Minutes of the Park Ridge Planning Board
Meeting of May 23, 2012 – 8:00pm

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, Don Schwamb, on the above date, time and place.

Chairman called for the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL: Present: Ms. Eisen, Messrs. Ludwig, Mesiano, Metzdorf, O'Donoghue, Schwamb, Councilman Misciagna, Mayor Maguire
Absent: Messrs. Browne, Mital, Von Bradsky
Also Present: William Rupp, Esq., Board Attorney
Eve Mancuso, PE, Board Engineer
Brigette Bogart, PP, Planning Consultant

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The Notice for this meeting required by Section 3(d) of the Open Public Meetings Act has been provided by the adoption of a resolution by the Park Ridge Planning Board on January 11, 2012, setting forth a schedule of regular meetings, by mailing of said schedule to the Record and The Review on January 12, 2012 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

There was no one.

PUBLIC HEARING:

P.R.A.H., LLC – 38 & 40 Park Avenue NBD
Lots: 10 & 11 Block: 1601

David L. Rutherford, Esq., Ridgewood, New Jersey came forward appearing on behalf of P.R.A.H.LLC. together with Dr. Donna Mandarino, Louis Mandarino and Richard Eichenlaub, PE.

RUTHERFORD: If the board would indulge me, I would like to make a brief opening statement just to explain why we are here and to review the nature of the relief we seek. We seek preliminary and final site plan approval and related variances and waivers as submission requirements.

We seek to demolish the existing building, the old post office building on Lot 10, which is 38 Park Avenue and construct a new two-story building with basement on Lot 10, the first and second floor of which will be the new home of the Park Ridge Animal Hospital and the second floor of which will contain one one-bedroom unit and two two-bedroom apartment units.

We also seek to expand and renovate the existing building on Lot 11, which is 40 Park Avenue...that's the existing Animal Hospital Building so as to make it suitable for commercial purposes and we propose two affordable housing units on the second floor of that building.

We do not propose to merge the lots. Rather, we propose a shared parking arrangement which will be accomplished by a cross-easement agreement subject to the review and approval of Mr. Rupp. This will give both properties the right to use the common driveway on Lot 10 and to share the parking area likely with some designated parking for the specific uses.

We believe that this shared parking arrangement and common driveway arrangement is consistent with the purpose and intent of the NBD zone of the ordinance, which encourages such arrangements and, indeed, offers incentives for developers who do engage in shared parking and combined lots. So, in this case, while the lots are not going to be technically merged, they are going to be developed and used in a cooperative fashion.

In addition to the site plan, we seek an impervious lot coverage variance for Lot 10...we're seeking 83.58% where only 75% is permitted. We're seeking a front yard setback variance on Lot 11, this is an existing condition. The existing Animal Hospital Building is 6.9' from the front lot line, where 10' is required, while we will be exacerbating that by going up one floor we will be no closer to Park Avenue than we are at present once construction is complete. We also seek a side yard parking setback. We propose no side yard parking setback, where 5' is required. This, however, is in the portion of the property where Lots 10 and 11 abut each other. We do comply with the 5' setback around the other perimeter of the property, it is where the two parking areas come together that we do not propose a setback, which in our opinion would defeat the very purpose of the shared parking arrangement that we propose.

With respect to the improved lot covered variance and Mr. Eichenlaub will address this, while the lots are not merging, they are, as I have indicated, connected in a sense that the parking is shared. Coverage by improvements, when considering total coverage of the area in both lots, is about 58%, well under the 75% that is permitted.

The front yard setback, as I indicated a moment ago is existing and is being exacerbated only in the sense of the proposed second floor.

We believe we have uses that are all compliant with the ordinance and we believe will represent a very nice improvement, not only to this property but the entire downtown area of Park Ridge.

Now, with regard to construction sequence and I should be clear...we seek approval for the entire project as presented to you this evening. From a logistical however, and a construction staging point of view, and also to meet requirements of our lender, we expect that the first floor and basement on the new building on Lot 10 will be built first. The existing Animal Hospital building will then be renovated and expanded because Dr. Mandarino needs a place to go and once that is accomplished, the last phase of the project will be the construction of the second floor of the new building with the three residential units. However, I emphasize that we present the entire plan and we seek approval for the entire plan at this time.

Over my right shoulder is Mr. Elliot Urdang, an attorney representing the Park Ridge Synagogue is certainly able to speak for himself and certainly will speak at the proper time. His client has raised some concerns and we have spoken with Mr. Urdang and a representative of his client this evening and they have consulted with our engineer and we are prepared to address whatever concerns Mr. Urdang's client may have with regard to development of this property. We certainly want to be good neighbors.

Elliot Urdang, Esq., Tenafly, New Jersey came forward.

URDANG: Elliot Urdang, appearing on behalf of Temple Beth Sholom of Pascack Valley, an adjacent property owner. What Mr. Rutherford said is eminently correct. We have no objection to the application. We had some concerns, prior to the meeting, for the last couple of days and I've had conversations with Mr. Rutherford and tonight, both with Mr. Rutherford, his client and most importantly, Mr. Eichenlaub because our principal concerns were about drainage.

I think we have received answers that are satisfactory and that might help us move this along for the applicant as I am not here in an adversarial role.

Thank you.

RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have taken the liberty, in the interest of time to have pre-marked the first eight exhibits that I intend to use and with your consent, I will hand them to your secretary.

We will be addressing those exhibits and will be referring to each of them as we proceed. I think almost all of them, with perhaps one exception, the Board already has and are consistent with the memos of your professionals and the plans that we've already filed. I've included the Affidavit of Service and publication.

With that, if the Board pleases, I would like to proceed with Mr. Eichenlaub.

Richard Eichenlaub, PE, R&L Engineering, 24 Wampum Place, Park Ridge came forward and was sworn.

RUTHERFORD: You are a professional engineer with the State of New Jersey?

EICHENLAUB: I am.

RUTHERFORD: How long have you been such an engineer?

EICHENLUAB: 30 years.

RUTHERFORD: Give us a brief summary of your educational background.

EICHENLAUB: Attended the University of Lowell, Mass...received B.S. in Civil Engineering in 1977...passed P.E. exam in 1981 in New Jersey...received my license in State of New York later than year.

RUTHERFORD: You have testified as an expert in the field of professional engineering before planning and zoning boards in the State of New Jersey?

EICHENLAUB: Many, many times.

RUTHERFORD: You have appeared before this Board as well?

EICHENLAUB: Even more...

RUTHERFORD: And have been accepted by them as an expert in the field of professional engineering?

EICHENLAUB: I have.

RUTHERFORD: I offer Mr. Eichenlaub as a professional in the field of professional engineering,

Mr. Eichenlaub, you prepared a six page plan, dated February 7, 2011...all sheets but Sheet 2 revised on April 20...Sheet 2 having been revised on April 24, 2012...is that correct?

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

RUTHERFORD: And that is the plan you have now put on the easel?

EICHENLAUB: Yes. Actually that cover sheet is just a colored rendering of the site layout.

RUTHERFORD: Otherwise, with that sole exception, what is marked on the easel and what you will be referring to during the course of your testimony is what was filed with the Board.
EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Rupp, I have marked that as Exhibit A-2, that is on the Exhibit list.

Mr. Eichenlaub, I would like you to refer initially, I think, to the existing conditions map and describe for the Board, existing Lots 10 and 11.

EICHENLAUB: This property is known as Lots 10 & 11 in Block 1601. It is located along the south side of Park Avenue, just to the west of the Pascack Brook. I'm sure the Board is familiar with this property, it is the old post office and it is the Park Ridge Animal Hospital occupying those two lots.

As I indicated it is along the south side of Park Avenue. It is located within the NB, Neighborhood Business District and the operations and improvements and upgrades we are looking to form on these two lots are all in compliance with that zone regulations.

RUTHERFORD: Lot 11, at the moment is improved with a one-story building, which as you indicated presently houses the Animal Hospital.

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

RUTHERFORD: And one of the other features of Lot 11 is that there is quite a bit of parking area that surrounds the building on its west and south and easterly sides, is that correct.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. Right now access to that particular lot is through a single driveway located on the west side of the building, off of Park Avenue which allows access to that back parking lot area.

RUTHERFORD: You mentioned the Pascack Brook...would you just outline for the Board, very briefly, what some of the limitations the Pascack Brook places upon the applicant's ability to develop this property?

EICHENLAUB: I will refer to this map....the top of the bank which controls the buffers is located along that dashed line, right along the top of the bank. The second dashed line is located 25' off of that top of bank, which is referred to as a *buffer* to the stream. Now again, a good portion within that buffer is our existing parking lot, which we are looking to remove under this proposal. It will be revegitated with natural plantings and lawn area. The actual plantings that we will be providing within that buffer area will be dictated to us by the DEP.

RUTHERFORD: What you are suggesting is that all of the macadam on existing Lot 11, but for what is shown on your site plan will be removed, both within and without the required buffer area subject to DEP approval and supervision.

EICHENLAUB: Absolutely. On our plan, we have indicated that initially....as a number of board members will recall, we were before the Board initially a number of years back for approval for improvements to Lot 11. At that time we went down to DEP and obtained permits from DEP to do work on Lot 11...that is the existing Animal Hospital.

Under that proposal, the parking lot was to remain, the buffers were established with the buffer extended over the parking lot and we were not going to make any further improvements within that buffer area.

We are now back down in front of DEP with our new application and the changes are that we want to remove all of this pavement that we were originally going to maintain for the operations of the Animal Hospital as it existing under our application several years ago.

We no longer need that asphalt and there is really absolutely no sense in keeping the asphalt within that buffer, where we can remove it and actually revegitate it and plant it with natural plantings, native plantings in that area...and that again, is what we will be discussing with DEP...what specific plantings they are going to want in that buffer.

RUTHERFORD: Would you talk generally about the topography of Lots 10 and 11.

EICHENLAUB: Both lots are basically graded from a high point along Park Avenue to a low point at the back property line, which is the south property line of both properties.

With respect to Lot 10, we've got a high point of 119.24 and that's located in the north/west corner of that driveway cut entry into the existing post office site. The low point on that particular lot is located at the back south/east corner and that is at elevation 109. So basically from the high point of the front property line to the low point at the back property line, we're dropping just over 10'. As I indicated the grades run from a high to a low in a southerly direction.

For Lot 11, our high point is located at the north/east corner of the existing parking lot and we have an elevation there of approximately 119.69. The low point again is located at the back south property line at 109. That is not the absolute low point on this lot because we've got the brook and the easterly property line for Lot 11 is the centerline of Pascack Brook. So our low point, in actuality, is 9' lower than that and it is down in the brook itself at elevation 100.

RUTHERFORD: Are there any drainage facilities or drainage structures of any sort on Lot 10 or Lot 11 right now?

EICHENLAUB: Right now, everything drains in a southerly direction from the north property line out at Park Avenue in a southerly direction. Approximately 25 to 30' of our westerly portion of Lot 10 drains in a westerly direction onto the temple property. And that is one of the concerns that the temple and Mr. Urdang had questioned me on earlier this evening.

RUTHERFORD: If you would just flip to the Existing Conditions map and this is what you are referring to?

EICHENLAUB: That's correct. You can see our contours in this area here all pitch towards that property. In the front northerly portion of the site there is parking or pavement right up to the property line and that drains in a westerly direction onto the temple property.

The rear 70% of the property along that 25 to 30' strip is lawn area and that all pitches in a westerly direction towards the temple property. And a portion of the existing rear parking lot also drains toward the temple property.

RUTHERFORD: Going back to Lot 11 for a moment, which is a triangular shaped lot with the brook and the buffer zone encroaching into it, is that right?

EICHENLAUB: That's correct.

RUTHERFORD: So basically, the only spot you could have a building on Lot 11 is the spot where you have it now, without encroaching into the buffer is that correct?

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

RUTHERFORD: And your Existing Conditions Map also shows where the temple building is located.

EICHENLAUB: The temple building is located on the adjacent lot...the existing post office building is located on the easterly side of Lot 10 and the existing animal hospital is located in the upper north/westerly corner of Lot 11.

RUTHERFORD: Let's go back to the colorized page. This is a color rendering of page 3, the grading and site plan page...

EICHENLAUB: It doesn't show grading but it does show the overall layout of the site.

RUTHERFORD: Let's focus, first of all, in terms of what we propose to do with respect to Lot 11...what do we propose with respect to the building on Lot 11?

EICHENLAUB: The existing building remains as we have shown it in white and is located at the north/west corner of the site. Presently there is an extension off the back of that building located at the south/east corner of the rear of that building, which is at basement level. That back portion will be squared off with the main portion of the building under renovation and the second floor will extend over the entire first floor.

RUTHERFORD: And the other aspect of Lot 11 is the removal of the macadam that you spoke about earlier.

EICHENLAUB: That's correct. We will be removing all of the existing macadam and any accompanied sidewalks that may exist now around the building.

RUTHERFOR: And the existing drive aisle on Lot 11 will also be removed?

EICHENLAUB: Correct. At present, there is a driveway entrance along the westerly side of the animal hospital...there is also a driveway cut now at the west side of what was the post office and then there is an exit drive adjacent to the animal hospital driveway on the north/east corner of the lot. In actuality, the exit drive as well as the drive for the animal hospital is one large driveway cut at present.

RUTHERFORD: And so the drive aisle for both of these properties will be exclusively on Lot 10 to the west...is that right?

EICHENLAUB: Well, no...a small portion of it does extend over onto Lot 11 under the proposed conditions. What we have done, is we have eliminated three driveway cuts and replaced it with one.

RUTHERFORD: And there will be nine parking spaces on Lot 11 as well, as shown on the plan.

EICHENLAUB: That is correct. Those are located along the westerly property line and it is for those nine spaces that we show, that we are seeking the variance for. They are internal to the property and the variance is actually within the body of the two lots...they do not impact any of our neighbors but are within five feet of that common property line.

RUTHERFORD: Other than landscaping and lighting which we will talk about in a few minutes, that's essentially what we propose for Lot 11?

EICHENLAUB: And there will be accompanying sidewalks across the back of the building and minimally along the west side. I did not have, at the time we prepared this plan, the architect's plan and I wasn't sure whether there would be an entrance or an emergency door along the easterly side. We did show at this time a sidewalk along the easterly side of the building.

RUTHERFORD: And you have designed it such that the drive aisle and the parking will be shared by both lots.

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

RUTHERFORD: The front yard setback for the proposed building on Lot 11 is the same as presently exists?

EICHENLAUB: That is correct. There is no change.

RUTHERFORD: It will be extended vertically.

EICHENLAUB: Vertically along the existing front face of the building.

RUTHERFORD: We will go through a zoning analysis in a few minutes but let's move to Lot 10. Here the existing building, asphalt parking area, walks etc are all going to be removed.

EICHENLAUB: All present improvements on that site will be removed.

RUTHERFORD: If you could tell the board a little bit about the building that is proposed, where it will be located.

EICHENLAUB: That building that is being proposed is located at the front north/west corner of the site, actually on the opposite side of the lot where the post office building is now. The total length of the building is 110' in a north/south direction and the width of the building is 49' paralleling Park Avenue.

RUTHERFORD: How many parking spaces are proposed?

EICHENLAUB: We've got along the westerly side of the building 11 spaces including two handicapped...across the back of the building, the rear parking will be 10 spaces along with an additional 15 spaces along the westerly property line. Proposed is 25 in the rear, 11 along the easterly side of the building for a total of 36 spaces.

RUTHERFORD: And all those spaces comply with the dimensional requirements of the Park Ridge Ordinance.

EICHENLAUB: They do.

RUTHERFORD: And as I indicated in my opening statement, we do comply with the 5' side yard parking setback in the rear parking field?

EICHENLAUB: That's correct. There is a 5' offset along the westerly property line.

RUTHERFORD: And we will address the comments that Ms. Mancuso and Ms. Bogart had in their memos, in a bit. Go back to the plan that shows the grading. That shows a two-way drive aisle in the front of the property adjacent to the building and then it becomes a one-way drive aisle here, is that right? And maybe you can explain to the board what circulation pattern you had in mind here.

EICHENLAUB: On the driveway, which has both an egress and an ingress... movement of traffic to the entrance of the site along the westerly side, exit from the site along the easterly side onto Park Avenue...two-way traffic continues all the way down to the rear of the proposed new building and then one can continue straight back along the driveway that we provided along the easterly side of the site...circulation down around a clockwise direction around the southerly end of the parking accessing two-way traffic with parking along both the east and west side of that parking area. That is a 24' driveway for two-way traffic. It is one-way along the easterly driveway as I indicated in a southerly direction...the traffic within this parking area is prohibited from going, exiting along that driveway and going in a northerly direction. They will have to pull out and come back up along our loading space here, make a left turn and leave the site.

RUTHERFORD: So it is a clockwise circulation pattern in the rear.

EICHENLAUB: One way circulation.

RUTHERFORD: There are no dead-ends, no one has to turn around in a K turn.

EICHENLAUB: No dead-ends. We did provide for a widening in the area here for maneuvering of vehicles that may back into the loading dock so that's why we have this little bump-out here in our curb alignment to allow trucks to come in, pull out in this area here and back into our loading zone along the southerly side of the proposed building.

RUTHERFORD: You have also shown a dumpster location.

EICHENLAUB: The dumpster location is at the rear of the proposed building.

RUTHERFORD: Just tell the board briefly its dimensions, what its materials will be, its height.

EICHENLAUB: The dumpster, itself, is a 12x17 dumpster pad, we've got gates on it, we've got a masonry enclosure 6', there is room on the north side of the dumpster pad for recyclables, recyclable bins and one of the concerns the temple had was screening. It will be a masonry enclosure and around it are plantings of 6' high Arborvitae.

RUTHERFORD: An amendment to the plan will show that.

EICHENLAUB: Correct.

RUTHERFORD: You have already discussed the existing drainage patterns on the property so why don't you tell the board what we propose with regard to stormwater management structures on the properties.

EICHENLAUB: At present there are no structures on site. The drainage from these two lots, presently, is allowed to flow freely in a southerly direction and from Lot 10 in a westerly direction toward their neighbor.

What we are proposing is that the roof leaders of the new building will be tied into an underground seepage system and the seepage system for that new building will be located at the northerly end of the parking lot under a parking stall. We are increasing the footprint of the existing animal hospital building and we are proposing for the roof leaders for that building to also be tied into a seepage system located in the back of that building.

We have not performed test pits at this time for the reason is the entire site is still being used for parking purposes and we're proposing the seepage pits be located in the middle of the existing parking areas.

(?????) letter indicated we should be doing excavation to determine soil types and we will end up taking some soil sample and running some permeability tests to determine the rate at the soil will be accepting (engineer kept moving away from microphone to map). We have agreed to do that.

We will maintain the existing drainage pattern where it will run from the north to the south but what we have done is we have prevented the runoff from our site from going in a westerly direction onto the temple property to the west. We have done that by simply introducing the building itself, any rainfall on the roof will run in an easterly direction to our seepage system. We also have across the back of the property along the westerly property line, a retaining curb, we're elevating this area of the parking lot by 1 ½ to 2'...the retaining curb will have a height of approximately 2 to 2 ½' and that will prevent any runoff from leaving our site and going in a westerly direction and will direct all of that runoff down in a southerly direction to an inlet that we propose almost at the end of the site.

We actually have three inlets located in the parking lot. One just off the rear of the building at the southerly end of the nine spaces on Lot 11, we have a second inlet located at the south/east end of the parking lot and again at the low point of the parking lot at the south/west end at the corner of the site, we have a third inlet. That third inlet will be the destination of our underground drainage pipe from the easterly catch basins that will feed this third inlet and that will discharge into a stone swale at the south end of the property.

One of the things we had to do is maintain the flow from our neighbors to the west. Presently the flow from the Temple property goes along this southerly stretch of our two lots towards the Pascack Brook. What we've done is we've kept this open, we're going to clean this out and allow that water that now ponds back at the south end of the Temple to freely flow through out site and toward the Pascack Brook.

The stone swale itself pitches in an easterly direction so the flows will be forced to go in an easterly direction toward the brook.

RUTHERFORD: In your estimation, that plan does comply with all applicable stormwater management regulations.

EICHENLAUB: Yes. We are not required to have on-site detention for the simple reason that we have minimal increase in pervious area. We are collecting the runoff from the roofs and we are sending those into our seepage system. It is a double 2,000 gallon with a considerable amount of stone around those seepage pits for the new building on Lot 10. And we are introducing a new seepage system for the existing building expansion on Lot 11.

RUTHERFORD: Is it fair to say that the plan will, perhaps, help the drainage situation on the property to the west because we are going to be reducing flow from our property onto that property?

EICHENLAUB: Absolutely.

RUTHERFORD: It is also allowing the water that does collect on that property to drain as it normally does along the southerly line of Pascack Brook.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. Right now there is a considerable amount of ponding that occurs in this back parking lot and it basically can't be used when we have heavy rains. The reason being is this area back here is all overgrown and it ponds and gets flooded...that will all be cleaned up under this proposal.

RUTHERFORD: I would like you to go to the Lighting and Landscape Plan...Sheet 5. I think you can fairly briefly advise the Board what we propose by way of special landscaping.

EICHENLAUB: The lighting that is proposed has shoe-box style lights in the back parking lot and along the common driveway between the two lots. We have building mounted fixtures on the building to illuminate the parking along the easterly side of the new hospital. We have shoe-box style fixtures to illuminate the parking along the 9 spaces and the entry walk for the building and parking spaces on Lot 11 and to the rear parking area, we've got 5 shoe-box fixtures located in that rear parking area and the ones along the easterly property line is provided with house shields to prevent spillage even though it is a parking area, we are preventing spillage of our lighting onto adjacent property.

RUTHERFORD: Do you see any adverse impact on any adjoining properties and certainly any residential properties?

EICHENLAUB: No. To the south of us is the athletic field of the high school, to the west of us is the Temple and their parking lot and to the west of them there is residential but we've got the light fixtures along that westerly property line fixed with house shields to prevent the spillage in a westerly direction.

RITHERFORD: We spoke with our client earlier and I believe the proposal, Mr. Chairman, would be that the lights will be extinguished at 11:00pm...no later than 11:00pm...the parking lot lights but we can address that as we proceed further.

EICHENLAUB: The reason being, obviously, for the residential purposes not necessarily for the animal hospital. The animal hospital hours are until approximately 7:00pm at night. We need the lights in the winter but in the summer the hospital would be closed before sunset but the lights will be staying on that long for the residential purposes.

RUTHERFORD: We also proposed some landscaping in various parts of the property.

EICHENLAUB: We've got considerable landscaping up along the front of the new building on Lot 10...we are also providing some street trees along Park Avenue where none exists now in front of the new building. We are also providing for two standard street lights, typical of the lights located along Park Avenue and Kinderkamack Road. The typical Park Ridge street light. We also are providing for plantings along the driveway, behind the

parking stalls and along a portion of the easterly driveway we have landscaping within the area of the parking to the south of the animal hospital and we also have plantings along the five-foot strip along the westerly property line.

RUTHERFORD: Also there was some discussion about a berm...

EICHENLAUB: Right now the only thing that is still pitching towards the Temple to the west would be the five-foot strip of plantings here...what the Temple has asked is if we could berm that up. Basically we have a five-foot strip from the existing edge of the pavement along the Temple driveway and rear parking area...that grade goes up anywhere from about a foot to a foot and a half...we can either provide for a curb along there and pitch that to the back or we could put a berm in which would elevate those plantings.

RUTHERFORD: I'm not going to go through the details but your plan talks about tree removal and soil moving and those are all shown on your plan as well.

EICHENLAUB: They are. All that information was provided on Sheet 3. We show the various improvements to the building, the parking lot and driveways and sidewalks, the dumpster, the pathways are all shown as our impervious area...those areas were used to calculate the percentage for coverage for both impervious and building. And those are located on Sheet 6.

RUTHERFORD: Actually we are showing a decrease in coverage on Lot 11.

EICHENLAUB: On Lot 11 all of this pavement area that presently exists is going to be removed. So there is a decrease on Lot 11 for impervious area, an increase in building footprint and coverage for Lot 11 because of the expansion off the back of that building and there is an increase on Lot 10 for both the building and parking area.

RUTHERFORD: Overall, if you look at both lots together, we are well under what is permitted for impervious coverage.

EICHENLAUB: Correct, we would end up being under if you combined the two lots.

RUTHERFORD: We are over on 10 but significantly under on 11.

EICHENLAUB: Correct.

RUTHERFORD: The only other variances that are required are the ones identified previously and that is the front yard setback variance on Lot 11 and the side yard parking setback between the boundary of Lots 10 and 11.

EICHENLAUB: Correct...under this proposal. What this proposal also does is eliminate several existing non-conformities on the existing old post office site. On the old post office site we had parking right up to the property line along the westerly property line, which we are eliminating...to the rear we've got pavement up to the easterly property line and we are eliminating that. There are a number of existing non-conformities that we are eliminating under this proposal.

RUTHERFORD: I would like to take a moment with your parking calculations...this is found in Note 30 on drawing 3 of 6...You calculated the parking for the proposed animal hospital use on Lot 10 as well as the

three residential units...the one bedroom apartment and the two two-bedroom apartments, right? And that yields a total of 30 spaces and that takes into account the credit, if you will, that is applied to parking requirements in the NB zone when parking facilities are shared...I know the Board is familiar with that but perhaps you would explain very quickly your methodology and how you calculated parking in this particular case.

EICHENLAUB: For the animal hospital we used the medical figure of one space for every 325 sq ft...for the basement area, the first floor as well as an office on the second floor, we've got 10,500 sq ft...so if you take the 325 divide it into that 10,500, you end up with 33. We've applied the 25% credit, which means we would require 25. We've indicated 25 spaces versus the 33 that we would under the standard application.

RUTHERFORD: And you have done the same thing for the residential apartments...you calculated a total of 6 spaces for the apartment use on the second floor and taking the 75%, it is 5 for a total of 30 on Lot 10. Based upon your experience and based upon the ordinance and based upon what you know about the proposed uses on Lots 10 and 11, in your estimation is the 25% credit appropriate in this case and consistent with the intent and purpose of the ordinance?

EICHENLAUB: Absolutely I believe so. I've talked with my client and the amount of parking we have on site for the hospital and the building next door on Lot 11, we probably would have 50% of the spaces empty during the majority of the day. We probably have close to 40% more than what we need under present conditions. That would allow for expansion and growth of the business as well as for the adjacent office building.

RUTHERFORD: With respect to Lot 11, you've done the same thing. You've taken the floor area of the expanded building, calculating 12 spaces against the 75%, which is 9 and then you calculated parking for the affordable units on the second floor, coming up with a total of 3, so you would require 12 on Lot 11.

EICHENLAUB: And we've shown on the residential on the second floor of Lot 11, we've shown two bedroom units...chances are they are going to be a studio type apartment and the other a one-bedroom apartment, so our calculations in that respect are conservative.

Same thing, we went through the calculations and with just over 3,600 sq ft on the first floor and basement area of the building on Lot 11, if we divide that by the 325, we require 12 spaces...if we apply the reduction, 75% that would require 9 spaces and the same was applied to the two apartments on the second floor where we require 4, apply the 75% and we come up with 3.

RUTHERFORD: So you have calculated a requirement of 42 and there are 45 spaces on the properties.

EICHENLAUB: Correct.

RUTHERFORD: And the floor plans and the areas that you used are consistent with what is shown on the plan for the expanded building on Lot 11, which has the area on the first floor and basement of 1,802 sq ft for both floors. With respect to the floor area calculations that you used for the new building on Lot 10, you referred to the floor plans prepared by Rauhaus Freeedenfeld & Assoc. consisting of 7 pages, dated July 27, 2011.

EICHENLAUB: That is correct.

RUTHERFORD: And those are the plans that were filed with the Board.

EICHENLAUB: They were.

RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman, they were marked as Exhibit A-3 on the Exhibit list. What you have done on your site plan is consistent with the Board has with respect to the architectural plans.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. What we show, however, is a rectangular box on our plans. The actual architectural plans have a few jogs in them that we don't show. Those jobs actually reduce the footprint we've indicated on our plan. What we have shown here is more conservative. There are a few indentations in the building to comply with the local code that requires and requests architectural features and some step backs and so forth and you can see those clearly in the architectural renderings. That's what they tried to accomplish with those setbacks and indentations.

RUTHERFORD: So that is going to require some adjustment to these plans.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. Our plans were completed and submitted prior to getting plans from the architect.

RUTHEFORD: So the Board should understand , we do acknowledge that you have elevations for the expanded building on Lot 11 but you do not have the floor plans and we understand you need those. Mr. Eichenlaub has just explained that they will require a few changes to the plans and some adjustment to the figures etc throughout.

EICHENLAUB: Our figures represent what the architect gave us because he forwarded them to us. In fact, if you use our numbers, the 41 x 110 they would actually come out a little higher than what we've indicated in our tables.

RUTHERFORD: Now, very briefly, there are several other approvals that we need here...Bergen County Planning, Soil Conservation and DEP...if you could just briefly tell the Board what you anticipate there and what you expect with regard to those approvals.

EICHENLAUB: We've had considerable conversation with Bergen County...Mr. Timsak expressed their concerns and in fact, there is some off-site improvement that will be done on Park Avenue by way of drainage. Presently during storms and heavy rain there is a lot of ponding and puddeling in this area here, in front of the post office parking lot on Park Avenue. The existing basin actually falls within the westerly edge of our proposed driveway cut. What we are proposing is a brand-new inlet along the curb line of Park Avenue and that will lead to a new manhole on Park Avenue the location of where that inlet is now, where the flooding occurs and the reason that is, is for the drainage on the north side of Park Avenue that runs across in an diagonal direction to that basin and has to be picked up.

From that manhole in an easterly direction we are replacing the line within Park Avenue at the County request and direction. That will be replaced up to the existing storm drain located just to the west side of the bridge over Pascack Brook and then the final stretch replacement will be from that inlet to the abutment of the bridge.

RUTHERFORD: And what are we going to need as regards NJDEP?

EICHENLAUB: I have talked to my consultant, Mr. John Albin, who has appeared in front of this board before...in fact, he prepared a letter indicating where we stand with DEP. They have already indicated that Lot 10 is absent of any wetlands but the entire site itself, both 11 and 10 fall within the riparian zone, flood zone of Pascack Brook...if this was a virgin piece of property undeveloped, we would have a great deal of difficulty doing anything on this site but because it is a fully improved site already, we've got the building and parking lot on 11 as well as 70% of the property on Lot 10 being covered with asphalt, walkways and building, so they are going to allow us, by right, to develop these sites.

The area they are looking at is in this back south area of Lot 11 where there was no disturbance and they are looking to keep that as natural as possible and we have agreed to do that. I have made several copies of that letter from Mr. Albin, of Connolly Environmental...

RUTHERFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have marked that as Exhibit A-9 and will hand it to your secretary. I don't know if we have to go through chapter and verse on the letter but...

EICHENLAUB: I more or less summarized what it says...we are in the process of obtaining that. In fact, Mr. Albin contacted our office and we have to make a couple of adjustments and a couple of notes and we are in the process of doing that.

RUTHERFORD: For the record, that is a letter from Connolly Environmental, Inc dated May 22, 2012. The other document I marked as Exhibit A-8 is a letter from the State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, dated February 21, 2012. That related to the flood hazard area application on this property as well.

EICHENLAUB: Correct, they have set that as 110.

RUTHERFORD: What I would like to do, Mr. Chairman, if the Board agrees and I know this can be a little tedious from time to time but we would like to go through, very briefly, the memos that were prepared by your professionals and try to address as many of their concerns as we can. I will refer first to the Brooker Eng. Memo, dated May 9, 2012 and prepared by Ms. Mancuso. We have gone through this.

I don't believe #1 requires a comment, that is more of an explanatory or informational item.

#2 requests that the Landscape Plan show landscaping proposed for area where pavement is to be removed on Lot 11 and we certainly can do that.

EICHENLAUB: I had mentioned that earlier that on our plan we show that asphalt area in the buffer will remain...there makes no sense maintaining that and our proposal will be to remove it and is one of the discussions we will be having with the State on what type of vegetation they would like to see us plant there, if any. It may be just a lawn area, it may be just plantings we can discuss with the Board or just plant our own.

RUTHERFORD: But we are proposing to remove all pavement both within and without the buffer.

EITHENLAUB: That is correct.

RUTHERFORD: #3 has to do with grading in the area of the 9 parking stalls and we can address that.

EICHENLAUB: No problem, that will be done.

RUTHERFORD: #4 had to do with existing drainage along the westerly property line and I think we have addressed that.

#5, details of the discharge from the E inlet to the stone swale should be provided and we can do that?

EICHENLAUB: Absolutely

RUTHERFORD: #6, does not require comment.

#7 we do agree that a condition of approval, should the Board agree to approve would be seepage pit tests satisfactory to Ms. Mancuso.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. The closed seepage pits that we are proposing will drain in an accepted amount of time.

RUTHERFORD: #8, we have discussed this, it has to do with the designated dog-walk area...we discussed that with Dr. Mandarino and perhaps you can tell the Board how that will be handled.

EICHENALUB: What we are talking about is an area at the back of the building on Lot 11...it will just be a lawn area. If one of these nurses or aids take the dog out for a walk to relieve itself, they can go in the back on the lawn area. The hospital will pick that up. There is no designated area it is simply a lawn area.

RUTHERFORD: There is no kenneling or boards of dogs here.

EICHENLAUB: No, there is no exterior kennels. The only dogs or cats that may be contained over night would be one that was operated on that particular day and just for observation. There is no boarding.

RUTHERFORD: #9, related to parking requirements and we have addressed that or tried to address that and we were asked for an additional handicapped stall on the west side and we can do that, correct?

EICHENLAUB: We can do that but what it would require is the elimination of one parking stall because we would still need the side aisle. We do provide for two spaces, which is provided but we can provide for the third and that would be located in this area here, along those nine spaces...the most northerly one would be converted to handicapped and we would provide for a dropped curb on that site.

Yes, it can be done.

RUTHERFORD: You can add sight distances to the plan, is that correct?

EICHENLAUB: Actually they were on the original plan and when we made some changes with regard to the drainage, unfortunately they were removed but they will be put back on.\

RUTHERFORD: In addition to adding them, they do, in fact, comply.

EICHENLAUB: We have an excess of 500', which is more than adequate for this (?)...it's got to be understood that there is parking allowed along Park Avenue and when we take our sight distance, we take it when parking is not present.

RUTHERFORD: #12 related to the possibility of an additional trash dumpster...you did discuss that with our client?

EICHENLAUB: Right. We have provided for the single dumpster for two reasons...1) lack of room on Lot 11...to get a dumpster in place it would require the elimination of a parking stall and we have the one dumpster located at the rear of the animal hospital and we provided for an ample size to handle both buildings. That is why we've proposed just one dumpster.
RUTHERFORD: Certainly except for further comment from Ms. Mancuso, we will defer to the Board on that issue.

#13 does not require comment.

#14 you addressed earlier and we will comply with the Borough of Park Ridge standard streetscape improvements?

EICHENLAUB: Correct.

RUTHERFORD: #15 was a detail about lighting, we do show an approximate average of one foot candle and you can show the light levels at the Park Avenue intersection?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, in fact, we do have a street light right off the north/east corner of the building...there are two street lights being proposed in front of our building...one street light alone would really make that entry but we do have our light fixtures located on Lot 11 and one mounted on the building which will illuminate that driveway as well.

RUTHERFORD: #16 proposed signage...we do show signage on the building, the architectural show that but the applicant is also requesting a free-standing sign, which is not shown and will need to be shown on the plan.

EICHENALUB: It will need to be shown and it will comply, it will not exceed the 24 sq ft allowable.

RUTHERFORD: We will not be seeking variances.

EICHENLAUB: None.

RUTHERFORD: We understand that the Board needs to see that.

`#17 and #18 do not require comment.

If we can turn then, to Ms. Bogart's memo, dated May 15, 2012, I will start with page 2...proposed development shared parking, we have addressed that as it has been made clear that we do propose a shared parking area and cross easements to permit the use of drive aisle etc.

Height...the buildings will comply with height...

EICHENLAUB: They do. I did prepare and I do have the architectural, which the Board also has. We did provide for calculations for building height that was submitted. The average grade around the building produces a building height of just over 32'...the maximum building height at the low point, which is located at the south/west corner of the building...and from that low point to the top of the building, will still be below 35'...in fact, it is 34.8'

RUTHERFORD: We understand that your professionals may need additional time to look at the architectural elevations that you've provided.

The circulation design you have addressed already...it does, in fact, call for a one-way circulation pattern in the rear.

EICHENLAUB: Correct. Along the easterly driveway.

RUTHERFORD: And we are able to comply and are going to comply with Section 101-58.23A with respect to plantings?

EICHENLAUB: Correct. We will re-evaluate that. If we feel the plantings have to be changed, we can discuss that.

RUTHERFORD: We've discussed green public space with our client, is that correct...that is Item 2E on page 2. We discussed this with our client after we received the memo and can you tell the Board what you feel we can or cannot do.

EICHENLAUB: Obviously we don't have a lot of green area, we admit to that. We can provide for additional green area at the parking stalls. We have provided for some green area within the parking area itself along the easterly side of our parking stalls and the majority of our green area is located along the perimeter of the site.

However, on Lot 11 we're actually increasing green area with the removal of the existing parking lot so it is more or less a swap. We are providing for additional green area on Lot 11 and we're providing for less green area on Lot 10.

RUTHERFORD: A related issue on the next page talks about a pedestrian walkway...a pedestrian greenway through the subject site. Can you comment on the feasibility of that on Lot 11?

EICHENLAUB: With regard to that walk area, obviously is it clear on Lot 10 there is no area that we can provide for a walkway...cut across the property and we can provide for a walkway down the property line. A walkway, though, would extend into the buffer zone.

Once you get to the south end of the property, there is a retaining wall that runs along and it is on the municipal property, the high school property, where the grade on the high school athletic field is several feet high than the grades on the south side of our two lots.

To provide for that you wouldn't be able to get from this sidewalk up onto that without some sort of a ramp and our concern would be that we've got this spreader for the drainage of the site, where we are spreading the drainage out and any type of elevation or walkway would drop that drainage.

RUTHERFORD: So there are some structure and logistical issues that address that concern.

EICHENLAUB: If that was requested, yes.

RUTHERFORD: Bicycle parking we can provide?

EICHENLAUB: We can provide for a bicycle rack.

RUTHERFORD: You've talked about the pedestrian and we've talked about the parking...the affordable housing we have addressed and the last items we can go through quickly.

The stone drainage swale...is a green swale , a natural rain garden appropriate or doable on this site?

EICHENLAUB: We can provide for something like that. We can look into that....we did not look into it but we can certainly look at that.

The purpose of that swale, clearly, is to control runoff and minimize the velocity of those flows from both our site and the Temple site to the west of us. Both lots drain through that swale.

RUTHERFORD: That requires a little further discussion.

EICHENLAUB: Yes, we can look into whether or not it is even feasible to build back in that area.

RUTHERFORD: Lighting, we can comply with...all the applicable lighting standards?

EICHENLAUB: Correct.

RUTHERFORD: Fire lanes for Lot 10, can you comment?

EICHENLAUB: We've got parking on both side of the driveway. We can provide for a fire lane, no parking stripe along the west side of the curb line on Lot 11. We can provide for a fire zone, no parking striping along the easterly and southerly curb line as well as the interior westerly curb line of the driveway. We can designate that with striping as a fire zone, no parking.

But everything else, along the easterly side of the proposed hospital, that's parking and across the back you've got significant parking and we do have the loading zone, which is for loading purposes only along the south side of the building.

RUTHERFORD: Refuse collection we addressed earlier. ADA accessibility for Lot 11 and accessible route to the building.

EICHENLAUB: Right. We will provide for a drop curb at this location for access along the sidewalk and that sidewalk will comply with ADA.

RUTHERFORD: That's all, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

MANCUSO: Just to clarify a couple of points, if you don't mind Mr. Eichenlaub.

You mentioned that you did propose lighting at the entrance up along Park...but the isolux foot candle lines that are designated don't appear to cover a sufficient spread to illuminate it. Your .5 contour is not quite covering the entrance area. That is why I was inquiring as to the level of lighting there.

EICHENLAUB: This area here...we certainly can add an additional fixture in this area here...what we don't want to do is drop the spillage out onto Park Avenue but we can provide and relocate this fixture within Lot 11 along the parking stalls to provide for an additional fixture, probably midway along this easterly curb line, which will illuminate that.

So can provide for that additional illumination on site.

MANCUSO: And perhaps if you added the lighting isolux foot candle lines from the existing light pole that is in front of the existing animal hospital, you might get a little bit of overlap.

EICHENLAUB: We can provide for that. There is an existing lamp located right in the middle of the existing building, so there is one there. We are not proposing for any additional in that area we were just maintaining that and providing for a new one in front of the new animal hospital.

MANCUSO: So there will be just one in front of the animal hospital? The one existing?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, there is one directly in front of the animal hospital.

MANCUSO: We would just be looking to have consistent lighting all along the frontage of that property.

EICHENLAUB: When you say consistent...are you looking for an additional one?

MANCUSO: Perhaps, that's why we have to look into the level of lighting so it is consistently illuminated all the way from Pascack traveling west through the property...an even existing level of lighting and preferably with the downtown standards.

EICHENLAUB: Which we are proposing. We will have to look at this area here since there are no fixtures in this area. That is something that we can certainly discuss and we might want to look at it because the sidewalk there is narrow. The area I am talking about is from the east side of the existing animal hospital towards the bridge, that sidewalk area is very narrow.

Typically we've got a paver area, which is where your fixtures go and the plantings, the shade trees, the street trees go and we don't have that in this area here. We are providing for that along the proposed building and we've got an expanded sidewalk area in front of the existing animal hospital. We don't have that luxury in this area here. When I see here, I mean the existing animal hospital.

MANCUSO: Ok, maybe it is something we can look at again.

Regarding the parking...is there going to be any designated parking for the residential units? How will that work out particularly on a Saturday?

EICHENLAUB: We really haven't discussed it but it is certainly something I can discuss with my clients. Certainly for the residential over the existing building that is going to be expanded upon, those spaces will be designated in here and we probably want to maintain the spaces along the east side of the new animal hospital building for clients' use so the additional parking that may be necessary for the second floor, residential, when it is built would be in this row of parking.

So the back parking area would be designated for employees and the overflow of parking for the animal hospital as well as the office area but I would envision these 9 spaces, which will end up being 8 spaces, when we add the handicapped spot, those 8 spaces will be designated for residential as well as the office use on Lot 11.

MANCUSO: In terms of the apartment units above the new animal hospital, would those tenants have the ability to access those units from the rear of the building as well as the front or will the rear be only for the office space above?

EICHENLAUB: I have not seen the interior layout. There is an entrance in the rear of the building.

MANCUSO: There is an entrance in the front and the rear with interior doors and I didn't know if those interior doors were to prohibit the tenant from accessing from the back.

EICHENLAUB: I think those interior doors would be to the hospital itself but there would be access to the stairwell from that back entry. To answer that question, I would imagine but I can't speak for my clients and I haven't seen the interior layout at this time.

MANCUSO: And my final question..regarding that dog-walking area. I was only concerned because of its proximity to the brook and that 25' buffer, which we are hoping will be a pristine buffer and personally, I know when I

bring my dog to the animal hospital, the first thing they want to do is jump out and do their business. I thought it might be a good idea to designate an area so people will understand.

EICHENLAUB: We can but the area we designate would probably be in this area here. There are some trees back in this corner but probably in this area here...there is a little triangular area outside of the buffer area that can be utilized. Something to discuss with my client and we can show it on the plan.

MANCUSO: That's all I have...thank you.

BOGART: I missed the beginning portion of your presentation when you were addressing the memo and I know you skipped page 1...can you just start on page 1?

Under submission items and completeness...there are a number of items of information that have not been provided. I just received the architectural drawings on Thursday and have not been able to review them for compliance.

RUTHERFORD: We fully understand that.

BOGART: But at this time the applicant is not requesting any variances from the Zoning standards?

RUTHERFORD: We are not.

BOGART: And so far you feel you comply with the architectural standards of the Neighborhood Business District?

RUTHERFORD: As far as we know and it is our intent that they will. But we do realize it is an open item. We understand.

BOGART: Another main point for the submission items was the information on the housing units and COAH distribution and which units were going to be deed restricted and what the bedroom distribution of those units were. Will that be provided at a future date?

RUTHERFORD: Yes. There are two affordable units proposed for the expanded building on Lot 11. The residential units on Lot 10, the new building are proposed to be market units.

BOGART: You may want to look at that because the floor plans on Lot 10 actually illustrate a COAH unit.

RUTHERFORD: Ok, thank you.

BOGART: But your understanding of the proposal is two COAH units on Lot 11.

Are you proposing any signage at this time or are you going to come back with signage?

RUTHERFORD: We had a conversation, actually, just earlier today with our client indicating a desire for a free-standing sign, so that will have to be on our next submission.

BOGART: A separate application?

RUTHERFORD: I would like to make it part of this application, if we can. We will revise our plan to show a free-standing sign and I don't believe it will need any variances.

EICHENLAUB: No, it will comply with Code.

BOGART: Going on to page 2...

RUTHERFORD: You didn't like it that I skipped over the incomplete items?

BOGART: No, because it took me a long time to put together page 1...

RUTHERFORD: I'm sorry, I am not making light of it at all, we understand that you need additional information.

BOGART: You had mentioned under the shared parking, Section A, I think you said there was going to be a shared parking agreement, circulation and parking.

RUTHERFORD: Yes, if the Board wishes to see that, I can prepare something and get it to you prior to the next meeting.

BOGART: My concern was how that would all work and now they are also sharing the dumpster facility.

RUPP: And the dog area.

RUTHERFORD: I agree and given the comment we heard earlier about the designated parking, I think we need to flesh that out a little better...we can provide something. I think the bulk of that will be the substantive terms.

BOGART: I think your engineer addressed the height issue and you've indicated it will comply.

For item C, the circulation design...my concern is that there is an opportunity here to reduce the impervious coverage on site...I don't think there is going to be so much traffic on and off the site that a dead-end aisle would be the worse thing in the world. Maybe there is an opportunity to provide the turnaround area in the back half of the property.

EICHENLAUB: If I hear you correctly, maybe get rid of this...

BOGART: Right.

EICHENLAUB: We would need, probably to extend down to this area here...probably in the neighborhood of 20 to 30' down this aisle to allow trucks. We don't anticipate large tractor-trailer trucks, maybe a small tractor-trailer, most of them would be small tandem trucks but to be able to back into this loading area here, if they swing out they are not going to make this turn...a small tandem truck will but a tractor-trailer may have to maneuver and do a three point turn to get out of this area here.

We are not married to this driveway. It was for convenience but we can cut it off down on this side here. This area could be designated and striped for turnaround.

We could eliminate this driveway here and that could be an additional green planted area. The entry drive would extend down about 30' to allow for maneuvering of trucks and I think we could probably eliminate this and designate this area for turnaround. So it really, truly wouldn't be a dead-end area. They would be able to back out and make that maneuver if they were in a parking stall.

I can guarantee you that you are not going to have trouble finding parking on this site.

BOGART: I didn't think they would be running around with that dead-end situation where they would have to pull out.
EICHENLAUB: We will look at that and present that to you at the next meeting.

BOGART: When I looked at this application, I had two levels of review. One was the Master Plan review and providing open space and public access and trailways and connecting to the Master Plan, which I addressed on the next page.

And second, I looked at Site Plan details. Pertaining to the circulation design, did you actually look at flipping the proposed site plan and allowing for all your vehicle circulation to the west side of the site and for the east side of the site to be for pedestrian purposes for green area?

EICHENLAUB: We actually contacted County on that because way back that did come up to try and get the driveway across from the street across from us. That would have worked out real well if we had been able to work out something with the Temple where we could have had a shared driveway in this area here but it didn't work out. What the County didn't want was two driveways adjacent to one another like the same situation that exists there today where you have the post office and the Temple driveway, and they are certainly entitled to their own driveway. If we had the double driveway cut on the post office we would have had a similar situation where we would have needed a 24' driveway aisle for ingress/egress to our site adjacent to the Temple driveway and the County thought the best location would be to locate it as we have shown here. I just thought it was better and provided for a little more privacy especially for the Temple.

We have a situation that any parking on our site can simply be dropped off by the building. I know that was long-winded but we did consult with County on it and they thought the best location, because we would have a shared driveway with Lot 11, the best location would be between the two lots.

BOGART: Ok, that makes sense but it doesn't address the second part of my question...the Master Plan issue of green trails and public access through the property. Did you look at, since you are moving all that asphalt on Lot 11, an opportunity to provide a public means of connecting to the dog-walking area or connecting to the park system?

EICHENLAUB: If I hear you correctly, what you are looking for is something to connect to the athletic fields?

BOGART: I just feel there is a missing opportunity...I'm not suggesting that the Borough has a plan to do that but it has been indicated in the Master Plan that maybe this is a site where you might want to connect across the street on Park Avenue to the ball fields, to the south, and I just wanted to raise that as an issue. Maybe you're not planning a trail or sidewalk or any of that now but is there an opportunity to provide any easements for the future, if you were looking at something like that? We could address that.

EICHENLAUB: It is certainly something I can address with my client before the next meeting. The only concern I would have and for easement purposes, since this is all going to be green area anyway, I don't see that being a big problem but to connect from Park Avenue back to that ball field, there is a difference in grade of anywhere from 2 ½ to 3'...we really

need this area here to be unobstructed to allow the even velocity flow from both our site as well as the Temple site of drainage towards the Pascack Brook...as it goes now, it goes that way now.

But to put any type of ramp system, which you would have to do to get up to the ball field here, that would block that and would require some form of a conduit beneath that ramp. Now we would be reconcentrating the flow from this area and would probably necessitate approval from the State.

BOGART: I understand all that because I have gone through all this with different recreational facilities and am currently working on a number of projects requiring all this. Right now I am not asking you to design it but for an opportunity to provide this.

EICHENLAUB: I will discuss that with my client.

BOGART: And in connection with that, you had mentioned that the sidewalk is very narrow on the east side of the current animal hospital?

EICHENLAUB: Correct. The current animal hospital to the bridge.

BOGART: Is there any opportunity, since we are removing the driveway, to extend that sidewalk area and provide for some public space...you're looking into additional lighting and it seems to be an opportunity to widen the sidewalk in that area and make it more pedestrian friendly.

EICHENLAUB: Again, that is something I can discuss with my client. We are providing for the off-site improvements for the County ... we are providing for an 8' wide easement in this area as well as on Lot 10 for road purposes. Right now we have a 50' r-o-w there and they are requesting 33' from the centerline of Park Ave, which requires an easement from us.

So we are providing for that. We were going to provide for that on Lot 11 under the original proposal and we will maintain that 8' easement on Lot 11 and also provide for it on Lot 10.

BOGART: As I said, I was just looking to provide additional sidewalk area at this location.

With regard to Item D, the Landscape Plan....I think there might be some sections under the Landscape requirement that you do not currently meet and I would ask you to take another look at that, including, and I don't know if you are providing an automatic irrigation system, which is also required.

EICHENLAUB: We will, yes, we will. The other issue is some of the landscaping that I do propose up front here is going to have to be altered anyway to accommodate the sign. There will be some changes to the landscaping and we will add a note to indicate there will be that automatic irrigation system.

BOGART: Ok and I would recommend that the Board and/or Borough be involved in any revegetation of that buffer area.

EICHENLAUB: Sure. As I indicated, a lot of time the State...and we were before the Board for a subdivision when the State dictated to us what the State wanted to see by way of vegetation in the wetlands...if they are open and don't have a problem with it and just say revegetate it, we will certainly discuss with the Board and the town what type of plantings you would like along there.

RUPP: There's a portion of that area that is outside the buffer, correct?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, there is a triangular area here and a triangular area here...the buffer line is right here.

RUPP: You wouldn't have any problem with having the landscaping in those non-buffered areas to be submitted to the Borough, would you?

BOGART: I think it all has to be designed together.

RUPP: But that doesn't even require DEP approval.

EICHENLAUB: Not outside the buffer.

RUPP: So if we made a condition that it be submitted to our planner...

BOGART: All these issues are connected, the public green space, the dog walking area and my next issue is going to be the bicycle parking and where that is going to go. So I think there is an opportunity to provide for all that.

EICHENLAUB: The bicycle parking...I would think the best location for that would be on Lot 11 here. Given that we are looking to provide for a sign in this area here, that limits the area. The best location would either be here for a bicycle rack or even on the east side of the building on Lot 11.

BOGART: I think you might want to tie into the east side...but you just raised a point that you might want to keep some of that asphalt in place on Lot 11 to preserve the rights to provide for a pathway in the future because if you remove anything, you have no more rights.

EICHENLAUB: Again, we can but understand, even if we maintain that asphalt, once we go into that buffer we are required to go down to the State for permits to go into that buffer area.

BOGART: Well, I know public walkways are permitted, they just need a review.

MANCUSO: If the paved area extends to about midpoint of the buffer...

EICHENLAUB: Where is the edge of pavement now? Here is the top of bank and here is the buffer and it goes back to this area here.

MANCUSO: If you connect the walk to the rear line, there isn't any pavement there now, so you would still need that same permit.

EICHENLAUB: Correct, as I indicated before. If we could take a step back...if we make changes in this area here and it now becomes green, we could provide it and it would be outside that buffer. But that is something I would like to discuss with my client and we will be ready to answer that question at the next meeting.

BOGART: Understood...lighting you addressed...refuse, you said they would all use the same dumpster and I do have a concern about that particularly with the easement that will be provided...it does seem like a long walk for the residents, since it will be on Lot 11 , to use the dumpster.

EICHENLAUB: I've lived in apartments where I've had a lot longer walk than that. I understand your concern and chances are that they would probably be bringing out their garbage either later in the evening or early morning when they are leaving for work when there will be minimal activity

in the parking lot. I don't see an area, if we are going to maintain our parking of 8 spaces...there is not a lot of area here for a dumpster. There are trees here now that we are looking to maintain, we are not looking to remove that group of three, they are existing and we are looking to maintain them.

There is not a lot of area on Lot 11 where I can introduce a dumpster.

BOGART: I guess is all depends on the easements.

RUPP: Maybe we can just over the list now, we know what the variances are that you are seeking...there are a number of site plan waivers, some of which, it sounds as if you are now complying with but it's a little bit hard for me to follow what you are seeking a waiver from...there was some issue about landscaping, for example, irrigation...

EICHENLAUB: We can provide the irrigation, we've agreed to that.

BOGART: It seems like there are a lot of omissions still to be submitted and I am not sure they can address the waivers until they determine what else they are submitting.

RUPP:: I tend to agree with that point. In the final analysis before the Board acts on this, we are going to need to know what waivers you are seeking in terms of our Site Plan requirements.

EICHENLAUB: Prior to the next meeting we will have those all ironed out.

SCHWAMB: I have a question regarding floor plans...will they be forthcoming at the next meeting?

RUTHERFORD: Yes. I don't know when that will be. We are aware of the 10 day requirement for filing and we certainly intend to comply with that fully for the next meeting. Tonight, obviously we spent much of our time on the engineering issues. We know that the ordinance is very detailed with respect to the architectural features and we want to make sure we have addressed all of those. We want to get this application done.

SCHWAMB: A question about the parking. Is it a total of 36 spaces including the handicapped?

EICHENLAUB: No. We actually have a total of 45 that we are providing. That is going to be reduced by one when we introduce the third handicapped stall on Lot 11. So we are providing for 45 spaces.

RUPP: By changing one of those spaces for a handicapped, you actually have to eliminate two spaces?

EICHANLAUB: One of the spaces becomes an access aisle for the handicapped. We are required to have an 11' space with a 5' side aisle or we are required to have an 8' side aisle with an 8' space. It all works out to the same 16' and that requires the loss of one space.

BOGART: By closing off two of the driveways you are actually providing more on-street parking than currently exists.

EICHENLAUB: Right. You can probably get two spaces in here...they are not delineated but right now between the two driveway cuts, the post office, you are lucky to get one space in there. So you are gaining one there and because of the curb return, the radii coming out of the site,

basically falls in front of the existing animal hospital, you don't gain any additional spaces to the east. At most you are gaining one additional space along Park Avenue.

The animal hospital is right here now and you can see our curb return comes out and basically falls in line with the west side of the building. There are no additional spaces there. If anything, we are gaining one space on Park Avenue.

SCHWAMB: On the buffer, you are putting 300 plantings and trees on the rest of the property, which is significant. To plant that entire site is going to be enormous.

EICHENLAUB: We don't want to plant all the trees. We are in agreement that we will put a row of trees along the top of the bank for several reasons...stabilization, a little bit more privacy but what we would like to do is keep a lawn area in here as well. Right now there is some existing plantings along Park Avenue, which we've got. Once we here from the State and we know what they want us to do or what they will allow us to do in that area and hopefully, they will allow us to remove the pavement, then we can come up with a plan for that area. Our planting plan for that buffer would also have to be approved by DEP.

The refer to it as "native" type plantings.

SCHWAMB: Anyone else have questions from the Board?

MAGUIRE: Yes, Mr.,. Chairman. Have you applied to the DEP?

EICHENLAUB: Yes, we have been down in front of them for quite some time already.

MAGUIRE: I was just trying to put together the timing with all the things you have to follow-up in 10 days.

EICHENLAUB: (to Mr. Rutherford) Did you present to the Board the letter from DEP in February as an Exhibit?

RUTHERFORD: Yes.

EICHENLAUB: We did receive a letter from DEP designating and approving our flood elevations for the site...

RUTHERFORD: Marked as Exhibit A8...

BEER: But that is not anything that the Board received. Tonight was the first time I received it.

RUTHERFORD: Yes, I appreciate that. We did not previously submit it. We do so tonight.

EICHENLAUB: And DEP has gotten back to our consultant, Connolly Environmental and they requested two very minor notes being added to the plan. From what I can see and from what I have talked to John Albin about, we are very close to receiving approvals from them as well.

MAGUIRE: Ok, and we can have a discussion about when you are coming back with all the follow-ups from today and hopefully we will have the response from DEP at that point.

I did have one question on the swale in the back of the property. Can you describe, at the point where it connects to the property to the west? The connection right there where the water runs from the Temple's

property onto that property. Is that just an opening? How does the water...and what's the elevations.

EICHENLAUB: Right now it is kind of overgrown and over the years we have had a lot of deposit of leaves and organic material, which basically has prevented what once was a clear flow of water from the Temple property along this back property line. That whole back area, which is a combination of weed growth, organic deposit...once that is all cleaned up and this rip-rap that is being in here for erosion purposes...there are larger rocks in this area here to reduce the velocity flow from the swale but our elevation from the rip-rap in this area here is at or below the elevation or low point of the elevation on the Temple parking lot. Once again water will be allowed to flow freely along that southerly property line.

MAGUIRE: Sounds like it will be an improvement. What is the elevation at that point on the Temple side?

EICHENLAUB: There is a contour line of 112 here, at this point, the low point just off the corner of the Temple parking lot is 111.12...so this area in the back corner here is about one foot lower than this triangular area here and that flow will just be conveyed...we would clean up all that organic material that has been deposited over the years in that back area. The elevation there would be somewhere around 111.

MAGUIRE: So the Temple should see an improvement in the drainage.

EICHENLAUB: I guarantee there will be an improvement. One of the things that causes an excess of flooding back there off of the post office property is now going to be prevented. They won't have that runoff onto their property any longer with these improvements.

MAGUIRE: Thank you.

LUDWIG: One question. Looking at the reference to the retaining wall on the west side from the middle to the far south border...is this a new retaining wall?

EICHENLAUB: Yes.

LUDWIG: Are there requirements for setback from the property line for a retaining wall?

EICHENLAUB: 5'.

LUDWIG: I think it might be 8'.

EICHENLAUB: It is actually a retaining curb. Basically it is a curb with a 6" reveal and is going to have a 2 ½ " reveal on their side. So it is just going to be an oversized curb.

LUDWIG: I saw a reference to a retaining wall and wondered if it was something separate from this curbing.

EICHENLAUB: It is virtually a retaining curb. It is like a larger curb than you are used to seeing in a parking lot.

MAGUIRE: Just to follow-up...so that is not a drainage easement coming along the back of the property, right?

EICHENLAUB: Well, that was never discussed. It is a natural flow at this point. When these site were developed....

MAGUIRE: So there is no requirement for the animal hospital to maintain that?

EICHENLAUB: Well, we've got to maintain that for our use. If that were to become deposited with organics again by way of leaves and stuff, that would inhibit our flow from our site and create a problem for us. We have to maintain that...the owner of that property has to maintain that just to allow our system to flow through there.

We have agreed that we will not provide any blockage there so the waters will be allowed to continue to flow through that swale.

MAGUIRE: Thank you.

SCHWAMB: You mentioned there would be a berm on that side.]

EICHENLAUB: Yes, we are going to look at that. I will discuss and make contact with Mr. Urdang but way back we actually talked about curbing that and the representatives that were here...but they were not happy with that. My thought is that the plantings we've got here are hearty enough that if they were to be covered with snow, they will regenerate and come back in the spring and summer. Their response was that they don't put any of their snow there, it is all pushed to the back. One of the things they are going to have to do now, is they are going to have to keep this back area clear now so that when the snow does melt it is now dammed up with a pile of snow.

If they want a berm, we will provide for a berm. We are providing for the plantings and we would provide for a berm as well. The amount of runoff coming from this area here, being as it is not vegetated or will be vegetated is minimal.

SCHWAMB: Anyone from the audience wishing to be heard?

There was no one.

MAGUIRE: We probably need to talk of when you will be back with all these items that we talked about tonight because the 10 day Notice would put us at June1st.

RUTHERFORD: Do you meet on June 27th?

BEER: We do.

RUTHERFORD: I think that is appropriate and we will be aware with a June 17th filing date. June 1st is not within our time. I'm hoping that we can finish up that evening. We will submit the material by Friday, June 15th.

RUPP: The hearing will be carried to June 27th.

RUTHERFORD: Thank you for your time and attention.

NEW BUSINESS:

37 Park Avenue, LLC- 37 Park Avenue
Request for release of remaining cash escrow.

WHEREAS, 37 PARK AVENUE, LLC, 37 Park Avenue, known as Lot 4 in Block 1505, on the tax map of the Borough of Park Ridge, had posted a Cash Performance Bond in the amount of $96,660.00 in 2006; and

WHEREAS, the Cash Performance Bond was reduced to $89,910.00 in October 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Cash Performance Bond was further reduced to $74,910.00 in December 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Cash Performance Bond was again further reduced to $17,760.00 in September 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Cash Performance Bond was further reduced to $4,341.75 in May 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Cash Performance Bond of $4,341.75 was returned together with interest in November 2011; and

WHEREAS, there remains in the escrow account $920.22, which escrow the applicant has requested be returned; and

WHEREAS, the project has been completed and Certificates of Occupancy issued, there remains no further reason to have an escrow account.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Borough of Park Ridge that the remaining escrow of $920.22 be released together with any accrued interest.

Motion offered by Mr. O'Donoghue.
Second by Mayor Maguire\

AYES: Ms. Eisen, Messrs. Ludwig, Mesiano, Metzdorf, O'Donoghue, Schwamb, Councilman Misciagna, Mayor Maguire

ADJOURN:

There being no further business to come before the Board, by motion of Mr. Mesiano and seconded by Mr. O'Donoghue the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Helyn N. Beer
Board Secretary

(10:00pm)