a loading zone on the property and as either a variance or waiver, relative to the height of the signage...as the architect will indicate, because of the slope of the property the sign, although they maintain the same height above the horizon, if you will, the land slopes down and therefore there is a variance for the height of the sign.

We do have two witnesses this evening to review the proposal. The first is the architect, Tom Cusanelli and Mr. Cusanelli will review the existing conditions on the property as well as the proposed building design and review some of the features of the ordinance and how this plan complies with those requirements.

(board engineer arrived at this time)

TEN HOEVE: Have we marked any of those?

MEESE: Not a bad idea, shall we just mark them all? (to his architect) Why don't we just mark them and that way you don't have to slow down while you're doing it.

Thomas Cusanelli, AIA, 143 Terrace Street, Haworth, NJ came forward and was sworn.

MEESE: Mr. Cusanelli, would you please review your background and experience in the field of architecture.

CUSANELLI: I am a registered architect, presently holding licenses in the State of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. I've been licensed since 1979. I've been practicing architecture for over 30 years. I've been licensed in the State of New Jersey as a professional architect since 1981.

MEESE: Have you testified before other planning and zoning boards in the State of New Jersey with respect to architecture?

CUSANELLI: I have.

MEESE: And you have been accepted as an expert in architecture by those boards?

CUSANELLI: Yes, sir.

MEESE: I offer Mr. Cusanelli as an expert in architecture.

MITAL: Thank you.

MEESE: Mr. Cusanelli, just for the record, you have marked several exhibits...can you take the exhibits that you have marked and make a list of them,

CUSANELLI: I have exhibit A-1, which is a copy of a photograph of the existing building that was originally erected on the site, dating back to the early 1900's.

A-2, is a Site Plan with some zoning calculations.

A-3, is a proposed rendering of the front of the building on Park Avenue

A-4, is an additional front rendering, optional

A-5, is a rendering of rear elevation of the proposed building

A-6, floor plans, first and second floor

A-7, elevation drawings of the proposed structure, all four sides

A-8, is a diagram indicating front and rear building façade elevations with height lines drawn for both building height and signage height.

A-9, is an existing site survey of the building...this is actually a copy dated May 18, 2010.

MEESE: Very good. Would you start by reviewing with the board the nature of the building which had existing on the property. You can start by reviewing the property and the building that had been there prior to March of this year.

CUSANELLI: The existing site is Park Avenue and Maple Avenue consisting of a two-story section of the building, which was this original building plus a one-story extension that was added, not quite out to the property line and a one-story additional built back in the 60's, which was pretty much out to the front property line on both Maple Avenue and Park Avenue.

MEESE: The building actually had a little third story kind of cupola on it as well, didn't it?

CUSANELLI: The existing building, which was the two-story building, the old post-office, I understand was two-story plus a third story with a widow's watch up on the top...sort of a gambrel roof up here, double hitched roof that was an additional space up on the third story.

MEESE: And the building has been substantially destroyed by fire?

CUSANELLI: That is correct.

MEESE: And the proposal is to redevelop the site with a consistent use, being retail on the first floor and office on the second floor?

CUSANELLI: Yes. We intend to construct with what we thought were some similar elements from the older building that was existing on the site. We developed a colonnade along the Park Avenue side, set the building back 10'

to comply with the front yard setback, with the exception of the covered walk.

The site is sloping, approximately 6 ½' from what would be east to west. In order to accommodate handicapped accessibility into the proposed building, we have different access points. One up at the extreme east corner for a floor level on that side of the building, the building steps down at that point approximately 3'8" to access the main section of the building and also additional access to the lower level or dropped level of the stores, which is going from west to east.

We originally had some vertical elements at both ends and then the center that we designed to make the architectural design similar to the old building that was here. We have an issue on the west corner involving clearance to utility lines which are coming around Park and heading down Maple and we have devised an optional plan elevation, which is still in keeping with our basic intention of the elements from the older building, however, getting more into a recto-linear square turret on the two extreme ends of the building in lieu of the octagonal. As a result, we were able to pull the building in on the second floor and maintain clearance for the high voltage wires going down Maple.

As a result, approximately 146 sq ft of floor area was reduced out of the building on the second floor as we pushed that façade in, in order to maintain clearance of the power lines.

MEESE: That would be a design element that would then comply with the PSE&G requirement of separation from the power line on the street?

CUSANELLI: Yes, that is correct.

We have additional copies of this elevation if the board would so like.

TEN HOEVE: I'm not sure. Are you proposing to construct the building in accordance with the optional design or the initial design?

MEESE: At this point it is unclear. This comment came from the County. The County was the one that tipped us off to the PSE&G requirement. We have not confirmed that yet with PSE&G. We are assuming that the County is correct and there needs to be a 10' separation.

TEN HOEVE: So, if it is, then it will not be A-3, it will be A-4.

MEESE: That's right and we do have other copies for the board.

BEER: The optional were never submitted to the board.

(optional plans were then given to the board)

This plan is A-4?

MEESE: Yes, A-4.

Mr. Cusanelli, would you please review the proposed floor plan layout?

CUSANELLI: The proposed first floor is similar in use to what was the previous use, a retail space and we've indicated six possible suites on the first floor...access into a lobby area, which is this area here in order to access the second floor, which is proposed to be additional office space.

MEESE: Is there an elevator proposed for the building?

CUSANELLI: There is an elevator proposed. There are two sets of stairs from the rear; one coming off the property line at the rear, right here and that space has an access to the elevator to the first floor and second floor as well as cellar space.

MEESE: With respect to access to the basement area...originally you had proposed a staircase on the eastern side of the building and in order to accommodate the concern for the stairs at that location, have you found a location internal that this staircase can be located?

CUSANELLI: Yes. This stair was originally on the property to be acquired or subdivided and has now been rerouted to inside the stair wall.

MEESE: So, the stairways at each end would both go up and down and allow access to the offices upstairs.

CUSANELLI: That is correct.

MEESE: What is the proposed use of the basement area?

CUSANELLI: Storage for the retail space and meter rooms, mechanical rooms for the building spaces above.

MEESE: The mechanical units that you would have on the exterior of the building will be mounted on the roof?

CUSANELLI: The air-conditioning equipment, the mechanical units would be mounted on the roof, which is a flat roof behind the mansard roof here, the sloping roof, on the interior space of that flat roof.

MEESE: They would all be shielded from public view?

CUSANELLI: Yes, they are.

MEESE: Now with respect to the Park Ridge Zoning, there is particular requirements for building materials and building design in the Neighborhood Business Zone and have you designed the building to be in conformance with those requirements?

CUSANELLI: Yes, we have. We've gone through the Neighborhood Business Zoning and a number of items that were listed from the planner's report...we have horizontal articulation along both facades of the building...on elevation drawing A-7...vertical articulation no less than 30' apart with the elements on both the front and rear elevations...30% of the first floor of the building front should be clear window and we have all public access to the retail window space that totals 44.52%...the minimum 40% of front door being glass, the doors proposed are primarily glass, they are 21 sq ft, 61.9% of that door is glass...exterior materials, the primary material being at least 60%, our primary material would be stucco, which is comprised of 63% or 5,172 sq ft...the secondary material of brick being required to be not more than 40%, is 37% of 3,091 sq ft, that is all the brick on base and bays and front articulation...the earth-tone materials and wall colors are encouraged and we believe we have complied with those tones.

MEESE: With respect to the building height, would you review how the building height is addressed with the sloping lot and how the height is calculated?

CUSANELLI: This is Exhibit A-8. This is a three-dimensional drawing of the front elevation or Park Avenue and the rear elevation...the red dashed line at the top represents the 35' high line maximum building height...we have an average building height that we've taken from east to west and that average building height is 33'5"...the lowest portion of the building or the westerly portion of the building here is the area that comes into non-

compliance with the 35' maximum height and that is a result of the sloping plane of the site. We are able to maintain two different floor levels, however on the office floor level in order to maintain a consistent height at that floor, the maximum flexibility for rental, we have a two floor elevation that is consistent and to consequently maintain a consistent roof line, which is what has caused this section to be in non-compliance.

MEESE: But the average roof height is in compliance with the code requirements.

CUSANELLI: The average roof height is 33'5", which is less than the maximum 35' and only two stories.

MEESE: How tall would be the maximum dimension that we show?

CUSANELLI: The maximum dimension on the elevation, which is again that westerly exposure off of So.Maple is 36'10"...the height varies from 29'11" to the mid-point of the roof to 36'10"

MEESE: With respect to the front façade and the rear façade, you're also proposing sign boxes where the retail tenants would mount signage?

CUSANELLI: That's correct.

MEESE: And have you determined whether those signs would comply with the code requirements in terms of the height above grade?

CUSANELLI: The wall signs as per the Neighborhood Business Code is between 8 and 12% and we have provided 11.6% on signs located in these areas for these boxes above the colonnade...again due to the sloping site we have an average sign height of 15.2" and that varies from east side to west side as you we go down Park Avenue.

MEESE: So there will be a variance requested for that part of the signage in terms of height at the western corner of the building.

CUSANELLI: I made these small little triangles on the upper level of these retail stores and the small triangle on the lower level of the retail stores are the only two areas that are in non-compliance.

MEESE: Have you been able to maintain adequate clearance beneath the sign area?

CUSANELLI: What we tried to maintain here is a consistent height of 10' clear underneath the colonnades as you walk through for visibility of the retail space and we've maintained that same proportion on the lower level, consequently keeping the difference between the two sign bases the same as the difference between the two floor elevations, which is approximately 44".

MEESE: This applicant is not seeking approval for the actual signs at this time because there are no tenants lined up so we don't know the colors of the signs...just for approval of the sign boxes or areas.

CUSANELLI: That's right. Sign areas being within the maximum limit of 12% and we're providing 11.6 and maximum height of the sign which is slightly non-compliant.

MEESE: With respect to the fire safety, is this building proposed to be totally sprinkled?

CUSANELLI: Yes, totally sprinkled.

MEESE: And the building would otherwise comply with all building codes?

CUSANELLI: Yes.

MEESE: And other than what you have addressed, the building itself would comply with the Neighborhood Business Zone requirements other than the setbacks that the project engineer will deal with.

CUSANELLI: Yes.

MEESE: Any questions of Mr. Cusanelli?

MAGUIRE: You mentioned a step-down from the easterly side to the westerly side in the covered walkway...is it actually a step or a ramp?

CUSANELLI: It is...on the first floor plan, as the sidewalk comes down from east to west there are steps within the colonnade for access to the upper level stores from the lower level, however, access is also provided via the sidewalk and ramp to come in for handicapped accessibility, so we have both, we have steps and we are using the sidewalk sloping plane as a ramp to access that lower level of stores.

MAGUIRE: That was my concern, we have a handicapped population. So if they wanted to go past the building they would have to go on the sidewalk...if they did not want to go into any of the stores and they just wanted to go by the building...

CUSANELLI: They would be on the sidewalk.
The colonnade, the planter are all within the property line. The sidewalk being out in front, which is this space here.

MAGUIRE: And you pushed the building back 10'

CUSANELLI: Yes. We have the first floor wall back at 10' and within that 10' setback is the colonnade with a small planter within that 10' setback distance.

MAGUIRE: So it is 10' back from where the existing building sits today.

CUSANELLI: Yes, it is.

MAGUIRE: On the westerly side.

CUSANELLI: On the westerly side...

MAGUIRE: Today...the westerly side protrudes more than the easterly side.

CUSANELLI: It is pretty much on the easterly and the westerly because the easterly side also had a one-story addition onto it that has since been demolished and that was approximately 1'2" off of the front property line.
So the building wall itself has been pushed back anywhere from between 8'8" and 9'.

MAGUIRE: And what is the width of the sidewalk?

MEESE: Within the colonnade or the public walk?

MAGUIRE: The public walkway.

CUSANELLI: 7'.

O'DONOGHUE: How did that affect the parking lot in the back...pulling the building back 10'?

CUSANELLI: We were able to maintain...

MEESE: That is probably a question that the engineer can review. The handicapped accessibility is also maintained at the rear of the building as well.

CUSANELLI: Yes, it is. The site is pretty much uniformly sloped from east to west...at the same access point that we have a handicapped access from the sidewalk on Park, allows us handicapped access in the rear from the parking lot.

BROWNE: Would you comment please on how the gutters and leaders would be, given that you have the setback on the roof?

CUSANELLI: The leaders drain from upper roofs onto lower roofs and lower roofs to required storm sewers or detention/retention systems.

BROWNE: I'm just curious if you would have a multitude of leaders with the different roof setbacks.

CUSANELLI: Flat roof internal...the flat roof at the topmost part would drain internally...they would go directly down via internal drains...the sloping façade would drain down onto the lower roofs...those roofs with the colonnade space and the lower roof in the back would come down most likely to grade at varying points along the rear wall

VON BRADSKY: The flat roof is the one with the setback.

CUSANELLI: That is correct. This roof line, the ceiling of the second floor and the floor of the second floor are all continuous for the length of the building.

MAGUIRE: And by pushing the building back, you were able to clear up that line of sight coming around the corner of Maple Avenue.

CUSASNELLI: Yes, as a matter of fact, the alternate elevation where we had somewhat...where we came up with the octagonal shape in order to cut back on a 45, with this now being setback even further, if this alternate scheme for the façade goes, we will even have more space...more if a sight line on that corner.

MAGUIRE: I like that you did that. And above that, the colonnade...how much of an overhang? It looks like what could be a porch up there but I guess it is just a roof...and there's nothing going up there?

CUSANELLI: There is nothing going up there, there is no access to that proposed...no equipment. We have maintained in order to bring some light into the colonnade; we have skylights up there ....

MAGUIRE: Some of the second floor overhangs the walkway, I guess.

CUSANELLI: No, it does not. Second floor wall is in line with the first floor wall below, also a 10' setback.

MAGUIRE: And on the Maple Avenue side, it looks like you've dropped the roofline down...is that an architectural issue or is that because of the PSE&G line?

CUSANELLI: I'm sorry?

MAGUIRE: On the Maple Avenue, optional rendering...did the roofline change with the optional or was that part of the design?

CUSANELLI: That second floor was pushed in slightly and reduced the second floor footprint by 146 sq ft. due to potential clearance for the wires.

MAGUIRE: So that was always a consideration? Was it always a consideration?

CUSANELLI: We had set it in but it wasn't set in quite far enough.

MAGUIRE: But originally you had pushed in the second floor.

CUSANELLI: Yes, the second floor setback and here is the line of the first floor below.

MAGUIRE: And maybe this is for Mr. Eichenlaub....the mechanicals for the building, the heating...so will each unit have its own mechanicals in the basement?

CUSANELLI: We are proposing for the retail spaces and for the office spaces, individual heating, they will be split systems with fan units in the space and remote condensing units on the roof.

MAGUIRE: So those six suites, they could be combined if there was one tenant that came in there...they could be combined into one retail tenant.

CUSANELLI: Yes.

MAGUIRE: They would be heated and cooled by individual...

CUSANELLI: That is correct.

TEN HOEVE: What did you say was the maximum height of the sign box?

CUSANELLI: 15'0".

VON BRADSKY: What are the interior dividing walls made of between retail spaces?

CUSANELLI: The entire building is non-combustible construction. We will be going with a steel frame, concrete floors, all light gauge metal studs for the exterior façade, the demising partitions will be metal stud and sheet rock.

MEESE: I just want to step back quickly and answer Mr. Ten Hoeve's question with respect to the sign.

As I understood your question, you wanted the top of the signage in the front, the maximum height above the grade?

TEN HOEVE: Yes.

MEESE: I believe it is 16'10". I just want to confirm that.

CUSANELLI: I'm sorry...the code required?

TEN HOEVE: No, the maximum height that is proposed.

CUSANELLI: I'm sorry...

TEN HOEVE: I didn't think you had mentioned it during your testimony.

CUSANELLI: The height of the tops of signs varies from 13'6" to a maximum of 16'10". An average of 15'2".

OPPELT: Are there any plans for lighting those signs?

CUSANELLI: Not at this point.

O'DONOGHUE: What about the building itself...lighting the outside from an aesthetic?

CUSANELLI: We haven't gotten that far but we most likely would like to get some architectural lighting on here in order to enhance the façade with some more shadow lines.

VON BRADSKY: Back to Mr. Maguire's comment about the retail space and the demising walls...are you saying that the building is being designed with flexibility so that there may be a possibility of combining retail spaces and maybe even going back to one use as it was before?

CUSANELI: Yes, it is possible. There are columns located where we have demising partitions right now and the answer is yes.

MEESE: And that would be true on both floors.

CUSANELLI: Yes, it would be.

VON BRADSKY: Also just to be clear on the setback of the building...the building is setback but the planters and columns that you are going to see will be pretty much where the building is now, so is it correct that the sidewalk stays the same?

CUSANELLI: Yes. Sidewalk...nothing proposed is outside of the property line. The 1' planter and 9' colonnade and then the 10' setback of the building wall of the first and second floor.

VON BRADSKY: I am looking at the proposed first floor where the planter is and then there is a dashed line for the old foundation line...so that planter on the right-hand side, that's not coming any closer to the street than the building....and I guess that would be the area of the 1960's addition?

CUSANELLI: That building was initially set back 1.2 feet off of the front property line...it was not built out to the property line. That dashed line that you are seeing on the floor plan and the difference between that dashed line and the edge of the planter is that 1.2'... that the building as it is standing today was set in from the front property line.

VON BRADSKY: Ok, so then from a pedestrian point of view, there is going to be one foot less sidewalk versus what you would be walking right now.

CUSANELLI: That is correct. That would be planter proposed on some additional sidewalk on site now.

The drawing A-3 shows the location of the property lines and the relationship of the planters and setbacks from there into the site.

VON BRADSKY: I wasn't as concerned about the property line as the visual between what is there and what is going to be. I just wanted to clarify it.

CUSANELLI: With all due respect, visually now you are going to be walking down a sidewalk and have a couple of columns and a low planter that would be encroaching into your view with another 10' of view as you are looking down.

Presently as you are walking down you're looking at the face of the building.

VON BRADSKY: Yes, thank you.

MITAL: Any other questions from the board?

BOGART: Can you just give the total floor area for A-3 and A-4...two different floor plans.

CUSANELLI: Total floor area of the building as proposed is 23,800, existing was 23,577.6.

BOGART: So A-4 is 146 sq ft less?

CUSANELLI: Sorry that is lot area.

Floor area existing is 12,145, proposed 17,166.94

MEESE: And with the alternate plan you lose 146 sq ft from that?

CUSANELLI: We lose 146 sq ft roughly rounding it off to 17,000 sq ft. The first number I gave you was site area. I apologize.

Maximum allowable 17,966 sq ft.

BOGART: And that includes the land that the borough owns currently?

CUSANELLI: These calculations do.

BOGART: My other question pertains to the architectural guidelines for horizontal delineations...I was wondering if there's any opportunity to look at the rear façade. You have entrances to the parking lot and could potentially add some horizontal delineation to break it up? Even if it was same material but different tone...

CUSANELLI: We originally had a crossing here of the masonry that we felt sort of added to the horizontality of the building but we wanted to break it up rather than make it go horizontal but we can certainly add that back.

BOGART: So what you are saying is that from your perspective it is actually better without the band?

CUSANELLI: Yes, I believe so.

BOGART: I don't have a problem with it especially if you think it looks better this way.

CUSANELLI: We toyed around with additional signage back here and it just kept enforcing horizontality and not breaking it up as much as we felt it should be.

BOGART: Is there anything you can do to the doors...could you add some detail there?

CUSANELLI: We provided some double doors there, they were originally a single door access...they do have surrounds that have been incorporated.

BOGART: Will they have signs above them?

CUSANELLI: Yes, they do. Small, little...

MAGUIRE: The handicapped access in the rear...that is a ramp that runs along the back there? I see the stairwell going up...

CUSANELLI: What we have here is not necessarily for handicapped accessibility although it does work that way. Handicapped accessibility was from the front or primary entrance to the space.

What we did here is level off an area as we did with the two different walks in the front of the building with access on the east side that would allow for delivery and handicapped access to the rear as well as to the lower side on this raised platform, which is site-wise, behind the building on both sides. This one is accessible from the high side similar to what is happening in the front and this one from the mid-point of the building to access the rear stores there.

The rear entrance here is completely accessible from the driveway parking lot side.

MANCUSO: Continuing along those lines with the ADA accessibility from the rear...I can appreciate that the primary ADA access is to the first floor in the front but the parking is in the rear. If an individual were to park in space 8 or 9 and choose to come in through the rear, the sidewalk at the head of the straight area needs to be increased in order to be able to make the 90 degree bend along the sidewalk onto the ramp...I didn't know if you could slightly modify that bump out or slightly modify the parking just to gain that extra foot.

CUSANELLI: Yes, we can.

MANCUSO: And the second question was, you had mentioned that the building itself was set back 10' from the property line and I appreciate that is the major building wall but what is the setback to the lobby area, the center part of the building? Because that actually is part of the structure as well.

CUSANELLI: That is open at that point but yes, that is out at the 9' line from the face of the building, 1' back from the property line.

MANCUSO: So for that limited amount of area, there is a 1' setback to the structure.

CUSANELLI: This section right here at the approximately seven or eight foot width, it is one foot back and again it is only a little bit more solid that than the open colonnade....still less than 50% enclosed but that is correct. That octagon entrance is 1' back from the property line.

OPPELT: Are you saying it is on the same line as the planter?

CUSANELLI: The back of the planter.

TEN HOEVE: Just clarify for me, where do you want that change for the one foot access on the plan?

CUSANELLI: At the rear entrance.

TEN HOEVE: To widen the sidewalk area there?

MANCUSO: The sidewalk at that point is labeled as 4' and needs to be 5'.

TEN HOEVE: Fine, Ok, thank you.

MITAL: Any other questions from the board?
At this point, I would like to extend the opportunity to ask questions and I will emphasize *ask questions* to the architect hopefully relating to his testimony tonight to the public.

George Mayer, 159 So. Maple came forward.

MAYER: I live in the condos. We've been talking about property on Maple Avenue; it is really South Maple Avenue...just for the sake of the record.
There are approximately 114 units...

TEN HOEVE: This is an opportunity for the public to question the witness, you will have an opportunity to make whatever statements you want to make and you will be sworn in at that time that you make those statements. That will come later after the applicant finishes the case. This is just to ask questions of the witness.

MAYER: I would like to know whether the distance between the curb and the present building will change in any way between the curb and the proposed building.

MEESE: That is really a question for the site engineer with respect to curb details.

TENHOEVE: If he knows and can answer that.

CUSANELLI: Where is that?

MAYER: Coming out of So. Maple Avenue, it's a difficult situation now because there is very little visibility.

CUSANELLI: We have actually taken the corner where the building presently is and cut it back on a 45 to increase the sight line on that curb. You will have better visibility than you do today.

MAYER: Will the building itself be closer to the curb...the new building?

CUSANELLI: No, sir.

MAYER: You mentioned that the air conditioning units will be up on the roof and will not be visible. Is that true for the people who live in the condos, will they not be able to see the air conditioning units?

CUSANELLI: I'm sorry I don't know the maximum height or how many stories the condos are. Are they above three stories?

MAYER: They are two stories.

CUSANELLI: Then you won't be able to see these unless you are flying over.

MAYER: I don't intend to do that. I think that is really what I wanted to ask.

Hazel Greenberg, 105B So. Maple Avenue came forward.

GREENBERG: We have great difficulty (resident walked away from the microphone to the map)...how is a truck going to get in there...

CUSANELLI: We have a 24' wide aisle here with parking accessible off both sides for loading and unloading. Trucks will be pulling in, backing in and a smaller truck can actually fit in a spot, a van or a small delivery truck and anything larger would park in the aisle, deliver and then leave.

GREENBERG: Will that work with the additional traffic?

CUSANELLI: No more traffic than any other vehicle using the side entrance today. We've eliminated the access out to Park, this is the access.

GREENBERG: I've seen where there has been parking on one side and when the big delivery trucks come in they have to...

TEN HOEVE: You can't testify now, you can only ask a question. You will have a chance to do that and can tell us everything you'd like to tell us.

GREENBERG: No, that's why I'm concerned about the loading...

TEN HOEVE: What is your question to this man?

GREENBERG: He won't let me answer.

MITAL: Thank you very much.

Erwin Greenberg, 105B So. Maple Avenue.

GREENBERG: There is only one thing I would like you to clarify for me. I didn't quite understand (walked away from microphone to map)...

TEN HOEVE: Excuse me; you really need to speak near a microphone. Put that over on the corner so it can pick up both the question and the answer.

GREENBERG: This wall, are you moving it 10' in?

CUSANELLI: We are not, sir. We are maintaining that wall but we are cutting it on a 45, actually even further back than this diagram states. We are taking approximately five or six feet of that wall as it intersects with Park and cutting it on a 45 degree angle in order to increase the site lines coming out of Maple onto Park.

GREENBERG: You still haven't eliminated...there's a power pole, there's a building and when you are coming out of So. Maple, in order to see the traffic going this way, going east...if I want to make a right turn I have to creep out almost into the intersection because the corner of the building and the power pole interfere with the line of sight. I would have moved this whole wall back.

CUSANELLI: We can't do anything about the pole, I wish I could.

GREENBERG: It's not the pole, it's making the right turn.

CUSANELLI: Let me explain to you here. Where the building came out to within a foot of the front property line on Park, the building wall now is setback 9' further in. You'll be able to look through the colonnade to view traffic....what, you don't believe me?

GREENBERG: Well, I drive it, you don't. So it's scary now.

CUSANELLI: I can only give you the facts. The way the proposed building is drawn and the way we propose to build it, you will have an increased visibility coming out of Maple to make a right or left turn onto Park but I understand your question and as I said the wall that is pretty much right out to the property line, one foot back...is going to be set in nine more feet. The wall is out here now, is going back nine feet.

There will be a column out there, not too much obstructive than that pole is but you will be able to look past it and the building wall is actually moving in.

GREENBERG: The traffic on Park Avenue is increasing every day. You don't have any traffic control lights or anything like that.

MITAL: You are saying that you are improving his situation...(to Mr. Greenberg) Do you have any other questions?

GREENBERG: No, but I do have doubts about that.

Henry Riemersma, 101B So. Maple came forward

RIEMERSMA: I face the back of the building. My question goes with everything else that has been said here. Are you going to be submitting a legal sight distance requirements for this corner?

CUSANELLI: A legal sight distance?

RIEMERSMA: Yes, the engineering sight distance.

CUSANELLI: The site engineer will be up and you can ask him that question. Again, we moved this back to the required setback for the zoning.

RIEMERSMA: It's really a bad corner and if I remember, if you set out where the sight distance is supposed to be, you're not supposed to have any (?) in that area...I know you're looking for a variance in that area and I don't think you can get a variance for there.

I was just wondering what the legal sight distance would be.

MEESE: Mr. Eichenlaub will answer that question when he gets up.

MITAL: Once the engineer finishes his testimony that would probably be a more appropriate question for him.

RIEMERSMA: Ok, just for the record.

MITAL: Anyone else from the public like to come forward?

No? Then you can call your next witness.

MEESE: I would like to call Rick Eichenlaub, site engineer.

MESIANO: Is the visibility different from the first option to the second option?

CUSANELLI: It is actually a little bit better. Probably a lot better. We had a solid wall and it now has these openings here....sight line is somewhere around 3'6" and in a vehicle you will be looking right through all this out to the park.

VON BRADSKY: You'll submit revised plans of that corner because originally weren't the stores going to come right out into the turret on the first floor?

CUSANELLI: The store was always pretty much back where it will still be. This, now, will come back to a corner of 90 degree. The second floor and I believe we came in 1'2" or so.

Richard Eichenlaub, PE, 24 Wampum Lane came forward and was sworn.

TEN HOEVE: You do not need to qualify Mr. Eichenlaub; he has testified many, many times before this board.

MEESE: Mr. Eichenlaub, would you please review the existing conditions of the property and show how it relates to the site as well as how it...

TEN HOEVE: That plan hasn't been marked yet. We will just mark the whole set A-10, Site Plan consisting of 7 sheets.

MEESE: Would you review the existing site and how it relates to the property as well as the park property next door.

EICHENLAUB: The property is a corner lot, located in the NB zone and is located at the corner of So. Maple and Park Avenue and would be located at the southeast corner of that intersection.

At present there are the remnants of the existing building, foundation to the east side of the building still remains and to the west side, there remains the one-story structure that was built back in the 60's.

The building itself occupies approximately 1/3 of the property and the rear 2/3 of the property is presently a parking lot. The lot as it exists today is 100% impervious coverage by the building and the parking lot.

Grades run from a high point at the east side of the property with an elevation of 146 to a low elevation of 135 at the driveway entrance on So. Maple Avenue. There is actually an 11' drop from the east side to the elevation on So. Maple. The grade runs in an east to west direction and all of the drainage on the site runs from an east to west direction and onto Maple Avenue.

Along the southerly property line, which is our common property line with the condominiums, the complex to the south, there is a row of white pines that stand approximately 30' in height, which provides further screening between the condominium building closest to our property and the property itself. In fact, if you were to stand in the parking lot or driveway just behind the first building on So. Maple looking in a northerly direction, you can't even see the building as it exists today. I'm sure back when the two-story structure, prior to its burning down, existed you would be able to see a portion of the second story.

MEESE: Is there also a grade differential between the properties?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, there is approximately an 11' drop between our southeast corner of the property and the parking lot of the condominium association. There are a series of retaining walls along the condominium association's parking area to maintain the grade of their parking area.

To the east of us is the municipal park property and again, it is a park, landscaped, with walkways, landscaping...what we are looking to do is create a subdivision that would subdivide off approximately 11 ½' of that park area, which now is simply covered with a driveway which services our present site off of Park Avenue. That driveway is along the easterly side of the property.

Those are the existing conditions as it is today.

MEESE: Are there any drainage structures on site?

EICHENLAUB: At present there is no drainage on site. As I indicated the drainage runs freely off of the rear parking lot onto So. Maple. There are downspouts coming down the corners of the building at the low end and the leaders are buried underneath the sidewalk and to be perfectly honest with you, I am not sure where they go.

I will get into it but we are looking to make significant improvements with regard to the drainage.

MEESE: And what are the approximate setbacks of the building to both Park Avenue and So. Maple?

EICHENLAUB: Right now we have a setback at the front northwest corner of .5'6" and at the southwest corner of the building along So. Maple we've got .6, just over 7".

Along the front, Park Avenue, we have 1.2' off the front right-of-way or property line for approximately ½ of the building and then as you get to the northeast corner of the building, again along Park Avenue, we are just over 2 ½ feet setback.

MEESE: Would you please review the proposed site plan?

EICHENLAUB: The property consists of 22,577 sq ft of property...that's Lot 1, Block 1604. What we are looking to do is a proposed subdivision to obtain a slice of the property off of the park property, which measures approximately 11 ½ feet by approximately 125' long, which would add an additional 1,377 sq ft to the existing lot.

The new building we proposed along the northerly portion of the building is slightly larger than the building that presently exists; the increased footprint will extend back in a southerly direction into the existing parking lot.

The rear parking lot right now, as it exists, is parking along both the south side and the south side of the building and a row of parking in the middle of that parking lot. By pushing the proposed building back into the parking lot, we are decreasing that parking lot and the available parking spaces to us by approximately 20', so we end up with two rows of parking, one on either side of the main driveway aisle entering and exiting the site.

At present there are two access points to that parking lot. Two driveway cuts on to the south side, the north side of the parking lot and we are looking to eliminate those two driveway cuts and provide for one uniform driveway cut into the parking lot off of So. Maple. We are proposing 31 parking spaces, two of which would be handicapped and they would be located right off of the main rear entrance to the building and as the board engineer indicated, we will provide for the additional foot off of that handicapped aisle for access to the handicapped off of that back rear entrance. Instead of the four feet as shown here, it will be five feet.

The parking lot as it presently exists extends all the way to the south property line, the pavement actually encroaches beyond the property line and five feet of that will be removed and in its place we will provide for a planting strip of five feet along the south property line.

As it presently exists the site is not curbed. We are proposing that the parking lot be fully curbed.

The dumpster location is located at the east end of the parking lot beyond all of the parking. Drainage will flow in an east to west direction. We are proposing inlets at the west end of the parking lot, at the two corners of parking stall 16 and parking stall 1 and then again a trench drain along the mouth of the driveway entrance into the site. That drainage being

picked up will be routed into an underground retention system. There is no drainage along So. Maple right now so there is nothing we can tie into. The system itself will be a system of chambers underground, surrounded by crushed stone and the three structures that we are proposing, two inlets and trench drain will feed that system. That has all been sized up for a 25-year storm. We haven't even taken into consideration the percolation so in actuality it is an overdesigned system.

Walkways across the back of the building are being proposed for access to the six ingress points for the retail space. The seventh entrance would be to a rear lobby area, which would allow access to the second floor office space.

MEESE: There is a sidewalk along the parking lot as well as a ramp to get into the stores.

EICHENLAUB: The ramp that we talk about is in actuality a raised porch area across the rear of the retail space. Access at grade would be for the westerly half of the building would be just to the south of the bumped out area for building access...and to the east portion of the building, access to that porch or raised area would be at the east end.

MEESE: There are also stairs in the middle.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. At the midpoint of those two porched areas, there are steps.

MEESE: With respect to the building setback at the intersection, which has been a concern of the residents, can you describe what the setback is today and what the setback is as shown on the proposal.

EICHENLAUB: The setback as it exists today along So. Maple is 6" off the property line. We are proposing to maintain that 6"....5' to the west face of the building. At present the building setback along Park Avenue is 1.2' just under 3" and it is proposed that the base of the building itself be pushed back 10' off the property line and be an access area to those retail spaces, which would be setback 1'. That 1' off the property line would become a planter area.

MEESE: With the colonnade that was described by the architect.

EICHENLAUB: That's correct. The covered porch area.

To the northeast corner, within that 11 ½' strip, which is being subdivided off the park property, at present there is proposed a patio area, which would be an exterior or outside dining area with tables in the event that a restaurant would take occupancy of one of the retail spaces.

We have provided for, at the board's request, a two foot widening along Park Avenue on the south side. At present there is parking along Park Avenue on the south side. They are not delineated spaces and what that widening would do is you would have to relocate the existing standard street lights the municipality has along that stretch of Park Avenue and there are several street trees that would have to be relocated along that stretch.

We have maintained the existing standard paver strip between the sidewalk and the curb along the entire stretch of walkway along Park Avenue.

MEESE: What will the width of the sidewalk be in front of the colonnade?

EICHENLAUB: Sidewalk including pavers would be 6'.

MEESE: And that would be dressed up consistent with the downtown...

EICHENLAUB: Right, same paver strip and a brand new concrete sidewalk.

MEESE: What lighting have you proposed?

EICHENLAUB: Parking area – at present we are proposing shoe-box style fixtures, two along the north side of the parking lot and two along the south side of the parking lot, which will provide for the illumination of the parking area. The southerly fixtures will have house shields to shield down the outcast of light onto the condomumium property to the south and all of the light will be directed to the parking lot itself.

We are proposing landscaping along the parking stalls 1 and 16 on So. Maple and again across the south property line, the landscaping will be Uranemous (?) and that was picked because we've only got five feet of property and with snow removal, if any of that planting were to be damaged in the winter months, they are very hardy and will grow back. No problem in the spring. So even if the branches were snapped and broken with snow removal they will grow back.

MEESE: Is there a reason why street trees are not proposed along So. Maple Avenue?

EICHENLAUB: Along So. Maple right now the power lines and utility poles that exist that provide service down So. Maple are on our side of the property, they are on the east side of So. Maple. There is one Maple tree located off the southwest corner of the building now and that has been pruned back so much that it really is in a pretty bad state right now. They have had to prune it back because it has grown into the utility lines...electric, telephone and cable and as everybody has seen in the summer months, the Borough has a tree company going along pruning all these trees out and that is what happened to this tree.]

We didn't propose anything at this location 1) because of the narrowness of walkway and 2) we have a power line right above where those trees would be planted. Once those trees grow up they just keep getting pruned back and they end up in a state similar to the Maple tree that is there now.

Around the dumpster we proposed for screening American Arborvitae to screen the dumpster from the park property. The park property is actually at a higher elevation than our property. There is a retaining wall that exists right now along the east side of the driveway that exists, along the east side of the building. That retaining wall is a cement block wall and the differential is anywhere from about a foot at the north end to about 2 ½ to 3' at the southerly end of that retaining wall. So there is a grade differential and the park property is higher than our property.

We are providing for additional plantings along the east side of the property. We have some plums, some cherries, we have low flowering shrubs along our walkway at the east end of the parking lot and as I indicated the plantings that exist now along Park Avenue will be removed and replaced with new plantings.

There will be a slight change in grade to accommodate the drainage pattern on the property but most of that will be made up by an increase in pavement and resurfacing the parking lot. We are looking to create a crown in that parking lot so that half the drainage off that parking lot goes to the south and half to the north.

The roof leaders we've indicated will be tied into the drainage system. At this point we are just indicating the roof leader will be tied into the system, we are not sure exactly where those will come down in the building at this time but they will all be tied into the drainage system. The question being, should this system ever fill up and overflow and we got two severe storms in a row and the system were to fill up, the safety valve here would be the trench drain located at the mouth of the driveway. That would fill up

and back up there and simply run off and down the line of South Maple as it does today. We don't anticipate that. As I indicated earlier the system itself is overdesigned and hasn't even taken into account percolation. So it has been designed for the entire volume of a 25-year storm for both the building itself and the parking lot.

MEESE: Any questions for Mr. Eichenlaub?

OPPELT: The parking on Park Avenue as it exists today will be actually recessed closer to the building by 2'...what will that do to the line of sight as you're coming out of So. Maple?

EICHENLAUB: That's a good question. The line of sight that one has there now is really interrupted by the parking along Park Avenue. Yes, you have to go out beyond the corner of the building but the front end of your car would jut out and you would be able to see past that corner...what obstructs the view especially for cars coming in a westerly direction would be the parking along that side of the street, not necessarily the building.

One coming out of So. Maple and going in an easterly direction, there main concern would be the traffic coming in an easterly direction. The clear line of sight in a westerly direction is well over 400' and it is a 25 mph speed limit and that well exceeds the requirements for sight distance.

If a vehicle were coming out and making left hand turn going in a westerly direction there line of sight would be for traffic flowing on the opposite side of Park Avenue going in a westerly direction. It is not so much the building that creates the obstruction but the parking. So you have to creep out just behind those cars that park along Park Avenue to see those vehicles.

OPPELT: And moving it in two feet reduces that problem?

EICHENLAUB: It doesn't necessarily reduce that problem, the problem still exists and that's with the parking itself.

OPPELT: Then you might not be able to park that close to the corner.

EICHENLAUB: Right now there is a No Parking to Corner sign located where we show the end of that first stall. Basically it matches what is out there now.

SALUZZI: Don't we have a 25' sight triangle on the corners.

EICHENLAUB: That would be the corner, that's not the property. Is it slightly better than what we have there now, Yes, because you can see through the area and the only obstructions would be the columns within that covered porch area.

What you would be looking at is you would be looking through and looking at the parking along Park Avenue, unless you restrict the parking...that is where the problem is not the building.

MAGUIRE: To clarify...today the front wall of the building is 7' off the curb, right?

EICHENLAUB: About 8'.

MAGUIRE: With the new addition the front wall of that building is going to be 18' back?

EICHENLAUB: With the two foot widening you end up about 16' back.

MAGUIRE: So if there were no cars parking along Park Avenue, this would be a major improvement.

EICHENLAUB: A big improvement.

MAGUIRE: But it's the SUV's and the mini-vans and parking close to the corner, which is kind of what happened with the post office building...they had a problem pulling in and out of the post office so they had to put No Parking on the westerly side of the entrance.

EICHENLAUB: If it wasn't for the parking here, we'd have a line of sight off the corner of that building of well over 250' beyond the railroad tracks.

MAGUIRE: The buffer along the Park Ridge Crossings property to the rear, are those pines staying or are they coming down?

EICHENLAUB: They are not our pines, they are our neighbors' pines. The have been there since the Crossings were developed and they are full mature trees.

MAGUIRE: They're staying and there's going to be additional...

EICHENLAUB: Yes, lower growth which will shield any headlights from going through. Right now there's a split rail fence that exists but it appears that the split rail fence is on our neighbor's property. So there is no proposal to remove that.

MAGUIRE: You mentioned the park property and the difference in the elevation...what's the difference in the elevation?

EICHENLAUB: At the front of the property, at the northeast corner of our property basically the two properties meet...there might be an 8 or 9" differential, there are some larger rocks that were placed to retain the plantings on the park property.

As you go down the driveway in a southerly direction, the retaining wall increases in height. We have a top of the wall elevation at about the midpoint of the building of a 3' differential and as you proceed back just off the rear, the southeast corner of the proposed building, you've got a grade differential of about 2 ½'...so it is anywhere from 8 to 9" along Park Avenue to a high point of 3 to 3 ½' at midpoint of the wall and then back down to 2 ½' at the southerly end of the wall.

MAGUIRE: And that's a railroad tie wall.

EICHENLAUB: No, it's a segmental block...its cast stone.

MAGUIRE: And that's staying?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, it is not our property. That falls right now along the easterly side of that driveway.

VON BRADSKY: There's a note on Drawing 3 that says "outdoor dining area which will be eliminated at the time Bergen County requires easements"...would you explain that?

EICHENLAUB: We haven't sat with County...I know Mr. Meese has talked with them. Normally the County would take an easement as they did with the park property. Right now, the way we show it this patio area falls within a portion of the property we will obtain from the municipality and a portion of that patio falls within the 15' roadway easement.

VON BRADSKY: That's an easement off the park.

EICHENLAUB: Within the park property. Not our property. We're not offering any to them. The understanding is at this point, that they may not even request it from us. But that note pertains to the portion of the patio that falls on top of the easement that is now part of the park property.

MEESE: Verbally the County indicated they had no concern with respect to the outdoor dining in that location. They also indicated there was no plan to widen Park Avenue.

EICHENLAUB: That note has been added because they've asked for that type of note from us before when we've installed signs within their easements...they allow that to happen but they want everybody to be aware that if they come in and use that property, it is to be removed.

VON BRADSKY: So it is essentially just for future road widening.

EICHENLAUB: In the event they would ever widen the road.

SALUZZI: Does this retention system have to be maintained in any way?

EICHENLAUB: The catch basins are going to have to be cleaned. What it is, is instead of large pipe there are chambers that go in there and are surrounded by stone.

SALUZZI: There's no filters in there or anything like that.

EICHENLAUB: No, no...the bottom of the catch basins will have a sump so if there is any sand or grit in the parking lot during the winter months it would be trapped before it entered the retention system.

SALUZZI: And from what I see here, you prefer to have the overflow dump out right onto this street.

EICHENLAUB: No, no...we are not dumping it out directly onto the street. What will happen is if the system should fill up, and the only way the system would fill up is if we had two 25-year storms back to back...before the first one had a chance to percolate, it would come up out of that trench drain in the lower south corner and then go down to the street.

SALUZZI: You prefer that to tying it directly to a storm drain?

EICHENLAUB: There are no storm drains. If there was a storm drain we would tie directly into it. Right now, all this flow that comes off this back parking lot goes directly into So. Maple. Under our proposal we won't have that any longer. Not only is it helping the flow and any gutter flow along So. Maple but the drainage that does exist is well south of us on So. Maple and is going to reduce the flows to that as well. I believe that drainage goes down onto the school property behind the football field.

MITAL; So even on the furthest northeast corner of that building, you're going to take that leader and go all the way into that drainage field.

EICHENLAUB: Yes, this is at the low point of the property so any drainage coming off here we have more than sufficient retention and if there were anything coming off this front corner...any buried leaders at the northwest corner would certainly get into that system and there's no problem without drainage coming off the easterly end of the building and burying those leaders. There is more than sufficient detention in the system.

BOGART: I just have one question regarding the change of grading between the subject site and the park property. I think there is an opportunity there to either grade into the park so the outdoor dining area is at the same elevations as the subject property.

EICHENLAUB: I guess my question would be, all along this area of the park there is a significant amount of plantings that the borough has put in. As I indicated a wall extends all the way back beyond where the back of our building is proposed. Would it be your proposal to remove that entire wall and grade that entire stretch back? Now, what we are talking about is grading well into....I indicated at the south end of that wall you have about a 2 to 21/2' wall and then the grade goes up at a decent pitch to an elevation of 150. You're going to be grading significantly into that property.

BOGART: What about maybe the first 20 or 30' of that property where the wall is much lower...you could grade out there and meet the retaining wall to the south.

EICHENLAUB: It would certainly be a lot easier to grade that portion. That would be the northwest corner of the park area. It is a lot easier to grade that because the grades are quite as high. If you've been out there you can see they just rebuilt the retaining walls up there and there are retaining walls all along Park Avenue to this northwest corner...so all those retaining walls would have to be taken down as well.

I believe those may be the railroad tie walls.

BOGART: I just think there is an opportunity there to create a nice public space between the retail.

MEESE: One thought on that...at this point we are not sure what that space is going to be used for. We designed it so it could be a restaurant. If it is a restaurant it could be an Italian restaurant, a French restaurant or a pizza parlor. Each use would have a different thought as to how to position their outdoor dining. What I would recommend is that issue be saved until there is a tenant that's going to utilize it because it may be a shoe store or a lighting store, in which case there won't be anything out there at all.

BOGART: I guess from my perspective regardless of what it is, even if it is a shoe store, you still have an opportunity to create some connections between the retail uses and the public green space, which is one of the goals in the Master Plan for a number of years now and I am just asking if the applicant and borough is willing to regrade that area or look into regarding that area as part of this application.

MEESE: We can certainly discuss that with you. Are you looking for something like an access point to bring a walkway in?

BOGART: Just to open it up a little bit because right now there is a big separation because of the retaining wall and it is a shame that that park is not as visible from the retail space. So if we could just open it up a little bit I think it would be appropriate.

MAGUIRE: I think that is a good idea, I do like the idea of pulling it together. I will certainly discuss that with the Mayor and Council since they did spend a lot of money to redo the park and those plantings. I think if we could tie the two together if there was a proposal, I would certainly bring that back.

MEESE: Maybe we could have an on-site meeting between the planner and Mr. Eichenlaub to better outline what you have in mind?

BOGART: Ok.

BEER: I would include Councilman Maguire with that because it is Borough property and over the past three years the council has spent a great deal of money in putting in all those plantings and the new wall. This board doesn't have the total authority but perhaps the representative could sit there.

BOGART: My other question goes back to the parallel parking on Park Avenue and that one space to the right of Maple. Is there any way we can eliminate that space so cars do not park there?

EICHENLAUB: We've only shown that because parking exists there now.

MEESE: That would also be a Councilman Maguire issue.

TEN HOEVE: Maybe not.

BOGART: My suggestion is maybe we could look at modifying the sidewalk width from Maple to the second space so you would basically just be extending the curb out a little bit further?

EICHENLAUB: To be honest with you I thought that might be a concern of the County and that they would bring that up. Where you would actually bring that curb further out behind that stall to create a situation where you would allow the cars to go further out into the intersection.

TEN HOEVE: And have no car parked blocking the view.

EICHENLAUB: We are showing delineated spaces, there are none there now. We wouldn't have a problem if you wanted to eliminate one of these spaces because who is to say how many are there now. You could fit this number because as I said, they are not delineated at this time.

MAGUIRE: Would that also help define the sidewalk crossing?

BOGART: Yes, and give a larger space for pedestrians to cross. I think that would be a good move.

MITAL: And significantly increase the sight line.

EICHENLAUB: As I indicated for people coming out of Maple and going in an easterly direction because they are looking west at that traffic coming up upon them...they have a clear line of sight. There is parking along the stretch of Park Avenue, which is to the west of us but that curb line is much further to the south and it gives them a much greater line of sight.

The concern here with the parking is that when someone is coming out of So. Maple and making a left turn and going in a westerly direction, they've got to be looking at the oncoming traffic from the east. That is the concern here. So you do have a little bit more leeway and if that curb line were to extend out, that would allow them to move out into that intersection a little bit further and they could see that traffic. So that would certainly increase and provide for greater line of sight.

TEN HOEVE: You would need to get the county to approve that as well, I assume.

EICHENLAUB: Yes.

MANCUSO: Continuing along those lines, would you be able to define that sight triangle so when you do approach the County the information would be available?

EICHENLAUB : We don't have a problem with that. Without the cars there, we have a clear line of sight right up to the Broadway intersection beyond the railroad track but again, it is the cars that are parked along there that create the obstruction of view.

MANCUSO: Perhaps eliminating and even providing some striping or *no parking within 50' of the intersection,* something along those lines.

EICHENLAUB: Make the existing *no parking to corner* sign, which exists right now at the west end of our last stall here, could be slid up here and eliminate that one stall. That's where we would start the striping.

TEN HOEVE: So you are willing to revise the plan to show all of those changes?

EICHENLAUB: I think what we've got to do is meeting with the County. The County does have these plans and are in the process of reviewing. Soil Conversation has these plans and they are in the process of reviewing. I think this is certainly something we can talk to Eric Timsak about (planner @ County).

BOGART: We did receive a letter from the County asking us for our recommendations so I think they may be Ok with that.

One more question regarding the lighting fixtures. I know the shoebox you are recommending in the back parking lot and is that because it provides a better shield?

EICHENLAUB: A better shield and I just think we get a better cast of lighting. In the past we have used your standard fixtures that you have on Park Avenue and Kinderkamack Road. We've used those in lots and I believe we have those up in the Municipal parking lot off Hawthorne Avenue. I think you need more of them to create the light that the shoeboxes provide and we can get the shields on these to downcast the light off the property line. We would need more of the lantern style fixtures if we used those.

BOGART: And would that create more glare than the shoebox?

EICHENLAUB: With the shoebox everything is cast down, with the lanterns it is cast out so you would see the fixture and the light with the lanterns. With the shoebox, unless you were directly underneath it and looking up you wouldn't see it.

BOGART: So maybe this is a case for the shoebox. Thank you.

MANCUSO: In the rear parking lot, is it the intent to keep the lights on all evening on or will they be shut off at a certain point in time when the stores and offices are closed.

EICHENLAUB: They certainly can be put on a timer, say an hour after the stores have closed that they go off. I'm sure there will be building mounted fixtures on architectural features for security purposes but it's not necessary to have the lights on in the parking lot all night.

VON BRADSKY: I don't know if you addressed it....parking stall numbers...is there any variance required at all?

EICHENLAUB: I'm sorry, there is. We are seeking a parking variance. We require 37 spaces and we're providing 31. I think Mr. Meese spoke to that in his opening remarks. There is a parking variance of six.

VON BRADSKY: And that's for the combined retail and offices upstairs?

EICHENLAUB: That's correct. We've broken down the parking requirements...if you refer to Sheet 4 of 7, our note #30...parking calculations...our calculations are spelled out right there. It also takes into account the allowable deductions in the zone for office and retail space.

We require 16 spaces for the office space and 21 parking stalls for the retail stores for a total of 37.

VON BRADSKY: And in addition to what you are providing in the plan, you have 6 or 7 spots in the front.

EICHENLAUB: Yes, but we didn't include them, it's not our parking.

VON BRADSKY: I know but the reality is...

EICHENLAUB: We can't include them but they certainly can be used, that's the intent but we did not include them.

MITAL: Anyone else from the board or professionals? No? Then I would like to extend the opportunity to the audience to come forward and ask questions. You are going to have plenty of time, once we wrap this up to come up and voice your opinions. So come forward and identify yourself again.

George Mayer, 159A So. Maple came forward.

MAYER: If you are going to give up those six parking spaces in the parking lot that now exist, isn't it likely that those people are going to park on Park Avenue, again obstructing the line of sight.

EICHENLAUB: I am not giving up any spaces in the parking lot.

MAYER: But you are required to have 37 and you only have 31.

EICHENLAUB: Correct, that's the variance we are looking for.

MAYER: You will have six fewer spaces than the law requires. So those people who would have parked there will be forced to park on Park Avenue or So. Maple making the condition even worse.

EICHENLAUB: But that's all hypothetical anyway...the parking along Maple is for the retail establishments.

MAYER: I just wanted to make it clear...

EICHENLAUB: No, I understand...I understand.

Deidre Burns...from the condos came forward.

BURNS: He said So. Maple, it is only one side. Right now across where the other stores are, across Maple on the west side, they are so full they ask their employees....

TEN HOEVE: No, you have to ask a question of the witness. You will have an opportunity to say what you are saying in a few minutes.

BURNS: How do you plan on having a retail store with what comes to approximately 3 parking places. Even the businesses upstairs, say an attorney, would have himself, his secretary and if he had only one client there, say in a divorce, he would have two cars and that would be four parking spaces for each place upstairs, which is less and for retail stores downstairs, shouldn't they have more? With only three customers, they would go out of business.

EICHENLAUB: There are no assigned parking spaces, it is all based on square footage not on the number of employees.

BURNS: I know, but it doesn't seem reasonable.

EICHENLAUB: Well, to be honest with you, the parking we are providing here is substantially more than a lot of the establishments have along Park Avenue. And I would venture to guess, to be perfectly honest with you, that there may be times when somebody who is going across the street will be using the parking stalls here. The may come into one of our retail spaces and then run across the street to get something at the bagel shop, the liquor store and run up to Cycle Sport and they would be using one of ours.

We have substantially more parking than any of the other establishments in the area.

BURNS: The one on the west side is always full. You can't get into their parking lot usually. There employees have to park along So. Maple which prevents the people who live on Maple from using that area.

EICHENLAUB: There are no restrictions to parking. Parking is available and people are going to use it.

BURNS: It's not really available.

EICHENLAUB: If there is no parking available in the parking lot, they are going to do one of two things. They are going to look for parking on the street or they are just not going to go in.

MITAL: Point being there are 37 required and you are providing 31...that is part of the variance they are asking for and is certainly something we are going to take into consideration.

BURNS: Please do.

Joseph Carlo, 5A South Maple Avenue.

CARLO: On So. Maple Avenue you have a line drawn straight on the left side and right side but actually, if you drive down So. Maple where Krell Lighting is, the road juts .... It's only 20' wide and then when you get to the condos it's 30' wide. What happens is, if you have a truck coming out of there and they go to head north on So. Maple they are going to be turning into the lane of people coming this way because the road is only 23' ...it's not 30' like everywhere else in town. If you notice the jut out there, it's a serious problem.

TEN HOEVE: What's the question you want to ask him?

CARLO: I'm asking him on the diagram if it is 23' or 30'...

EICHENLAUB: The change in the street occurs to the south of us after the end of the southern end of our property. As you indicated it is wider in front of the condos.

CARLO: That's our big problem, getting in and out. If a truck would come out of your parking lot, it can't make a hard right without going into the incoming lane.

Also with fire apparatus coming in and out, it's the same thing. The road is very narrow. Are you considering widening it to the same as So. Maple because that would alleviate a lot of the problem.

EICHENLAUB: First I am going to start by saying the widening you are looking for would be on our side of the property.

CARLO: That is correct because it is your property that juts out into So. Maple Avenue, no one else's does.

EICHENLAUB: Right now, we have been told that we cannot move the utility pole on the corner and as I indicated, we have 8' of sidewalk now along this stretch of So. Maple on the west side. To widen that reduces the sidewalk down to 6'.

Again, we have been told by the utility company that we cannot move that pole.

CARLO: Isn't it the Park Ridge the Utility Company?

EICHENLAUB: Yes.

CARLO: And they wouldn't let you move the pole?

EICHENLAUB: They do not want to see that pole relocated.

CARLO: And as far as your drainage...you're saying there are no storm drains on So. Maple, would you consider tying them into Park Avenue because if there is two 25-year storms, we're just going to come up at the edge of that driveway and go right across the street and right into the parking complex of the building.

I've seen a lot of flooding in Hillsdale and in Park Ridge and that water is going to wipe out that guys property across the street. So you should tie the drainage into Park Avenue if you are going to tie them in.

EICHENLAUB: There is no drainage on Park Avenue.

CARLO: And you are telling me there is no drainage on So. Maple?

EICHENLAUB: Please let me finish. There is drainage on So. Maple all the way at the south end, down towards Forino and that area. The drainage along Park Avenue is all the way down by the convenience store.

CARLO: There is no drainage on Park Avenue?

EICHENLAUB: Not up at that section.

CARLO: Then where is all that water going to go in an emergency?

EICHENLAUB: I understand, that's one of the reasons we've done what we've done. There is no drainage there now. If we didn't put this drainage in you would still have the drainage continue to run off that back parking lot.

What we've done is we've provided for drainage that we would normally provide for a virgin site that was just developing. By far this is a big time improvement for the drainage off of this property.

CARLO: So you're not worried...
(engineer and resident both began to talk at one time)

MITAL: So, Rick, what you're saying is you're improving the existing conditions.

EICHENLAUB: Substantially, with regard to the drainage.

CARLO: But now what happens if there are two storms? Then you'll be getting all the water off all the gutters, all the leaders, all the parking lot, all coming out to So. Maple.

TEN HOEVE: That is not what he said.

CARLO: Before it was getting dispersed all over the property now it is coming out to one spot.

TEN HOEVE: That is not what he said. He is saying he is taking the leaders and putting them into a drainage structure underneath that doesn't exist there now.

CARLO: And what he is saying is that drainage structure, if it overflows, it is going...

TEN HOEVE: Right, but if it happened right now it would be worse than it will be when those drainage structures are there.

CARLO: That is not true.

TEN HOEVE: Well, that's what he's telling you.

EICHENLAUB: I'm trying to explain that what we are proposing here is going to provide for big time.....

CARLO: And the other thing, as far as the 20'...do you need a variance for the side yard setback from So. Maple Avenue? According to this, you're supposed to be 20' back from that curb line to the beginning of that building.

EICHENLAUB: The 10' front yard setback?

CARLO: Not front yard, I'm talking about side yard from So. Maple Avenue according to this letter. You should be 20' and are you asking for another variance?

EICHENLAUB: I think what you are talking about is ....

CARLO: 20' along Maple is required, that is what that letter says. 20' is giving a lot. I would like to see maybe 10' but 20' from So. Maple Avenue to the beginning of this building is what code is and to give them within 1'.

EICHENLAUB: The code for building setback is 10'.

CARLO: Ok.

EICHENLAUB: The parking requires 20' and we are looking for 4'.

CARLO: No, the parking requires....

EICHENLAUB: Along the front yard.

CARLO: But if you went to the 10' then you could pick up your original parking spot and not have trouble with those 37 spots.

EICHENLAUB: I can't get any more parking on the site.

CARLO: If you were to move the building back 10' from So. Maple...

EICHENLAUB: That wouldn't do it.

CARLO: You wouldn't get those extra spots there?

EICHENLAUB: No.

CARLO: How are you going to handle a truck coming out of there trying to make a right? They will wind up being in the incoming lane.

EICHENLAUB: What you've got to understand...

MITAL: We are beyond the point of questioning...I would like to give others the opportunity to come up and resolve any questions they may have.
Any more questions?

TEN HOEVE: You have no other witnesses, is that correct?

MEESE: That's correct.

TEN HOEVE: Now is the opportunity for anyone who wishes to testify and say anything they would like to say to come forward and be sworn and you are no longer limited to questions, you can provide any testimony you would like. Now you need to be sworn in though.

Karen Mania Humphrey, 2 Conklin Avenue, Hillsdale, NJ came forward and was sworn.

HUMPHREY: I happen to be the owner of Mania's Hair Styling, his sister. Someone had mentioned earlier about parking on So. Maple. Mania's employees do not park on So. Maple. We cannot park on So. Maple, we park back here behind the fire house all week and on Saturdays we park at the commuter lot. So it is not an issue with parking.

MITAL: Thank you.

Ella Toms, 9B So. Maple came forward and was sworn.

TOMS: At the risk of sounding repetitive, I just want to raise my concern about the parking issue. We do have one hour parking on So. Maple, which we worked very hard to get because we only have that one site to park on. I'm very, very concerned about the amount of parking spaces that are going in. I know we talked about it but I just want you to know that I'm very concerned about it.

I'm looking at six stores and four offices and I know this is hypothetical, but you put one nail salon in there and you are going to have 12 more parking spots going in. I just wanted to let you know.

MITAL: Thank you very much.

Erwin Greenberg, 105B So. Maple Avenue came forward and was sworn.

GREENBERG: I am only concerned about the size of the building and the intersection at Park Avenue and So. Maple. The traffic on Park Avenue is increasing daily. When I come out of the driveway here and reach that corner, I have to edge out into Park Avenue to see what is coming from the right and the cars on Park Avenue going east, they don't slow down and it is very difficult to get into Park Avenue whether I make a right turn or a left turn.

This problem has to be addressed. We're 114 families here plus the commercial building and the apartments on the west side of the street. You got Forino. I don't think you can see 400' as the engineer testified.

I don't know how else to express it. This is something we have to consider. You have to consider us living in the condos.

TEN HOEVE: Did you hear the testimony that was given tonight regarding changes that were requested by the borough planner? They are moving the building 10' back from where it is now, there's going to be an open porch that will enable you to see through and more importantly, they are going to redesign that intersection so that no car can park at that corner and the sidewalk and walkway will come all the way out to make it better than it is right now.

GREENBERG: You're talking about that one particular corner where he is going to put some stuff so we can see through it. Right now there is the power pole and the corner of the building. You are not changing anything.

TEN HOEVE: Yes, the building is being moved back 10', it's being cut at a 45 degree angle, parking spaces are being moved and their engineer testified that the view is really parked by the cars parked there, not by the new structure that is being proposed.

GREENBERG: The cars that park there go across the street to shop but from what I saw the corner of the building remains where it is now. The back of the building going north on So. Maple is going to be cut in at 45 degrees....

EICHENLAUB: The corner of the building that is blocking your view will not be there. There will be a column there. That corner is back 10'. You will pass that corner 10' sooner as you are driving.

GREENBERG: I still see it as an obstruction. If you have the corner of a building or a column or something, there is an obstruction there. You have to do something to make it possible to get in and out of So. Maple. We have no other means of getting in and out of So. Maple Avenue. We can only go on to Park Avenue and the traffic is horrific. They don't slow down and that's my objection. I think you have to consider the people who live in the condos and the private houses and Forino.

MITAL: I can assure you we are absolutely considering it and just the fact that was just described and what Mr. Eichenlaub described before I personally feel is a significant change. With the building being moved back 10'...I know you keep reiterating that there will be a column there but they are improving it and I think even more so with the moving of that parking space.

I wish there was that triangulated, graphic depiction of that sight line being improved and then you could graphically see the improvement of

that sight line, which is something that might be added to a drawing in the very near future.

GREENBERG: And you also have to consider people from No. Maple entering onto Park Avenue. It is really a hairy situation.

MITAL: Thank you.

Joseph Carlo, 5A So. Maple Avenue came forward and was sworn.

CARLO: One question about this utility pole that they say can't be removed. I can't understand it. You can build a building but can't remove a utility pole? Is it an expense problem? I see them putting in poles in town all the time and wires.

MAGUIRE: I can't specifically give you too much but the background there is that's the feeder cable coming in from PSE&G. So we have two main feeder cables into the Park Ridge substation that come out of Hillsdale. They come up So. Maple and that pole is carrying...and actually right now they are upgrading...you know about the outages...they are upgrading the cables and the new cable they are putting on is a much heavier cable. So they are actually going through town putting in a lot of new poles because they are having to reduce the spaces between the poles because of the heavier cable.

PSE&G actually engineer those pole locations for a certain distance because of the weight of the cables. I don't know but they have apparently looked at it and do not want to move it but that is what is going on. They are actually engineering the weight that goes on that pole to support that cable.

CARLO: Would you just consider moving the pole and widening the street to 30' from 23' so they don't have a problem with the people coming in an out? If a truck comes out you can see they can't make a right hand turn. He is going to be in the other side of the road and it is going to create a lot of problems. Then you have the Mania hair salon parking lot. We have 300 cars from So. Maple...114 units at two cars each, Forino's place plus all those other houses plus Mania's parking lot plus another 31 or 37, so you have 400 cars and that's a lot. It's going to happen.

I think this is the time to widen the road and make it 30' all the way through. Call the utility company and do it right and that would fix that whole intersection. That's the right way to do it.

And the drainage...find a way to tie it into Park Avenue or So. Maple because that is going to come back to bite you down the road. That water is going to come right out of that lip and go right into that parking lot. We've all been through the storms. We had 9" two years ago and we had Floyd in '99 and it is going to come back. That's it.

MITAL: Thank you.

Hazel Greenberg, 105B So. Maple Avenue came forward and was sworn.

GREENBERG: I'm still concerned about trucks because I live on this street and they have great difficulty. It is a very narrow street. The big trucks that come to make deliveries cannot get through if there is a truck parked on one side, it is hard for a car to get through but for a big truck, it is almost impossible. I was watching a delivery that went to Forino's and the guy did not know how to bring the truck in because there was a big truck parked on So. Maple. He had to call somebody out and they had to back the truck in and it turned around on Park Ridge Crossing's parking lot. It is a great

danger. You couldn't get a fire engine through there. It was difficult when Krell was there. They have flammables there. So how are you going to get deliveries and how are we going to do that problem with the big trucks passing through having no room to make the turn and make their deliveries?

MITAL: Thank you.

GREENBERG: I hope you will be able to look into that aspect because it is a problem.

MITAL: Thank you.

Shari Fried, 7A So. Maple came forward and was sworn.

FRIED: I just had a concern...I mean the design looks beautiful but in this day and age and the economy when you see so many buildings closed...I'm a big fan of going to Ridgewood and all those buildings are closed there and Park Ridge is beautiful but to make so many stores. Is there any way to reduce it because it just seems with everybody upset about the parking situation, to maybe make it not so many stores?

I'm going to miss Krell Lighting, it was such a nice store and I wanted them to rebuild it but if it is not going to happen that way, maybe not make as many stores because if you do get a place like a coffee shop, which will attract kids, you have to think of those things too.

If people are upset about condos, you have to think about noise and all those other factors involved, maybe not make it as big if they're so concerned over the parking. It is beautiful...the plans look beautiful but it just seems like with the bad economy to make all those stores...is there going to be a turnaround of losing those stores and losing the business and everything. You hope that it does well but if a business closes down and they're not there anymore and it's a turnaround. These things happen all the time. Maybe not make as many stores and then they don't have to be as concerned about the parking situation and all that other stuff.

It's just a thought. It looks so pretty but it looks too much in such a not big area. That was just my concern over everything. You've got to think about the economy. It is very pretty.

MITAL: Thank you.

Peggy Jacobson, 113A So. Maple came forward and was sworn.

JACOBSON: This is just to change the whole subject. I'm concerned about pedestrians. Crossing So. Maple in front of where Krell's was, I don't know what it is about So. Maple but no one stops to look to see if a car is coming. I'm concerned mostly about the school children. They walk along talking and it was alright when I went to school in Park Ridge...there was like five people in the street. Now they walk and it is from here over to there, talking away and they just cross that.

If there was some way since you are building this beautiful new building and take that...the *no parking* on the street would help that visibility a little bit but what can we do to make pedestrians, joggers...no one stops, I'm telling you...whether they are going east or west they just keep going and because our visibility is so bad we can't see them.

I've seen walking through town, close calls, where "oh, there's a car there" as they are touching the car. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention. If there is some way where the signs are *no parking from here to corner*, 9 times out of 10 there's a car parked there. Both in front of Magic Cleaners and Krells...

TEN HOEVE: That you should speak to the Police Department about.

JACOBSON: We have, we have and not only that, they also make U turns in that area. It's a nightmare. But I am more concerned about the children crossing the streets and I don't know what can be done to make everybody stop there and look. That's all. Thanks so much.

MITAL: Thank you very much. Anyone else? No?

TEN HOEVE: You are going to make revisions to the plan, resubmit it and come back on September 15th?

MEESE: I guess so if that was a question.

BEER: And your professionals will be able to have everything in by September 8th or 9th and that really wasn't a question.

TEN HOEVE: And for the public, the hearing will be continued on September 15th. You won't get any additional notice.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion made by Mr. O'Donoghue to approve the minutes of the closed session for June 23, 2010 as written.,
Second by Mr. Von Bradsky

AYES: Mr. Mesiano, Mr. O'Donoghue, Mr. Von Bradsky, Ms. Eisen, Mr. Browne, Mr. Oppelt, Councilman Maguire, Mr. Mital
ABSTAIN: Mr. Saluzzi

Motion made by Mr. Oppelt to approve the minutes of the public hearing of June 23, 2010 as written.
Second by Ms. Eisen

AYES: Mr. Mesiano, Mr. O'Donoghue, Mr. Von Bradsky, Ms. Eisen, Mr. Browne, Mr. Oppelt, Councilman Maguire, Mr. Mital\
ABSTAIN: Mr. Saluzzi

**MAJOR SUBDIVISION:**

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

**WHEREAS, L.C. DEVELOPERS, LLC**, Grand, North Fifth and Lafayette, officially known as Lots 3 & 28 in Block 1001, on the Tax map of the Borough of Park Ridge, had posted Performance Bond in the amount of $234,348.12, of which 10% was a Cash Performance Bond in the amount of $26,038.68; and

**WHEREAS**, the Performance Bond was reduced in July 2008 to a total of $137,446.80; and

**WHEREAS**, the developer has completed part of the required Landscape Plan and has submitted a Landscape As-Built detailing the plantings on two of the lots, said lots now known as Lots 34 and 28; and

**WHEREAS**, the remaining two lots, now known as Lots 33 and 3 are still to be completed as required by the approved Landscape Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant has requested a bond reduction; and

**WHEREAS**, the board planning consultant has both reviewed the As-Built Plan and conducted an on-site inspection and has submitted a report dated July 22, 2010, copy of which is attached.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the **PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE** that the Cash Performance Bond be reduced in an amount that retains $11,950.00 for the completion of the remaining landscaping.

Offered by Mr. Mesiano
Second by Mr. Oppelt

AYES: Mr. Mesiano, Mr. O'Donoghue, Mr. Von Bradsky, Ms. Eisen, Mr. Oppelt, Councilman Maguire, Mr. Saluzzi, Mr. Mital
ABSTAIN: Mr. Browne

**ADJOURN;**

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Helyn N. Beer
Secretary

10:21pm.