

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

The regular meeting of the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment has been called for Tuesday, January 17, 2012, at 8:00 pm in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL: Mr. Brennan, Mr. Capilli, Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Raman, Mr. Sandler, Dr. von der Lieth, Mr. Walker

Absent: None

Also Present: William Rupp, Board Attorney
Lyn Beer, Secretary to the Zoning Board
Robert Ludwig, Zoning Officer
Eve Mancuso, Borough Engineer

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The Notice for this meeting required by Section 3(d) of the Open Public Meetings Act has been provided by the adoption of a resolution by the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment of January 18, 2011, setting forth a schedule of regular meetings by mailing of said schedule to the Record and The Ridgewood News, on January 24, 2011, and by the posting of said schedule on the Municipal Bulletin Board and the continuous maintenance thereof and by filing the said schedule in the office of the Borough Clerk.

OATH OF OFFICE:

VON DER LIETH: We have a new member joining the Board tonight, He is John Sigillito.

RUPP: Please put your hand on the bible and raise your right hand.

SIGILLITO: I John Sigillito, do solemnly swear that I will support the constitution of the United States and I will support the constitution of the State of New Jersey. I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same and to the government of the United States and to the State of the Government established in the United States under the authority of the people, and that I will faithfully and impartially and justly perform all the duties of the office of a Board of Adjustment member, according to the best of my ability, so help me God.

VON DER LIETH: Congratulations, we will need your signature right here. We welcome him as a new Board member and some of our other Board members who are returning for different terms.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW & REAPPOINTED BOARD MEMBERS:

Matthew Capilli – reappointed Board Member for 4 year term said term to expire December 31, 2015.

William Walker - reappointed Board member for 4-year term said term to expire December 31, 2015.

Gil Sandler - reappointed Alt. II member for 2-year term to Expire December 31, 2013.

John Sigillito - Newly appointed member to fill unexpired 2-year term, Expiring December 31, 2013.

REORGANIZATION MEETING:

BRENNAN: Mr. Chairman I make a motion that we suspend the regular business in order to reorganize for the year 2012. Seconded by Mr. Hoskins. Carried unanimously

VON DER LIETH: So moved.

WALKER: I make a motion that the meeting be opened for nominations to elect officers for this year. Seconded by Walker. Carried unanimously.

VON DER LIETH: May I have a nomination for Chairman of the Board.

CAPILLI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate Eric von der Lieth, for Chairman of the Board for 2012. Seconded by Mr. Walker. Carried unanimously.

BRENNAN: I would like to make a motion that the nominations be closed, and that Dr. von der Lieth be elected as Chairman of the Board for the year 2012. Seconded by Mr. Hoskins. Carried unanimously.

VON DER LIETH: Thank you very much. I would like to call for a nomination for Vice-Chairman of the Board.

BRENNAN: Mr. Chairman I nominate Matt Capilli, for Vice-Chairman of the Board for the year 2011. Seconded by Hoskins.

BRENNAN: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that nominations for Vice-Chairman be closed and that Mr. Capilli be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Board for the year 2012. Seconded by Mr. Walker. Carried unanimously

VON DER LIETH: Congratulations, Mr. Capilli. It is great to have you here. May I have nominations for Secretary of the Board.

HOSKINS: I would like to nominate Bill Walker for Board Secretary. Seconded by Mr. Capilli.

CAPILLI: I make a motion that nominations be closed and that Bill Walker be appointed Secretary to the Board for the year 2011. Seconded by Mr. Hoskins. Carried unanimously.

BOARD APPOINTMENTS:

VON DER LIETH: One other introduction I would like to make is Mr. William Rupp, sitting to the left of me, our new Board Attorney. May I have a motion that Mr. Rupp be appointed counsel to the Zoning Board for the year 2012. The motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Flaherty, carried unanimously.

VON DER LIETH: I make a motion that Eve Mancuso be appointed Engineer to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the year 2012. The motion was made by Mr. Capilli and seconded by Mr. Hoskins. Carried unanimously.

VON DER LIETH: I make a motion that Brigette Bogart be appointed Planner for the Zoning Board of Adjustment for the year 2012. The motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hoskins. and carried unanimously.

VON DER LIETH: I make a motion that Helyn N. Beer be appointed as secretary to the Board of Adjustment for the year 2012. The motion was made by Mr. Hoskins and seconded by Mr. Walker. Carried unanimously.

VON DER LIETH: I make a motion that Margot Hamlin be appointed Transcriber Secretary to the Zoning Board of adjustment for the year 2012. The motion was made by Tom Hoskins and seconded by Mr. Walker and carried unanimously.

**DESIGNATION OF REGULAR MEETING NIGHTS, OFFICIAL PUBLICATION
& FEES**

BRENNAN : Mr. Chairman I would like to offer a resolution to confirm that the third Tuesday of each month as regular meeting nights with the exception of the month of December, and to designate the Ridgewood News, and the Record as official publications and to recommend annual fee for mailings. The resolution was offered by Mr. Brennan and seconded by Mr. Hoskins. Carried unanimously.

BEER: Would you all please take a look at that calendar. If you have children please check with the schools. As soon as you know about Back to School night, please let us know so that the Professionals can be notified.

**SCHEDULE A – ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
PARK RIDGE, NEW JERSEY**

Meeting Dates

2012

February 21

March 20

April 17

May 15

June 19

July 17

August 21

September 18

October 16

November 20

December 12

January 18, 2013

All Meetings are held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building

Work Session – 7:30 pm Hearings – 8:00 pm

MOTION TO RESUME REGULAR ORDER OF BUSINESS:

The Chairman entertained a motion that the regular order of business be resumed. So moved by Mr. Hoskins and seconded by Mr. Flaherty. Carried unanimously.

CASE: 11-17 Block: 1601 Lot: 15	Application of <u>Park Ridge Board of Education</u> , 85 Pascack Road to utilize existing house as the Board of Education offices necessitating a Use variance in an R-20 residential zone. Hearing postponed from July 19, 2011 for Notification of property owners within 200 feet. Hearing begun August 16, 2011, carried to September 20, 2011 for Board
----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Engineer's review of revised plans, rescheduled by Board to October 18, 2011, applicant did not appear, carried to November 15, 2011 and continued to January 17, 2012. Revised map submitted with County changes. Engineer reviewing.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

RUPP: Mr. Chairman, may I just suggest that we call CASE: 12-01, just for the purpose of announcing that it has been adjourned, so that we have it on the record, so that no notice will have to be provided and any members in the audience who might be here for that application, do not need to stay around.

VON DER LIETH: Excellent. That would be CASE: 12-01, the Application of Kevin Guarderas, 134 Morningside Avenue. For the record, no one is here for that case. If there is anyone here in the audience, for that case, there is no one here. Let it be known that it will be heard February 15th.

RUPP: Let me just note, that this application has been adjourned for one month at the request of the applicant. The applicant has extended the time period for the Board to act. By reason of that, a continuance and the matter has been rescheduled for February 21st and there will be no need to re-notice based on that.

VON DER LIETH: Thank you Mr. Rupp. Good evening gentlemen.

KOVATZ: Are you ready for us? I am still Douglas Kovatz. This is our continuing meeting. We were here before back in August. Our application has been carried several months to allow the Engineers to confer with one another, resulting in some redesign work. I understand that we had a recent meeting, again with the Borough Engineer.

I would ask that the testimony that we previously had be incorporated into this hearing, normally it would be. I don't think, unless your council advises us otherwise, that you need to re-swear the witness. He still understands the importance of this.

RUPP: Does the witness understand that he is still under oath and is still sworn in?

LANTELME: Yes, I do.

KOVATZ: Just on a point for the council, has your newest member and I am assuming that he has not had an opportunity to review prior exhibits or signed certification? If we get to them.

RUPP: That is correct. I am assuming that the new member has not listened to the tapes of the previous testimony, and would not be able to vote tonight, should there be a vote taken. If he did review, than he would be able to vote.

KOVATZ: Certainly, if he did review it in time to vote on the motion, we obviously have no objection, if he has had an opportunity to meet that certification.

RUPP: May I have the dates, by the way, on the previous.

KOVATZ: I believe that the minutes that were approved this evening, I think they reflected the dates. August, 2011, I don't recall the exact date. I guess it would be about the 17th.

WALKER: August 16th.

BEER: August 16th, September 20th, October 18th, November 15th, and continued to January 17th.

VON DER LIETH: Mr. Walker, do we have items to add?

WALKER: We have a few more items to be added into evidence

Item 26 is the Board secretary letter dated 11/22/11.
Item 27 is Bergen County Planning Board letter dated 12/01/11.
Item 28 is Director of Operations Park Ridge letter dated 12/22/11
Item 29 is Board secretary letter dated 12/27/11.
Item 30 is revised plan dated per the County dated 12/29/11.
Item 31 is Board Engineer's review dated 1/10/12.
Item 32 is Board secretary's letter dated 1/12/12.

That is all that I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

VON DER LIETH: Thank you.

KOVATZ: In reference to the January 12th letter, may I ask you to identify the top?

WALKER: It is addressed to Mr. Wright and it attaches a copy of the Borough Engineer's review, dated January 10th.

KOVATZ: Okay, I got you. Unless there is any objection, I think what might be best to do this evening, is to simply go where we have made modifications to the site plan with regard to the development of the site. We will leave that to our expert, in this instance.

Can you first describe for the Board, what modifications we have made? I understand also maybe just give us an overview of how we got here, modifications that you have made, and I understand that there are minor modifications when we go forward.

LANTELME: Do you just want me to take a minute and just go through this.

KOVATZ: That would be helpful.

LANTELME: Just to describe the project briefly and then we will get into the latest changes. The property that we are talking about, the corner of Pascack Road and Wampum Road. It is a fairly stooped lot. If you recall, it is about a 16 foot drop from Pascack Road down to the back of the lot. There was some talk, initially, about sidewalks and that steep drop is really why we came to the conclusion it would be better without sidewalks.

I don't think sidewalk is even being discussed at this point, not in the last engineering letter, anyway. The existing condition is a building and a driveway and some walkways. What is on the lot right now, from a site standpoint, we are not proposing to change. There is no extension of the building. These walkways are actually the same. This planting bed remains and the driveway remains.

The proposed conditions or improvements is primarily a parking lot in the back end of the lot. It is going to have 13 spaces. There is also a handicapped spot in the driveway and that is the only parking that we are proposing in the driveway for the handicapped. So, it is 13 spaces plus a handicapped spot.

We are also proposing curbing along Wampum Road. There is going to be a retaining wall behind the, on the rear end of the parking facility. I will get into that in a little more detail when I go over the engineer's report, in terms of slope and things like that. There is a retaining wall there. There is a drainage system, we are proposing. It is a seepage pit system, one of the things we are also going to be talking about with the Engineer's report, is to have an overflow to that drainage system.

We are adding a walkway, basically to get from the parking lot up to the building to the driveway of the building. We are also proposing some landscaping and I will just put this up for a moment, just to show you the landscaping, then I will go back to the original plan. In fact, if you look at this landscaping plan, it is maybe a little easier to see

what the changes really are. The building stays the same. This whole area, the driveway, the walkway, they are existing. These two trees are also existing.

KOVATZ: May I interrupt for one moment?

LANTELME: Sure.

KOVATZ: I believe that we had this marked previously.

WALKER: No, I don't have it.

LANTELME: This is going to be an additional sheet to the plan. You don't have it, so, do you want me to mark it now?

RUPP: It needs to be marked for identification.

WALKER: We are up to applicant's number 33.

LANTELME: Okay, so this view does give you a quick look at what we are proposing. This is the existing and this is the parking lot that is basically being proposed. As far as the landscaping, this is a wall that is going to be holding up a portion of the parking lot. We are proposing a row of arborvitae in front of that wall. We are proposing 3 new trees in the right of way.

This is showing a Red Maple, I don't know if you have a tree advisory in this town. Okay, Red Maple unless somebody says that they would like to see something else, and Boxwoods, along this parking lot here. That is it for landscaping.

KOVATZ: How many trees are coming down?

LANTELME: There are 7 trees that are coming down. They are marked on the main plan.

KOVATZ: The location of the arborvitae along the retaining wall, are they on the inside of it or the outside?

LANTELME: On the outside.

KOVATZ: Approximately how many plants will there be?

LANTELME: We are showing 12 arborvitae.

CAPILLI: They will at grade level then?

KOVATZ: Yes, they will be in front of the wall.

CAPILLI: How high is the wall?

LANTELME: The wall is going to be, the parking lot is 2 feet and then there is going to be an additional 18, 24 inches above that. We are actually extending the wall to act as a barrier. We are still using curb stops. We don't want the wall to be what people bump every time that they come to the parking. It will be more of a safety issue. It was requested that some kind of guard rail or something be put on that wall and we decided that it would probably look better just to extend the wall.

One other thing that I will mention in terms of improvements, is the County had a couple of requirements and they wanted some handicapped ramps at the sidewalks crossing Wampum Road. So, there will be a new ramp and a crosswalk will be painted in the street. The other thing that they wanted, it just they want to extend the right of way, of course, with some monumentation. So the right of way at Pascack Road, at this point, will be filled in.

CAPILLI: Can you just clarify, again, the total area would be including the extra?

LANTELME: At the worst case, it is going to be about 5 feet.

CAPILLI: Five feet higher than grade level now?

LANTELME: Yes.

CAPILLI: And you are back filling to level off the parking lot, than 3 feet.

LANTELME: Three, that is maximum. It is a fairly steep slope back here and actually, that was addressed in the Engineer's report, which I will to now, unless there is a question.

WALKER: I am just thinking in terms of perspective to the house that adjoins that property. Now you have a 5 foot wall. There is a house next to us going down Wampum.

LANTELME: There are only 2 points that we are asking for some relief on. The first point compares fence and guide rails. That is what brought us to raising the wall 24 inches, instead of putting in a guard rail. That is what we are proposing.

The second one is regarding the grades and this is a fairly tough lot. It is fairly steep back here. Really just because of the geometry of the lot, there is one area that you can go in and have parking on either side. So, it slopes down, so ideally what you would do is that you would raise the parking in the back and cut in the front.

What we are proposing is to raise the lot in the back an additional foot from what we already had. We already were going to raise it 2 feet, we are going to raise it another foot, so we can get a slope. It comes out to about 3%. Right now, as you can see in the Engineering report, we have almost a 7% slope on this parking lot. To alleviate that to some extent, we are raising the parking lot in the back and additional foot. It brings it to about a 3 foot slope. What we don't want to do is lower in the front. That is what you typically do. You go into the lot and you raise it here and lower it here, and you end up with a somewhat flat parking area.

There is an existing stone wall here, that we don't want to undermine. That is really the reason why we don't want to lower it. So, we are looking to keep a 6.67% slope, where ideally we would only have a 5% slope. On the back side of the parking lot, we are going to have about a 3% slope, 5% slope, you usually don't want to get steeper than that. That was item 2.

Item 3 is percolation test. The answer, of course, is yes. We will do a percolation test. We would like to do it at the time of construction, when we have equipment, backhoe, on there so we can dig the whole without bringing in equipment just for that.

Item 4 requesting an overflow of the seepage pit. We do have a catch basin in this parking lot. Again, maybe looking at the key map, it is part of lot 1. It is maybe 50 or 75 feet beyond our lot. That catch basin we are actually going to repair. It is in pretty rough shape. What we are proposing is to repair that seepage pit and also have an overflow pipe go from the existing seepage pit, probably 2 of them, to that other catch basin.

That brings me to number 5, requests for structural calculations. Yes, we will submit them.

Item 6, parking area to be curbed. Typically, you would want your parking lot to be curbed all the way around, so it catches the water. Here again, we have the area that we don't want to undermine for the same reason that we don't want to lower the parking lot close to this existing stone wall, so we don't want to put a curb in front of it. It is also up hill, anyway, so it wouldn't be catching any water. If anything it would just be for looks. So, up in this whole area, actually over here, to, we do not want to put a curb.

The rest of the parking lot, you know, is going to have a wall. It acts as a curb. We are putting curbing out to the right of way and up Wampum Road. Handicapped accessible, we will show that just to let you know, though, there is a door here. We didn't indicate it on our drawing, but there is a small overhead door right at the end of the driveway. That is going to be the access for the handicapped.

Limit of pavement of payment to remain, we are going, it should be clearly shown. We are going to indicate that a little more. Items 9 and 10, they are just statements and not requesting anything. Item 11 lighting plan has been submitted. The light levels appear to be a little bright. We are going talk to our lighting expert again. We will probably just lower the wattage of the bulbs. I don't think that we are going to change the location of any of the lighting. The criticism there was really the bollard lighting, which is along the walkways.

RUPP: Please describe what a bollard light is?

LANTELME: A bollard light is a round conical stanchion with a light on top of it. You have seen them walking through parking lots or walkways. They are about 3 feet high and the light is at the top.

The lighting plan, by the way, is your second sheet. There are 4 lights for the upper walkway and another 4 lights for the lower walkway connecting the parking lot to the driveway. Right now, we had 100 watt light bulbs in there, it will probably go down 75 watts. That is something that we will just confirm with our lighting expert and the next revision will have a slightly different light contour map to it.

KOVATZ: But these basically light to a walkway none from the existing 1 ½ story frame. (not speaking into microphone can not pick up testimony).

LANTELME: That is right they are both just for lighting the walkways. Item 13 is soil erosion and sediment control plan. Of course, that would be part of a building permit application, and construction details be site specific. Those are a couple of details that were challenging to make them conforming, being a little more clear that it is specifically for this site.

KOVATZ: Let me discuss specific changes from the details that you have and I think you mentioned that you were going back to the wall.

LANTELME: Yes, this plan shows a wall and it was showing the wall being about 6 inches above the parking lot. We decided to extend the wall up so that instead of putting guard rail an extended wall will take place of the guard rail. This is also a paver wall that will probably change to a reinforced concrete wall.

KOVATZ: What is the benefit over the paver wall?

LANTELME: It will be stronger, particularly since we are raising it above the parking lot. You wouldn't want to have a paver wall be what is stopping you if a car goes a little to fast or a little out of control, and hits what would be a guard rail. You are just going to have a lot more of a solid foundation with a concrete wall.

KOVATZ: Is it fair to say that instead of a paver wall, the suggestion back was maybe then do a guard rail and that the aesthetic value of the paver wall and guard rail would not have looked as nice?

LANTELME: That is what we were trying to avoid. We didn't want a guard rail. So, the best thing to do, we thought, would be to extend the wall.

KOVATZ: Basically, remind the Board this advantage to the reinforced concrete wall would have arborvitae on it.

LANTELME: No, I mean the arborvitae is going to be covering the wall. That is one thing that we weren't showing before, we didn't think that we needed to because of

the paver wall looking a little better than concrete wall, so, that is why we are putting 5 foot arborvitae there.

KOVATZ: Again, let me go back to one of the comments that you made before. Just for the purposes of making this record clear. The arborvitae on the outside and the distance, and again, I know you haven't scaled it off, but the distance, if you will, from where the arborvitae advances from the rear of the lot to lot 14, because basically the Board of Education owns the property of 1601, Lot 1. I am trying to get the width of that sort of (pave or pay if you will?).

LANTELME: It is actually about, actually it is a little more than the length of this lot, which is 150 feet. It is probably a little more than 150 feet from those arborvitae/retaining wall to the property line of Lot 14, which is the next residential lot.

KOVATZ: Do you know what is contained on Lot 1 in that area? Is that just a flat surface? Is it paved there?

LANTELME: Lot 1 is a parking lot, primarily a parking lot.

KOVATZ: So basically, instead of looking at the rear of this lot now, Lot 14, some 150 feet away will be a row of arborvitae?

LANTELME: Yes really don't even see the whole row of arborvitae. There is a building here that cuts out to about half of the row of arborvitae.

KOVATZ: Okay, would you describe what here means on the transcripts.

LANTELME: Actually it is shown on this landscape plan. This brown line here, and if you look at your drawing, it is the red line. It is a building line. It is actually shown the school building next to our property. So, that building is in front of this wall almost 50%, if you were looking from Lot 14.

I think that the point that I am making is the guy that is looking up the street from Lot 13, approximately half of this wall, say even more than half of this wall is exposed to him. He would be able to see it and the arborvitae are in front of it.

CAPILLI: Are you open to other planting materials if the Board so deems it, or the experts deem it?

LANTELME: Absolutely.

CAPILLI: One of the questions of the parking lot was when winter is here, how do you envision this lot being plowed and where do you think the area for the excess, because it looks like a small lot. My fear is even it is a reinforced wall, could it be plowed at night?

LANTELME: If there is any significant snowstorm, the school is going to have to remove the snow. On the upper area there is place to put the snow. In this parking lot, there is very little. If it is small enough, they could put it over on the side in the lot over here. Anything significant they are going to have to take it out.

BRENNAN: Remove it totally or push it to across the street or....

KOVATZ: I think we could have our Business Administer address what we currently do. I would suggest, again I am not under oath, I would suggest that consistent with what we do with Lot 1 when we are clearing snow, more likely than not, we would be moving it and placing it the same area.

VON DER LIETH: Mr. Wright, you can answer that.

RUPP: Mr. Wright would you please your right hand? Do you swear that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

WRIGHT: I do.

RUPP: State your name for the record.

WRIGHT: Robert Wright, to answer your question, what we do, we have a bucket loader and we have Cat. Whenever we get snow that is in excess of a certain, lets say 3 or 4 feet, and we can't push it comfortably against the side, we bring these in and we pick the snow up and we move it. The guys will drive it to an area where they can store it. We have actually have, on our upper lots, we have fences so we can dump down into a field area, so we are set up to handle large amounts of snow with this equipment.

WALKER: Mr. Wright, as long as you are up there, are all of these parking spots in support of this building? Or, is it like overflow parking for the school property?

WRIGHT: It will function as both. One of the complaints or one of the things that we have heard in the past, is that there is not sufficient parking at the Board of Education for either events or at the gym area when we are not in the building itself. So, what we chose to do in this case, because there was some extra space, is to create these spots. In fact, one of the calls that I received when this project was advertised to the surrounding property owners, was from the person who owns the professional building across the street. His comment to me was could you please put some extra parking spots in there because people a lot of time when they come to the games, they will park across the street in the parking for our facility.

I said that we would do whatever we can, but they would be able to use those spots. Usually the Board of Education building closes by 5 o'clock. So, that leaves all of those spots available for a game.

HOSKINS: I have one question. Right now I believe that there a couple of cars that face against the gym brick wall facing north. Is that going to be prohibited because this sticks out, or is that space going to be available? In other words, the door is to the left and there are cars parked facing the gym facing north.

WRIGHT: I know where you are talking about. Yes, you are referring to, I think there are half a dozen spaces right up against the gym. No, this won't effect that at all.

KOVATZ: We discussed, briefly, the changes to the retaining wall. Are there any other changes to the drainage to the site. You referenced that there is going to be a overflow, and you have to do lighting, in regard to the Bollard lighting, along the walkways, you referenced that there is going to be changes in the retaining wall and you identified the plantings. Are there any other modifications in the plans upon that which you have presented to the Board based upon the discussions that you may have had with the Borough Engineer?

LANTELME: I think we covered it.

KOVATZ: Was there something else about the drainage.

LANTELME: Just that we were going to put in an overflow for the drainage.

KOVATZ: I think that you have already addressed the County's a submission, you referenced it. Basically, you testified that you would comply with the direction of the County Planning Board in their letter to us regarding to drop curb and placement of the striping for the sidewalk area.

LANTELME: Yes, we have no problem.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment
Meeting of January 17, 2012 – Page 11

SIGILLITO: Just a question on the retaining wall again. You said it could be up to 5 feet. With this 5 feet provide for a fence to keep people from falling off of the wall? I think you said it wouldn't be a guard rail.

LANTELME: The reason for that being that high is that it would be is that it would be 2 feet higher than the parking lot, on the parking lot side.

LUDWIG: What about the down hill side?

LANTELME: That is where it is 5 feet high because the parking lot is raised 3 feet and there is going to be another 2 feet.

LUDWIG: So the total retaining wall would be 5 feet.

LANTELME: That is in the worst spot.

LUDWIG: We may have a requirement that retaining walls over 4 feet have some type of fencing. I will have to check on that. You are proposing that the 2 feet actually is acting as a fence in a way?

LANTELME: Um...

WALKER: No, that is a car barrier.

LANTELME: It is like a guard rail. This is how it kind of came up. There was a request for a guard rail or something as a car barrier.

WALKER: You are by a school, kids are going to walk on that wall, so it means they could fall down 5 feet?

LANTELME: No, they are going to be walking on the other side of the wall.

KOVACS: If some child decides, unattended, to walk along the top of our wall, what is the furthest distance from the top of the wall down to hard pavement.

LANTELME: The furthest distance is 5 feet. I mean, could we put a fence on top of it? We could. If it was a guard rail, would you request a fence on top of that? I would almost rather go with the guard rail again.

LUDWIG: I think the guard rail addresses the cars.

MANCUSO: It is 2 different issues.

LUDWIG: It is not really designed to keep people from being in an area where they could have a higher fall.

LANTELME: We could put, I don't know about a fence, but it is 2 feet high to begin with, another 2 foot could be made out of metal bars kind of like a railing. So you would have a 4 foot high railing, which certainly would be high enough and there would be 2 feet between the highest portion of that railing and where the wall comes up, to get through that, you would have to be climbing through it. So, we could do something like that.

LUDWIG: You might want to check with our Engineers to what type of fencing might be considered an adequate fence. I am not exactly sure what you design is.

MANCUSO: I believe that you need 42 inches for a hand rail.

LUDWIG: A retaining wall can be any number of feet in height, but once they get to a certain height, the fear is that people could fall off of it. It can be in places where there could be occupied. So, the purpose of a fence would be to keep people off of higher

retaining walls, even though they shouldn't be walking there because it is not a path, they still could be an area where people might walk.

I mean, suppose it is dark, and they walk out of the parking lot off the deep end.

LANTELME: Yes, anything could happen.

RAMAN: Couldn't you just put a handrail on top of the wall?

LANTELME: That is what I was describing before. Yes, you have a 2 foot wall and a 2 foot hand rail above, that it would be 4 feet high. I think that 48 inches is higher than you need to be. Isn't it 42 inches that somebody mentioned for a handrail?

MANCUSO: I thought that the height of the rail and I may be incorrect, but you could research that, and just provide sufficient height. You are addressing 2 different issues. You are addressing substituting the parapet instead of the guide rail and now you are suggesting you might add some ornamental fencing on top of the parapet to also address safety for pedestrians.

LANTELME: Absolutely. We can look into some options and present it in the next revision and have the Engineer approve it. Yes, I think what you are asking is easily remedied.

LUDWIG: One additional question, and maybe it is a clarification from the last meeting. It starts with a minor point and that is the proposed flagpole. We actually have an ordinance that says there will be no more than one flagpole on any lot. I guess my question is again, beyond the flagpole, and that is, are we merging the lots? Or, are we not merging the lots?

KOVATZ: I think that we agreed that we were going to merge these lots. We have not taken those steps pending the resolution of this hearing. In case we didn't get the relief that we needed, we could sell that lot and they we would have to come back and ask for a subdivision. It is our proposal to combine those lots because as far as we are concerned it is part of the school campus. That is our intention to merge those lots. However we need to conform, we will.

RUPP: If you merge, what is the "D" variance.

KOVATZ: When we originally appeared before the Board, it was our position that this would remain as a "D3" as a conditional use. With regard to the variance that we needed, our suggestion was we take a look at it as a combined lot and take a look at the specific conditions as a conditional use for the school. I think the Zoning Board of Adjustment could come to the conclusion and say look the conditional use of schools allow playgrounds areas and these kind of things. What we were saying is instead of a "D" variance the "D3" variance is a more appropriate fit because in terms of the conditions that we were not meeting. We were, in a sense, meeting those conditions on the entire campus.

RUPP: That is my question, do you have any "D" variance? That is what I am trying to understand. Assuming the lots have merged, what conditions are you not meeting with a conditional use of approval?

KOVATZ: If it is merged, I think we need, what I had explained to the Board because it has not been merged, it was an issue of how you wanted to interpret that. The condition we would not meet is the one with playground area.

RUPP: Yes but if you merge them..

KOVATZ: I think if we merge them I think we meet everything. I think that once we merge, we meet everything.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment
Meeting of January 17, 2012 – Page 13

RUPP: Assuming that you meet all of the conditions of the conditional use, for school use, what jurisdiction does this Board have on this application?

KOVATZ: I think that until the lot is combined, we need to get that perception I think you have jurisdiction over that. We have to prove that you are satisfied now until merging is done, we have to come before the Zoning Board of Adjustment to make the final judgment for that determination.

RUPP: So as it stands in this moment in time, this is an application on this lot, which is not yet merged with Lot 1. I know that the issue of merging versus easement because we have improvements crossing over the lot lines.

KOVATZ: I don't think we have that.

MANCUSO: We do.

RUPP: It looks that way.

KOVATZ: Oh yes, I am sorry.

RUPP: That is why that question had to be resolved one way or the other.

KOVATZ: The issue that we had and there was some discussion and you know, put your suspenders on and put your belt on also, is my original position by virtue of it being combined ownership and this lot being undersized, it was already merged by act of law under the Laughran Decision. The Board said well, that is all well and good, but you have to have something ready.

It was one of those fine, however you want to handle it.

VON DER LIETH: Are there any other questions?

RUPP: Yes I have a couple of issues. You indicated that Pascack Road is going to be an additional easement to the County. Is that what I heard?

KOVATZ: I think they want the road improved that they want us to.....

RUPP: Okay and that is not shown on the plan. What is the width of that?

KOVATZ: I think that it is described in the Engineer's report, I am sorry, the County Engineer's report. It is 33 feet.

MANCUSO: It is the green dashed line.

RUPP: Okay, I see it.

MANCUSO: It is 33 feet from the center line. The green dashed line, so it is an additional 9 feet from where the current property line is.

LANTHELME: We were not advised specifically as to why the County thought that was necessary. We still haven't asked that question. We have no opposition to it. Usually, what I see goes on in the Boards of Adjustment, again I am not trying to direct what you should do, usually it is the condition of approval that we will comply with any corrections from the County Planning Board or any matter of their jurisdiction, we will do that.

This is one that sort of popped to the front, so to speak, early one with regard to the dropped curb, the handicapped curb, and the sidewalk striping, and the request for an additional easement. I have no idea what the County has planned for this and couldn't represent otherwise. All I do know is that in the future, we won't have to buy it.

RUPP: With respect to the curbing of the proposed new lot, you indicated that there is an existing wall and therefore you didn't think curbing was necessary. Is there a wall around the entire lot? On the left hand side of that, just along that whole edge there, is there curbing or a wall there now?

LANTELME: There is no wall there now. It is all grass back here. This is part of the proposed wall and the wall comes to a height of zero because you are going up hill. I had said that the maximum height of the wall was 3 feet, actually 5 feet if you include what is coming up above the parking lot.

RUPP: Where does the wall end as you are going...now, if you take your finger there and go to the right, what is along the parking in that section right there?

LANTELME: Grass.

RUPP: And why wouldn't you have a curb there?

LANTELME: This is up hill. This area over here we could put a curb if...but it would serve no purpose, but maybe for continuity of having something along the edge of the parking lot. This parking lot is going up hill, so the curb isn't catching anything it is basically right next to there is an upward sloping lawn area. Here we have, actually more of a technical reason why we don't want the curb, over here is just has no purpose, other than possibly looks.

But, you see it doesn't even match because this is a wall. This is a wall along the parking lot.

CAPILLI: I have a question. What is the pedestrian flow through that parking lot? Is it only people getting in and out of cars? Can they get access, now, from all the way to the left, outside of the property?

LANTELME: No, there is a fence here separating.

CAPILLI: That will remain?

LANTELME: Yes.

CAPILLI: So anybody going from the school to this building has to access it from Pascack?

LANTELME: They would either access from Pascack and go in the front door, or if for some reason they wanted to come in here, I mean they could come around this way also, but, yes you would typically come through the front door and you would just take this sidewalk up and around.

I think that one of our initial plans did have an access here, but then we took it out.

CAPILLI: So, any handicapped is going to enter from the property and go into the front door?

LANTELME: The handicapped spot is in the driveway and there is a garage door here that will be their entrance.

CAPILLI: So, handicapped will go through a garage door?

WALKER: An existing garage door.

LANTELME: Or they could walk up these steps, quite frankly.

CAPILLI: Well, if they are handicapped, chances are they are probably not walking up the steps.

VON DER LIETH: Do you have any more questions? Eve do you have anything else?

MANCUSO: Yes. As Mr. Lantelme stated, we did have a brief meeting and discussion regarding my January 10th review letter. I just, not to rehash every single item, I would just like to make a couple of points. Item 1 of my letter did discuss the fence guide rail situation, but I think that we have come to solution by providing some parapet, some fence or some rail on top of it. But, I would like to clarify that the wall would be in excess of 5 feet because right now it is 3 feet and you are going to add the 2 foot parapet but you also stated that you were going to increase the height of the wall about a foot to flatten the grade. So, now we are up to about 6 feet. Just to clarify in terms of the point of drop off, that I think Bob was concerned with.

RAMAN: This drawing that we have now, is this a drawing that shows, cause I see top of wall and bottom of wall in the extreme left corner of that area in the back of the parking lot. Is that where the maximum is?

LANTELME: Yes.

RAMAN: What are those numbers 54 and 51.5?

MANCUSO: It is approximately 3 foot right now, due to the cross slope of the parking lot, Mr. Lantelme stated that he was going to flatten the lot and raise the grade approximately a foot.

RAMAN: That is not reflected here.

MANCUSO: It is not reflected here, no. That was something that we recently discussed so he didn't have the opportunity to revise the plans just yet. It is an easy solution, regrade the lot, flatten the grade so you can drop down below that. It was about 7% if I recall, 6.7%?

LANTELME: It is just under 7%.

MANCUSO: So by elevating a bit of that wall, you can flatten the surface of the lot. In addition to that, the issue with the guide rail versus the fence or parapet wall, the 24 inch parapet wall, is going to serve as essentially the guide rail for the vehicles, and the fence on top of the parapet is going to address the issue about the fence for pedestrians so there is no drop off for pedestrians.

RAMAN: So that top wall becomes 57 than, right?

MANCUSO: The top of wall there is, no, the measurement of height of the wall is down from the 53, no let me see.....the measurement of the height of the wall will be from the bottom of the wall elevation, which was 49, so you will come up to about 56, if you look at the left corner. Then it varies as it approaches Wampum Road.

RAMAN: It is less and less.

LANTELME: Yes, the wall is 6 inches above the parking lot now.

MANCUSO: Okay so you pick up that 6 inches. That is addressing item 1 and item 2 of my letter. Item 3 was discussed regarding the percolation test and typically we do allow for the percolation test to take place during construction and then the results are submitted to the Building Department, and any modification to the system that is required is done sort of as a field change. Overflow of the pipe needs to shown on the plan. They agreed to that. Calculations, same thing, that is an item that should be submitted prior to permits being issued.

Curbing, I think, is still an open item. There is some discussion regarding curbing and the need for it. Maybe in some locations to complete the edging around the parking

lot, handicapped stall now has been accessed. We still have an issue with the access into the building and it appears that modification to that door might be a solution rather than having a handicapped person go through a garage door for their sole point of access.

Limit of pavement is clearly shown now, with the colored rendering. Concrete curbs are now shown along Wampum as we had requested. I just not that the handicapped ramps are shown on the corners of Pascack as per the County review.

In terms of lighting, I was concerned with the level of lighting, especially with the bollards, because if the bollard lighting—the bollards are noted on the second page as 42 inches if I recall, which is standard for a bollard, but if the light is excessively bright, you are actually blinded by it as you come up the stairs. So, that was my concern and it is very difficult to shield the bollard, so due to the differential in the elevation with a down hill residential properties, that is actually going to look like a beacon if it is too bright. So, that was my concern about the level of lighting. That ties in with the request for additional landscaping. I wasn't so much interested with the disguising the face of the wall, as so much as filtering the light coming off of the parking lot from headlights and lighting, bollard lights and things like that, so I think the inclusion of the arborvitae corrected that problem as well as the addition of the boxwoods and we discussed the shade trees because of the number of shade trees that were cut down, I felt it was appropriate to supplement the site with additional shade trees along that Wampum Road right of way, which is now clearly shown on the plans. There are 3 trees added, which I believe all that the site could really accommodate, if you would space them appropriately.

Hours of lighting, I don't believe that we discussed that at our meeting. I think maybe there should be some condition or some commitment that the lights would go off at a certain time similar to what it does in other sections of the parking lot. I don't believe that the Board of Education had an issue with that. In fact, I don't think they really want to pay for lighting when it is not being utilized.

Item 13 is just a comment about erosion control plan needed. The applicant agreed to this. Same thing with item 14, those are just construction details which is pretty straight forward. We have no issue there. Thank you.

RUPP: Is there a solution to the lighting?

MANCUSO: Yes, they agreed to have the lighting vendor reevaluate it and just reduce the wattage of the bulbs. That combined with limiting the lighting, so after the event is over, the lights will go out. There is no need to keep the site fully illuminated if it is not being utilized.

VON DER LIETH: So, that being said, you guys have gone over and hashed out some of the points on the report. What do we have left here than. We are really looking at what is going to be put on top of the wall.

MANCUSO: I think that the only issue which the applicant committed to was to provide the appropriate height railing to meet the building code requirements.

BRENNAN: I have just one question with regard to the usage of the lot. You mentioned that it could be used for excess during games or whatever at the high school. So, the hours of usage would change from 5 o'clock to, could be 10 o'clock at night. How are those people getting to the school that are parking there if you can't get access through the back of the lot? Are they going around, going through woods or do they have to walk up to Pascack?

LANTELME: The only reason to park there would be if you were going to the gym. So, what they would do, is they would just walk around and that is the entrance.

BRENNAN: But would you have to walk in the street?

LANTELME: Over here.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment
Meeting of January 17, 2012 – Page 17

BRENNAN: But to get there are you walking in the street?

LANTELME: Yes. If you chose to park in this lot.

BRENNAN: Well assume that you are.

LANTELME: Then you would go out and come in through here.

BRENNAN: Is that path lit?

LANTELME: Yes.

BRENNAN: Is there a safety issue for people walking into the street to get access to that path?

LANTELME: That is how they get into the facilities now, currently. If you were to go to a game, that is one of the main entrances to get into the gym.

BRENNAN: But they are not using that lot to park now.

LANTELME: No, they are not, but they will either use that or they will use the church lot, which is right across the street. A lot of people will park...

BRENNAN: I am just concerned with the people who learn that that lot is available, they are coming in and out of games, there is going to be a traffic flow on that street and now they are walking on to the street. Let say if it is winter and all kinds of weather and now they are going further into the street, I don't know if it is necessary if they need a path that is safer off of the street? I don't know.

WRIGHT: You are talking about IF the event is crowded enough, they will most likely use the parking area across the street first. So, it would have to be an unusual event for anyone to park there.

BRENNAN: But if it is a more convenient lot, people are going to find that lot.

LANTELME: I don't really know why we took it off, who told us to take it off, we are happy to put it back on. From the parking lot right over here to this sidewalk, we could put something right here. It is practically flat. I will have to check the elevations, there might be a step or something, but I actually do think it would be flat. Then they can walk through the parking lot and have direct access to the school, for those times that you are describing.

WALKER: Even if they are exiting the parking lot, it is only 20 feet from the end of the parking lot to get to the fire lane. It is only 20 feet.

BRENNAN: Safety knows no vacation.

VON DER LIETH: No more questions from the Board? Professionals? No.

KOVATZ: I do have one other professional I would like to speak with. Mr. Bruno please come forward.

RUPP: Please raise your right hand? Do you swear that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

BRUNO: I do.

RUPP: Please state your name and address for the record?

BRUNO: Joseph J. Bruno, 21 Pascack Road, Park Ridge. I want to thank the Board for all the time that they have spent and I would also like to Ms. Mancuso for meeting with Chris Lantelme and myself yesterday. We had a very productive meeting.

We went through the letter item by item. To address your comment, Mr. Brennan, yes I suggested to Mr. Lantelme that we just provide that access, which would be at the, basically the northeast corner of the parking lot. That is an easy push. Right now, most of the cars park in the church parking lot across the street, so everybody is sort of in the road anyway, but it is a very appropriate comment and we will certainly take that to account and provide the access.

One of the things that the Board has wrestled with and one of the many reasons why we are doing this project in the first place, other than to provide office space that would free up classroom space, which is much more economical than building a new building, one of the things that we wrestled with is, if any of you have been in that back parking lot, the upper parking lot at the high school, it is very narrow getting in and out. My heart is in my throat every time I see somebody pull in to that parking lot because the kids are back there also.

So, what this will allow us to do, this parking lot, will allow the transient traffic to be down there where it is safe and away from the kids and more static traffic, meaning, you know, teaching staff, someone could be moved up to that upper lot, so you don't have visitors coming and going. I wanted to make that clear.

As far as whatever safeguards we need to do above the wall, cause I agree that if it is there, a kid will climb it. Even if it is not there, they will find some way to climb it. We will provide whatever is necessary and also acceptable to the Borough Engineer at the end of the day.

We agreed yesterday, that even though the plans would not be fully revised for this evening's meeting, that we would comply with any and all comments that the Borough Engineer had for the purposes of getting the building permit issued. So, whatever we need to do, we will do that. We are interested in not only satisfying the needs but also to be a good neighbor.

One of the things is that catch basin and I guess the southeast corner of the present high school parking lot is in severe disrepair. So that will be essentially rebuilt. Obviously, whatever we can do to alleviate any water issues, we will. It is in our best interest and also we don't want to cause any additional problems for the neighbors. We will handle what we can, meaning the parking lot is handled. Rehabilitating the catch basin unfortunately we can't do anything about what comes off of Pascack Road or what falls on Wampum, so, if anybody has any questions for me, I will be happy to answer. I just want to thank you for your time.

VON DER LIETH: Thank you Mr. Bruno. Does anyone have any questions for Mr. Bruno. I am assuming that there is nobody in the audience tonight to speak on this case.

Gentlemen, thank you very much. You can call Mrs. Beer in the morning. We will discuss this tonight.

As was stated before, Case 12-01 has been pushed to the next meeting. We do have a resolution tonight also.

CASE: 11-25 Block: 2406 Lot: 22	Application of <u>Charles and Stacy Dellavolpe</u> , 11 Sturms Place, for front yard variance to extend existing porch and stairs across front of existing house. Re-scheduled to December 20, 2011 for Notification to property owners. Hearing held December 20 2011, voice vote of approval. To be memorialized this evening.
----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

WHEREAS, STACY & CHARLES DELLA VOLPE, (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant"), being the owner of premises known as 11 Sturms Place, in the Borough of Park Ridge, County of Bergen and State of New Jersey, said premises also being known as Lot 22 of Block 2406 on the Tax Assessment Map for the Borough of Park

Ridge, previously applied to the ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE (hereinafter referred to as “BOARD”), seeking a front yard variance to allow the addition of a front porch to the existing home; and

WHEREAS, the premises are located in an R-15 Residential Zoning District as same is defined by the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge; and

WHEREAS, Applicant had previously submitted various plans and renderings to the BOARD including a survey prepared by Daniel M. Dunn, Licensed Surveyor of the State of New Jersey dated October 25, 2011, detailing the specific improvements to be made to the property; and

WHEREAS, the BOARD held a hearing in connection with the application, upon due notice as required by law, on December 20, 2011;

WHEREAS, the BOARD has carefully considered the application and all evidence and testimony submitted in connection therewith;

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

- 1 Applicant is the owner of premises located at 11 Sturms Place in the Borough of Park Ridge. After purchasing the home in June of this year, Applicant has been in the process of completing substantial improvements to the existing dwelling, improvements that will render the home significantly more attractive. Applicant testified that no variances were required in connection with the ongoing improvements to the dwelling, however, during construction they realized that the appearance of the home could be further enhanced by way of the construction of a covered front porch. Applicant also realized that the construction of a covered porch would make it possible for individuals to enter the home in a safer manner since the front entrance would be protected from the elements.
- 2 After designing the proposed front porch, Applicant learned that a variance was required since the porch would be situated 26.1 feet from the front lot line rather than the 30 feet required in the R-15 Residential Zoning District. Applicant has thus applied to the BOARD seeking a variance to permit the proposed front porch.
- 3 Applicant testified that the proposed front porch will extend along the front of the dwelling as shown on the submitted survey. Applicant testified that the porch would constitute a significant aesthetic improvement to the home. Applicant further testified that the porch would be covered thereby providing a protected area for those entering and exiting the home.
- 4 Applicant also testified that the proposed front porch would not result in their dwelling being nearer to the front lot line than other homes in the neighborhood, particularly homes located on either side of the subject premises. The addition of a front porch will thus not have any negative impact on the neighborhood. On the contrary, the BOARD finds that the proposed front porch will constitute a benefit to the neighborhood.
- 5 The BOARD finds that the Applicant’s request for a variance is justified pursuant to the flexible (c) provisions of the Municipal Land Use Law. The Addition will achieve a public benefit by virtue of the improved aesthetic appearance of the home. More importantly, the addition will result in a health and safety benefit by providing a safe and protected area for those entering the home.
- 6 Moreover, the BOARD finds that a decision to grant the requested variance will have no negative impact whatsoever. The front yard encroachment will

not have a negative impact on surrounding properties. A decision to grant the variances will not result in any substantial detriment to the public good nor will same impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan or Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge in any way.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE, by virtue of the foregoing, and pursuant to the authority of N.J.S.A. 4:55D-70, the BOARD does hereby grant the Applicant's requested front yard variance and variance to permit the construction of the proposed covered front porch as shown on the survey submitted to the BOARD subject to the following conditions:

- A. That Applicant construct the proposed improvements as set forth on all plans submitted to the BOARD and that same not be constructed in such a fashion so as to exceed the scope and extent of the improvement set forth on all documents submitted and described in all testimony presented to the BOARD.
- B. That Applicant comply with all Borough Ordinances and State Statutes with regard to the application for building permits and that the construction of the proposed improvements be in compliance with all applicable codes and all required approvals to be rendered by appropriate officials. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to represent an approval of the specific building plans submitted by the Applicant, said approval to be granted by appropriate Borough Officials. The within approval is specifically contingent upon Applicant securing building permits and complete building inspections from the Construction Code Official confirming that the covered porch has been constructed in compliance with all applicable codes.

The resolution was offered by Mr. Capilli and seconded by Mr. Hoskins.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Mr. Raman, Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Capilli, Mr. Walker, Mr. Hoskins,
Mr. Brennan, Dr. von der Lieth

Abstain: Mr. Sandler, Mr. Sigilitto

NEW BUSINESS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

CORRESPONDENCE:

N.J. Planner re: November 2011 - distributed

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Chairman entertained a motion that the October 18, 2011, minutes be approved as submitted. So moved by Mr. Sanders and seconded by Mr. Walker.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Mr. Raman, Mr. Sandler, Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Capilli, Mr. Walker,
Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Brennan, Dr. von der Lieth

Abstain: Mr. Sigilitto

APPROVAL OF VOUCHERS:

None

DISCUSSION OF APPLICATIONS:

The members discussed the application of the *Park Ridge Board of Education*. The members were confused by the fact that none of the objectors from the last meeting were present at this meeting. The Borough Engineer felt that most of the concerns of the public from the last hearing have been addressed by the applicant.

They still feel that there is a drainage problem, but not necessarily from this one lot. It was the consensus that the impact most likely to be impacted would be the parking lot as the next resident is approximately 125 feet away.

The attorney advised that the application definitely calls for a merger of the properties. He explained that had they done that first, they wouldn't have had to come before the Zoning Board. He felt that a condition to the resolution could call for a subdivision application.

The Board felt that approval should be held until the next meeting with revised plans and other requested documents be submitted. They also felt that more would have to be done as far as handicap accessibility.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business to come before the Board, by motion of Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Flaherty, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Margot Hamlin,
Transcriber