

REGULAR MEETING

Salute to Flag: 8:00pm

OPENING STATEMENT:

This is the Regular Meeting of the Wanaque Board of Adjustment and adequate notice has been given and it has been duly advertised by the placement of a notice in the Herald News and the Suburban Trends on February 14, 2016 and February 17, 2016 respectively, and a notice thereof has been posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building in the Borough of Wanaque and a copy thereof has been on file with the Borough Clerk

ROLL CALL: Chairman Jack Dunning, Vice Chairman Bruce Grygus, Members Frank Covelli, Peter Hoffman, Michael Levine, Susan Henderson and David Karp, Attorney Ronald Mondello and Engineer Christopher Nash

ALSO PRESENT: Kenneth Albert, Wanaque Borough's Planner

ABSENT: Member Donald Ludwig

Application #ZBA2015-03 – 1049 Ringwood Avenue, LLC, Applicant, 1049 Ringwood Avenue, Haskell, NJ, Block 430, Lot 1

Charles Lorber, Esq. of Mandelbaum Salsburg, Applicant's Attorney

Attorney Lorber is going to have Engineer Kennan and Architect Jarmel testify as to the revised plans. I think the revisions meet every single thing that you have all asked us for, besides incorporating all the other things that were asked for earlier on, such as the playground, the elevator, the firewalls, etc. It incorporates every single thing that we previously agreed to do. You should note that the revised plans, as pointed out in your experts' reports correctly, contain 2 additional units with 6 fewer beds. This is how we were able to maneuver it on the plan. We have also incorporated parking around the entire building since we moved the building back, which eliminates a lot of the questions concerning the fire safety.

Exhibits: Engineer Keenan

A-24 Colored Rendering of Site Plan (Last Revised 3/2/16)

A-25 Copy of Grading Plan (Page 4 of 15; Revised 2/18/16)

A-26 Fire Truck Turning 1 (Dated 3/2/16)

Engineer Keenan's Testimony

Engineer Keenan remains sworn in

I just want to walk through this updated submission and go through the plan starting with Exhibit A-22 which is titled "Alternative Site Plan 2" and what it has on it is the red-lined sketch that we came to the conclusion at the last meeting where we looked at relocating the building further back to the west and incorporating parking along three sides of the building. So this was really our starting point and I just kind of wanted to come back to this to indicate where we started and kind of the direction we had as we were moving forward at looking how to revise this application and the site plans to incorporate these elements. The building moved back and getting additional access around the building.

A-24 "Site Rendering For Wanaque Residential Development (last revised 3/2/16)"

This is just a colored rendering of the application that was submitted to the Board and we colored it just to enhance the features of it and make it a little easier for presentation purposes. This is just a rendering of what we already submitted to the Board.

I just want to go over some of the elements that we have incorporated here.

This takes the building and shifts it back further away from Ringwood Avenue, which was part of the goal of this resubmission. The initial submission had the building back 85.1' from Ringwood Avenue from the right-of-way; this building is 153.9' back from Ringwood Avenue so we shifted it back 68.8' further to the west. The setback for Ringwood Avenue is 30' so we are actually 123.9' further back from the setback line.

The other aspect we incorporated into this plan was the circulation around the building. Originally, I thought we were only going to be able to get access on the three sides, but when we looked at the plan and how we were going to revise it, we really wanted to get that fourth side of access. Ideally, we don't want to have a dead end parking situation in the parking lot. We really wanted to get full looped access around the parking lot. From an emergency vehicle standpoint, it works and functions a lot better. The emergency vehicles can come in, circulate through the property and come a lot easier, and it will be much simpler moving in and out of the property for the residents of the development. That was one of the aspects of this design is taking the building and really moving it back to the west also sliding it up north as much as we reasonably could to open up room on the southern side of the building to fit in some sort of access drive through there. We were able to get an 18' access aisle and that is what is adequate by RSIS standards for emergency vehicles. It is not adequate for two-way access. All the other aisles throughout the property are 24', so the 18' aisle really only allows us one-way access through there. We really didn't feel comfortable pushing it any further just because of the slope on the southern portion of the

property and then on the northern end we had the steep grades that we were dealing with on that property line. We decided it made sense to go with a one-way access on that southern end and from a site circulation I think it makes a lot more sense.

On the southern end we now have this intersection down here where all the movement from people driving in and out of the site on this main access to the west is all in one direction. The people coming out at that T intersection are just making a clean movement not expecting anyone to come back into them. It is a little simpler intersection and I didn't like the movement of people coming into the site and trying to turn up into drive. I think having that as a one-way I believe works and functions better for the site. The most important thing was providing that circulation around the building and giving four sides for emergency access around the building, and having a smoother function of the site.

Exhibit A-25 – Grading Plan (Sheet 4 of 15; Revised 2/18/16)

We just wanted to point out here in this northern corner of the property, which was an area we were always trying to avoid and I always had trouble pushing the building back because the grade is so steep back there and it creates a condition where we are really cutting into that slope, now that we have actually cut back into that area, it is creating a wall back there. We are showing a wall in that back corner that wraps around the edge of the parking lot and the drive aisle. At its peak, it is 16' tall in the back corner. We basically moved it as close to the property line as I think was reasonable. We wanted to allow some room for buffer so that we don't have a wall right up against the property line and allow for some separation and that allowed us to get the building up as high as we could to expand the driveway on the south. We are showing a keystone modular block retaining wall and planning it as a keystone wall. However, we reasonably expect that we are going to hit rock in this area and, if we hit rock, we will take a look at it and investigate it and make sure it is all stable and, if stable rock, we will just leave it as an exposed rock face. That is what we anticipate we will see back there, but we are planning that we could build a retaining wall if we need to.

The other aspect that we looked at was the stepping of the building. We talked about this in prior meetings. The more we could step the building, the more we could deal with the change in grade across this property. This whole property is sloping from the north down to the south. The area we are really trying to develop has a slight slope from north to south and to put a big, long, flat building in there became a challenge because we are cutting into this back slope, we were going to drop the grade too much in the back so what we went through and looked, after the last meeting, at how we can incorporate a change in grade across this property, and deal with that through the building construction. I will let Architect Jarmel discuss this in more depth after me. Architect Jarmel created a step in the building which allowed a 4' separation between the north side and the south side of the building. It allowed us to incorporate that thrall across the site so we have a reasonably sloped parking lot on both sides and we're allowing the site to rise up naturally with the grade that works through that property. It was a nice architectural feature that the architect was able to bring into this plan that really helped us from a grading standpoint to work with this site. It does allow us to have a compliant 35' building height. It also allowed us to have an elevator within the building. The elevator will be in the center and have access to both the north and south sides.

Member Levine stated it seems to appear that you were not able to reduce the slope of the main drive to Ringwood Avenue. Engineer Keenan stated correct. The drive coming down is the same.

The other thing we did in this updated submission is we relocated the fitness area. The fitness area was previously located in the southwest corner of the parking lot (A-24) and we relocated that to the southeast corner of the parking lot. What we are doing is leveling out an area here to really fit it, but it was much nicer that we had it closer to the building instead of tucked back in the back corner. After we submitted these plans, we took a better look at this and we actually have a little bit of a different thought. We would now like to relocate it, as Engineer Nash pointed out in his review letter, to the upper corner in the northeast corner of the parking lot where they already have a flat area and we are not going to be fighting the grades and our intention would be to take that fitness area and move it up into that corner still having much better access to the building for the residents of the development.

Engineer Nash questioned, what do you envision as the equipment? Is it for children or adults? You are putting it near the dumpster.

Engineer Keenan stated our vision is that we are looking at more of fitness equipment in there that would be more focused on the adults. It really hasn't been fully materialized as what we would put back there. With the market that we expect we are looking for with the people living here, we think they are going to be adults, and fewer children.

I want to cover the parking counts. First of all, Engineer Nash pointed out in his review letter that we did have a discrepancy in our plans on unit count between our plans and the architectural plans. The unit count and breakdown between the one and two bedroom units is correct on the architectural plans. We are now showing 36 units total (prior was 34) and the distribution is a little bit different. In the original submission, we actually had 66 bedrooms located throughout the building, now we are having 60 bedrooms. We are taking a reduction in the total number of bedrooms. The other aspect that changes from what we had indicated on our calculations and our plans is we had indicated 9 one-bedrooms when there are actually 12 one-bedrooms and we had indicated 27 two-bedrooms and there are actually 24 two-bedrooms.

What this all means from a parking standpoint is we had indicated that there 71 parking stalls per RSIS and what was actually required because there are actually more one bedrooms is 70 parking stalls required, and 77 parking stalls are provided.

Vice Chairman Grygus questioned how many stalls were on the last revised plan?

Engineer Keenan stated 71, but I think we had one that did actually have 83.

Engineer Nash, so there is no confusion, the number of parking spaces is measured by the number of bedrooms, not the units, not the beds, but they are using their units and the number of beds as something to better relate to. I think if you do look at the number of beds, there is a reduction in the number of beds, so there will be less people in the 36 units versus the 34 units. You measure the parking by the number of bedrooms. They have more one bedroom units so that is lowering the required number of parking.

Member Henderson questioned what is the reason you changed the number of bedrooms? Engineer Keenan stated it was marketing. We felt this fit better with the layout, which Architect Jarmel can speak about, but it was more what was a marketable unit.

Member Henderson and Vice Chairman Grygus questioned that a one-bedroom is more marketable than two or three bedrooms and the size of the one-bedroom unit?

Engineer Keenan stated I shouldn't really speak to the marketability of all the units, but that was my understanding when this was considered.

Member Henderson stated what was nice was that the units were a reasonable size and now it seems like the sizes have gone down and the one-bedroom seems so small.

Attorney Lorber stated the Architect will discuss this.

Member Levine, on the snow stockpile area that is basically two parking spots, there is a lot of driveway/area to shove snow into that little area.

Engineer Keenan stated I agree and this is one thing I wanted to go over. We did identify that as a snow removal area that is up by the dumpster, at the north end of the parking lot. Obviously, that is not going to handle the snow from the whole development, but that is why we have the 7 additional stalls that we felt, during the larger snow events, we could put as much as we could in this location and then we are going to be piling some in the corner but we do realize we are going to be losing some parking during the winter when we do have snow accumulation.

Member Levine stated the "old fitness area" would make a good spot for the snow and Engineer Keenan agreed that this is a good point.

Member Hoffman questioned if the new fitness area was going to be anywhere near your existing snow piling area?

Engineer Keenan stated it will be right behind it. We could put the snow removal area right in front and the fitness area right behind it. That is a fairly flat area back there, which is why we were looking to do that.

Vice Chairman Grygus questioned, since you are planning a retaining wall, is there any reason why you can't square off the parking area to the west and pick up those additional 7 or 9 spaces?

Engineer Keenan stated it is really just the wall height. It gets tall so quick.

Member Hoffman questioned if you can gain some?

Engineer Keenan stated we could certainly pick up a couple.

Vice Chairman Grygus stated, from day one, the Board's concern was there is no place for overflowing parking other than offsite, either illegally in the commercial parking lot next door on the road across the street.

Engineer Keenan stated, with what we are saying right now, I don't see any problem with picking up another 3 or 4 stalls so we would get over the 10 mark on additional stalls.

Attorney Lorber stated we are looking at the worst case scenario; not every is going to home at the same time, some on vacation, etc.

Member Hoffman said at 12 midnight on a Wednesday most people will be home.

Chairman Dunning questioned the fire truck turning radius since nothing was in the packet.

Engineer Keenan agreed it was not in the packet, but he has it tonight.

Referring to Exhibit A-26, Engineer Keenan stated this shows the fire truck movement in and around the site. The shaded area is the fire truck pulling into the property, going around the back of the building, looping around and coming down the 18' wide section of road and then looping back around. There will be no trouble in making that left.

Everything stays right within the curb line. I took the measurements of the ladder truck and got the plans so, from a fire truck circulation, this does work better than the previous submission.

Vice Chairman Grygus, regarding the whole eastside parking, I agree with you to some respect, someone pulling into that parking stall and they step on the gas, instead of the brake, and they are very close to that drop which is straight down. Maybe think about a wooden beam rail.

Engineer Keenan stated we could but I honestly don't think it is necessary. The area is heavily planted right along that whole edge with evergreens. From the errant condition where someone is hitting the gas, or something like that, they are going to be hitting into the established trees there.

Member Covelli questioned, when you say established, what are you planting?

Engineer Keenan stated on day one they will be moderate size trees. This is all established what is here.

Member Covelli jokingly commented so we are going to post a sign that says no hitting the gas, instead of the brake for five years.

Engineer Keenan jokingly commented for five years until the trees are bigger.

Member Hoffman asked Engineer Keenan if he would describe the landscaping.

Engineer Keenan, referring to the site rendering plan, you can see one of the keys things that we did in this submission is we really beefed up this screening on all visible sides of the property focusing on that southern end where people are going to be looking at the property from Ringwood Avenue and we put a series of all pine trees/evergreens along that side and then we also added the evergreens along the Ringwood Avenue side. We really focused on all of those points where people are going to looking at the property and putting evergreens right along those edges, staggering them especially along the southern end, so we are getting good screening out of those, especially as they mature.

Member Hoffman commented that it is very steep there also. Are you going to have any kind of guard rail around that corner?

Engineer Keenan stated right now no. I don't think we need one; it is a parking lot. I would be more concerned if someone was driving along here at 35mph.

Member Levine questioned what makes you think they are not?

Chairman Dunning questioned, where the one way out hits the driveway coming up, you have two trees/shrubs, are they going to create a sight problem?

Engineer Keenan stated those are deciduous so they will be taller and thinner so they are going to be looking at a smaller trunk.

Planner Albert stated that corner one is a maple and that is going to have wide. Wouldn't it be better just to put low shrubs on that corner and get rid of the maple and the oak.

Engineer Keenan stated we can do that.

Planner Albert stated that, during construction, you are going to decimate the southern side of the driveway. There is going to be no vegetation and you replanting it with the oaks. Why not put evergreens on that because as they mature it is going to provide some very good screening all year round.

Engineer Keenan agreed.

Engineer Nash commented that he has some concerns with that intersection. It is a very atypical intersection. You pull up to the intersection and you actually have to look behind you, over your left shoulder, and look way back behind you. A lot of people can't even do that. There is a grade difference and I am not even sure what the sight distance is and as soon trees and plants start growing you won't be able to see anybody coming up that hill. The people coming up the hill are going up a 12% grade and they are going to have "foot on the gas pedal". I just have some concerns about it. In my letter I was asking the Board to possibly consider keeping that southern loop road closed for emergency only, so you lose that circulation every day, but you do have it for emergency purposes. Then, when you are exiting the site, you are not making that awkward left; you just go back around the building and go out straight.

Member Hoffman questioned why don't you make one way the other way?

Engineer Nash said you can't turn into it. It is a difficult right turn to make.

Attorney Lorber questioned what would you suggest like a barrier across somewhere along there?

Member Hoffman questioned just stripe it or geotech it or use that grass?

Engineer Keenan stated maybe say emergency access only. That would probably be the better way to go.

Member Hoffman stated this way a fire truck could still drive over it if it needed to but a regular car probably would not.

Vice Chairman Grygus sees a problem that now somebody entering the site, drives all the way around to the east parking lot, gets all the way to the end of the east parking, and can't get a parking space – how do they turn around and get out?

Engineer Keenan stated what we usually do is basically take the width of two parking stalls and stripe it across so it is 60'x18' and you can't park there, it is a turn around . We will put in pavers or a reinforced turf surface. We are also taking the fitness area and relocating it.

Engineer Nash has some concerns about how the utilities service the building. Do you have the utility plan?

Engineer Keenan stated we do have the utility plan. You had pointed out that some of the utilities are snaking up the hill and you want to cut out the bends.

Engineer Nash stated they cut diagonally across the landscaped area and you really don't want the roots from the trees growing into utilities . You are almost going to need a utility clear corridor; a right-of-way for utilities with no trees in it.

Engineer Nash commented it was a good point. What we will do is take the utilities and keep them within the road and this will be converted to a turf surface free of landscaping and we will utilize that area and pull them around.

Member Covelli stated you did a nice job here. Referencing A-25 - When I look at the grade we are at 254 around your inlets, could we widen the mouth there?

Attorney Lorber stated I think you are saying to cut this corner a bit so it will be easier to make the right-hand turn.

Member Covelli stated maybe drop that whole piece.

Engineer Keenan stated angle it. I am following what you are saying.

Member Covelli stated I like the idea that you can flow around the whole lot and I have the concern of driving around and then having to turn around. I give Engineer Keenan credit for make this flow and now all of a sudden we are ready to throw it away. Whereas, I think you can pick up some width there and flair it.

Attorney Lorber stated we can do it either way, but we need a consensus because, as Engineer Keenan said, we could put the pavers in and make a turnaround and since there was an issue with someone making a turn, I do think if you cut it off a bit that doesn't become an issue.

Planner Albert questioned would you consider reversing; making that ingress with a bigger radius.

Engineer Keenan stated I would rather see these people coming in naturally into the site with a straight progression rather than trying to force people up here. I would like that circulation and I think it is a big improvement just to the site and the way it functions. I would rather see this connection in here and if we open that up, that would certainly help and I think if we could set up a sight line and make sure we don't have any tall trees in that area and we would have a stop bar and stop sign.

Vice Chairman Grygus commented that I give you credit too because in some ways it would have been easier to shift the building all the way down to that curb and only have three-way access because it would have taken away a little bit of your challenges to the northwest corner.

Member Covelli commented any time you have a full flow, you made it work.

Engineer Nash stated let us talk about it some more because it has to function to. We can't just have it on paper; we have to live with it. The profile grade is 5% coming up the driveway at that point, it passes through 12% and it is rounding off, but it is still 5% so that means the intersected road also has to be at 5%. Usually you are sitting in your car at 2% the other way so you are tipped over this way and have to look back over your shoulder. I am telling you it is very difficult intersection.

Member Covelli questioned why can't you slightly retain that and level the cars as opposed to having the car follow the grade.

Engineer Nash stated the grade is the grade. We can't change the grade.

Engineer Keenan stated Engineer Nash is correct. We are tying into a portion of the road that is sloping up and if we are tying into it, we need to tie in at the grade that road is coming in at.

Engineer Nash stated 5% is pretty steep especially when you are sitting in a stopped condition and you have to make a turn – it is a shot.

Engineer Keenan stated I would be comfortable with that and I would rather see that, and I don't think it will be a hindrance to people.

Chairman Dunning questioned is there any way to take your driveway, instead of hooking it right in, to angle it out towards the retention basin?

Engineer Nash stated we haven't talked about the detention basin yet. I still don't like that

either.

Chairman Dunning stated bring the driveway back there, which is flat land basically, you could create a few more parking slots back in there.

Engineer Keenan stated ultimately I really can't. I just don't have enough room. It is flat back here, but once I get to that point, it gets steep again. You can see that this is even relatively tight angle. If I come up this way, I have to swing back at a tighter angle. From my standpoint, I don't really see that the layout will work.

Chairman Dunning stated it would change your parking lot tremendously, but you could also take the "hookness" out of it and come up at a lesser of an angle and create a few more parking spaces back there.

Engineer Keenan stated I don't think I am going to be able to come back and then actually angle it again. I would have to be able to come back and angle further so somehow I am going to have to come back here and angle this way. I might be on flatter ground, but my turning radius would have to be so tight I don't think we can do it. This is as comfortable as tight of a turning radius that we are really comfortable putting into this driveway. I think if I bring it out any further I have to come back tighter to come back this way. I am almost coming to a right angle.

Member Covelli stated you can solve all that if you come in from the back and Engineer Keenan agreed.

Attorney Lorber stated I agreed to investigate that and Member Covelli questioned how did you do with that.

Attorney Lorber stated I haven't done anything yet. I am not spending my client's money until we have an approval.

Member Levine, referencing the eastern parking lot, and the far wall where you are putting in shrubs and saying that would stop anybody from going too far. I don't think it would and I would really like to see some kind of fence or wood guard rail or barrier.

Engineer Nash stated they have a wood guard rail on the main access road coming in.

Engineer Keenan stated we can add it up there.

Engineer Keenan, as Engineer Nash pointed out, needs to discuss storm water management. One thing you will notice in this submission packages we did not resubmit an updated storm water management report. Ultimately, we want to get through this process and hopefully have the Board approve what we have here and then we would certainly be resubmitting, for Engineer Nash's full review and approval, an updated storm water management report. When we looked at this and, some of the impacts we had by relocating this building further to the west, was the building is now located in an area that use to be occupied by an underground detention basin. We lost area for that underground detention basin. Our next thought was to split up the basin on put one on each side of the building. The problem we are running into to do this is we actually have soil in one area, but rock in the other so we would have to excavate the rock under the parking lot to be able to put in the underground detention system, which really didn't work. We looked at other alternatives and now we are looking at this back area, where we had the fitness area prior, and adding the detention basin in this back corner. When we looked at this, we focused on making sure the volumes were adequate to support storm water. We still have to go through the calculations and provide and crunch all the numbers to make it sure it

works, making sure we meet all of our reductions. As Engineer Nash pointed out in his review letter, we have one discharge point to the rear of the property and then we are still tying into the same point into Ringwood Avenue. Part of the logic on that was we know we have a drainage problem in the front on Ringwood Avenue, if we can afford to put any of this water into the back, we would do that to minimize the amount of water going to the location on Ringwood Avenue. However, we got the reduction requirements.

Chairman Dunning questioned if the discharge was being put onto a neighbor's piece of property?

Engineer Nash stated "correct", and we can only discharge what is currently going there today.

Engineer Nash, referencing A-24, stated that the storm water management ordinance requires reductions 210 & 100 and that is overall site reduction in the runoff. The concept they have discharging into the back and front is total site reduction, but I am looking at it differently. If you look at the back undeveloped portion, all that dark green area, and that whole dark green area currently flows south and discharges. They are not changing that. That is staying exactly the same except their adding that additional outflow. My point is anybody to the south that has any drainage problem is now going to point their finger at you and say you added that outflow, I never had a drainage problem and now I do, and you have no defense. The spirit of the ordinance is to have a reduction in the runoff from the site and technically you will because the sum of it will be a reduction, but you are reducing more out the front and adding more out the back. That is what I don't like about it. If you have a detention basin, I still think you have to get it discharging out the front because that is where the water that where it came from currently goes out the front.

Engineer Nash stated "yes" and I am following what you are saying and it is a point well taken. Ultimately, I would look at it from the standpoint, we have either reduce those percentages for what is going on and going out to the back, which isn't a whole heck of a lot right now to this point and reducing to this point separately. If I can't do that, I am not coming back with this discharge location. I'll be putting it right back where we had it the first time and it will go back into Ringwood Avenue. It is something that in concept I think it would be good if we can get our reductions down enough to be able to get it down into the back. If I can't do that to support it, I am going to be bringing it back into Ringwood Avenue.

Engineer Nash questioned if there was anything they can do with the roof runoff, which is clean water, and can you handle that separately? Are you doing water quality?

Engineer Keenan stated we are doing water quality. Ground water discharge we are not able to do.

Engineer Nash stated you don't need to do water quality for what comes off the roof.

Engineer Keenan agreed.

Engineer Nash questioned is there any way you can handle that separately? You only care about detaining that; you don't care about meeting the water quality storm for that.

Engineer Nash question you are asking us to handle it separately, reduce it separately and keep it outside of the water quality?

Engineer Nash stated contain it separately and then therefore you can then discharge it separately. I think these are things we have to work out outside of this meeting.

Engineer Keenan stated we can look at that.

Engineer Nash stated I think we will be able to work it out, just now here at this meeting. I

think we will be able to work it out; it's not like we can't work out the storm water management, therefore, you can't build this development. I don't think we are anywhere near that.

Attorney Mondello stated I know this is an important point having been involved with litigation where a homeowner has sued not only the adjoining neighbor, but the borough, as the result of approving a particular application. I am sure that Engineer Keenan and Engineer Nash can work this out. Otherwise, we are going to have a big problem. Attorney Lorber stated we can make a contingency that this should be to Engineer Nash's satisfaction. I don't think that is going to be an issue.

Vice Chairman Grygus stated to Engineer Keenan that he might have something here that might make the parking thing a little bit easier and make your life easier too. We could grab maybe 4 extra spaces. Look at the north end of the site, see those 6 spaces that you have, I think you could easily squeeze in at least 2 to the left of that because that is relatively flat there. Then that reduces how much you have to cut up here by the wall, and add another 2 or 3 down there.

Engineer Keenan agreed and stated I don't see a problem to around 10 additional stalls from the 7 we are at now; maybe even 11.

Chairman Dunning questioned what about your line of sight distance on Ringwood Avenue?

Engineer Keenan questioned the line of sight shown in the submission package?

Chairman Dunning questioned are you going to chisel off the front of that rock face? How are you going to get that line of sight that the County wants?

Engineer Keenan answered "yes". Actually we didn't have a problem getting a line of sight that the County is looking for. They actually were okay largely with our line of sight; they just wanted it dropped a little bit. The only problem is there is a little area right here that kind of nobs up, and then it comes back down and then you go up the big slope. We don't actually have to cut back into the slope as much; we just have to take out that little nob, and that is what this grading right here is. This actually incorporates the County's comment. That revision is incorporated.

Chairman Dunning asked what about the rest of that rock face running along Ringwood Avenue? Do you have any proposal to clean any of that up?

Engineer Keenan stated yes, we did indicate that we would clean that up and take out the dead debris.

Chairman Dunning questioned where you had the rec area before it moved, can you put parking in there?

Engineer Keenan stated we are going to be somewhat limited. The only problem at this point is we start necking down the drive and I am in the radius point of that drive aisle.

Chairman Dunning stated on the east side maybe you can get another 2 spaces.

Engineer Keenan stated what I think we can do is we could add 2 stalls up at this corner in the northern corner and then 2 stalls here. I would say if the Board is okay with it, I would be inclined to take additional stalls where the snow removal area is and if we lose them to snow removal so be it, but I would rather have the stalls available. We could probably pick

up 6 stalls from where we are now, so we are getting up around 13 over the RSIS required. Vice Chairman Grygus confirmed you are back up to the original 83 that you had on the last plan. Engineer Keenan stated “yes”.

Member Covelli stated counselor keeps assuring me that he would pursue the rear so what does this additional water storage area do if you were to put an exit to the property in the rear, all the way to the back?

Engineer Keenan stated I am going to have to cut through someone’s property.

Member Covelli stated I understand that, but what is it do to your retention?

Engineer Keenan stated it will make us come up with an alternate scheme. If I don’t have this access down here, I would probably put a retention basin down here.

Member Covelli stated he was a little disappointed to hear what counselor said because quite frankly, I took it upon myself to make some inquiries with the Borough and I know that you didn’t.

Attorney Lorber stated I told you I wasn’t going to. I said make it a condition, give me 90 days, as I recall, and I will make a diligent inquiry and do what is necessary. There are three property owners, not just the Borough, and I would have to deal with each of the three. I specifically recall saying give me a 90 day period as a condition of the approval, and this was always my understanding.

(The discussion continued between Attorney Lorber and Member Covelli about looking into obtaining approval of the three property owners for an exit)

Chairman Dunning questioned if we did get rear access, would that change all that parking because now you would have a road heading west out of the parking area? Chairman also described the route of the exit.

Engineer Keenan stated at that point, we are really in the neighborhood of 2 stalls and right now we are 13 over. I don’t think it is much of an issue. Just to go back to the detention, I think likely we would be putting an above-ground detention basin down here towards where the driveway is located now.

Engineer Nash stated there are too many changes. It is too difficult to juggle all of these things. It changes everything. That is Member Covelli’s point. He wants the driveway on the plan now because if you put it on later, it changes everything.

Attorney Lorber requested a recess.

Recess 9:01:16

Reconvened 9:07:01

Let the record show that everyone is present that was present before the recess.

Attorney Lorber stated Engineer Keenan has no more testimony. I repeat what I offered six months ago. I will investigate the rear and I would like 90 days to do that subsequent to an approval. I know that is what I said. I reiterate Engineer Keenan’s testimony that he and Engineer Nash will work out any draining issues whether we are going through the rear of the property or not.

Member Levine, referring to the trash and recycling area, stated it seems awfully small for 36 or so apartments. I don’t want to picture garbage overflowing the bins, do you feel this is adequate?

Engineer Keenan answered “yes”. For a building this size, this is what is we typically use

and that affects the frequency of pick-ups. Usually it is one large contained and a couple small recycling containers.

Engineer Nash has a couple of items referred to in his letter of dated February 29, 2016. Engineer Keenan stated he should have touched on that real briefly. We did get an opportunity to look at that letter and we take no exception to anything in there. Engineer Nash stated we covered most everything; I just have a couple things I just want to say:

Item #11 on page 3 – Regarding the retaining wall. I failed to indicate that the retaining wall would need a full protection fence along the top of it. You would have needed to put that on there anyway. We also need an engineer to sign and seal the plans. It is a very tall wall and a very important structure. You are right; it is very difficult to do it without knowing the soil characteristics. The type of wall he was describing is this Keystone, which is a brand name. The stone in the front is really just a façade. What really holds the wall up is the soil behind it. There is a grid behind wall and a 16' high wall has lots of grid and goes deep back behind the wall. If you have a lot of rock, you can actually use the rock as the wall. The wall is kind of like the storm water management issue, I think we have to just move the pieces forward and we can work that one out.

Item #8 on page 3 – There is a handicap ramp on Ringwood Avenue. On your north side driveway entrance there should be a handicap ramp for crossing Ringwood Avenue. There is one on the east side of Ringwood Avenue, but there is no receiving ramp on your side. That should be installed as part of your project. Engineer Keenan stated “yes, correct”. What we did on this is there is an existing ramp on that side and we extended it back deeper because it really didn't have a deep enough landing area but we felt the ramp itself was okay. We are going to have to go through all this and meet with the County and address that because that was part of their comments. Engineer Nash commented that you are going to build this whole development and to not have handicap ramps on the other quadrants and not do that one, you would probably end up doing it anyway. Engineer Keenan agreed.

Item #15 on page 4 – Lighting Plan – Engineer Nash questioned if there was a lighting plan exhibit for the new layout? I am just focusing on one light fixture. That light fixture since it is on the south side of that roadway, it wants to shed its light across the roadway. In order to do its work, the by-product of that is there is going to be glare seen from the house to the north. When they look back, they are going to see the glare of that light. It is not going to spread light onto their property, but when they look out, the glare from the light will be right there. I am suggesting moving the light on the north side and having it point to the south with a back screen on it then they won't be bothered by it. Engineer Keenan agreed to do that.

Engineer Nash stated the rest of the comments in my letter have been addressed.

Vice Chairman Grygus questioned if an irrigation system was being installed? It is an aggressive landscaping plan and I don't envision there being anybody there full time on site that will maintain this stuff. It would be ashamed if half of this stuff died if we get a dry summer.

Engineer Keenan stated as of right now there is no irrigation system proposed. A good thing about some of this is it's all relatively isolated areas and not spread out all over the

place on a massive site. This could be easily handled with some hose bibs around the building where you have the shrubs and out in the perimeter it is more trees. Someone is going to have to be here maintaining the property, cutting the grass and they will have to hire a landscape crew to do that.

Member Henderson stated, on that note, you talk about seeding, so if you have no irrigation how is the seed going to grow? To have to manually water that is a lot, and seeding does not grow nicely; it is very sporadic and takes a lot of care for it.

Engineer Keenan stated we don't irrigate every construction and I have done both.

Engineer Nash questioned how much seeding on this landscaping plan?

Engineer Keenan stated not a lot. It is very limited because we ultimately condensed a lot of our disturbance and what we have disturbed mostly we're landscaping. The seeding element on this property is going to be very limited. I don't see any problem with just naturally seeding it.

Chairman Dunning questioned how many fire hydrants are shown on the plan?

Engineer Keenan stated two. We continued with the recommendation of the fire dept.

Planner Albert stated the whole front area along Ringwood Avenue becomes very important. There is some growth there that needs to be preserved and one of the things I am recommending is that there be a tree protection plan submitted at the time of construction. Primarily for that area so we don't lose it, degrade it and have sediment problems, etc. I assume that is acceptable. Engineer Keenan stated absolutely.

Planner Albert brought up affordable housing, which has been discussed before. I just want to reiterate Member Covelli made a recommendation that I think the Board has interest in and I believe the applicant indicated that would be acceptable. Essentially, you have a 1.5% of the assessed value development fee built in the borough's ordinance and Member Covelli suggested perhaps half the units be built and the other half be a fee.

Attorney Lorber doesn't remember what the numbers were or how many units.

Planner Albert believes, but it will be determined from a legal standpoint, it is actually 20% of the units. So you would then be obligated to produce 10%.

Attorney Lorber stated whatever the law requires, we have to comply with it, and we have no objection.

Attorney Mondello stated Wanaque has filed a declaratory judgment .

Planner Albert it is a fluid situation and that may change. I believe that will also require a Developer's Agreement so then that part will probably require the concurrent.

Attorney Lorber stated he knows every town will have different COAH requirements and I know the courts have a certain time to do it on a town-by-town assuming you submitted the plan. I am not involved with doing that for any municipality. No matter what, we have to abide by whatever decision the county judges make.

Planner Albert stated that is fine and I do think that the 50/50 split was a very reasonable approach.

Attorney Lorber stated we agree to that. Whatever it is, 10% or 5% or what percentage it is, we have to deal with it and accept it.

Member Covelli questioned if you would consider an irrigation system for the plantings

particular on the southern side, which is going to get a lot of sun and make the appearance of the property, whether it be on the roadway or for the residents.

Engineer Keenan doesn't believe it is necessary to put an irrigation system on that, but if the developer wants to that is fine. We are talking about trees that will need to be watered a limited period of time and then after they will be fine with just the natural rain. If they die, they will be replacing them.

Attorney Lorber stated we do have to do a maintenance plan and that is something we have agreed to do.

Vice Chairman Grygus stated we will then say the condition would be to maintain and replace landscape plan if necessary.

Planner Albert believes one of two things should happen. There are steep slopes where the planting on the southern side is and it becomes very important for erosion control for that seeding and those plantings to both take place and also survive. I think this Board has every right to ask for a specific length of time for maintenance bond or, in lieu of that, an irrigation system. I don't think it is very large irrigation system and I do think on the southern side it would have great value to the owner/developer. If it wasn't for the slopes, I might agree with you.

Engineer Keenan stated you bring up a good point with the slopes because you are right in line with the Conservation District requested. They wanted us to make sure there is a stabilization mat on any of the slopes on that particular side.

Planner Albert historically has had huge problems with that sort of area. As small as it is, it could turn into a disaster. I would think you should consider one or the other.

Engineer Keenan stated we are proposing a stabilization mat along that slope to make sure that the seed doesn't get washed away, it grows in and we don't lose soil.

Planner Albert stated it does just so much. Again, I think a specific time frame and from my point of view, I believe a maintenance bond would have to extend to five years.

Engineer Keenan stated my concern and what I have usually found with these slopes is you have to get them stabilized and once they are stabilized, they are fine. That slope in particular has no drainage area to it, so it doesn't have a big or larger slope pouring down through it once it starts running through it. It is the water that hits it that runs across it. That is it, so there is a very limited drainage area so it is just going to have that natural rutting that may occur there. I think, in this case, if we require as part of the Developer's Agreement, that that gets stabilized and if it doesn't they need to come back and do something.

Attorney Mondello stated all my Developer's Agreement have some form of maintenance bond in it.

Any questions, of the public, only on the Engineer's testimony?

Robert Anderson – 1025 Ringwood Avenue

I just want to confirm where are the dumpsters?

Engineer Keenan in the northeast corner.

Any other questions – hearing none, seeing none, we close the public portion.

Exhibits: Architect Jarmel
A-27 East/North Elevation

A-28 ST100 – Conceptual Ground Floor Plan

A-29 ST101 – Upper Floor Plan

Architect Jarmel's Testimony
Architect Jarmel remains sworn in

I am going to start with a drawing that needs to be marked as Exhibit A-27, which is the east and north elevation of the building. Engineer Keenan explained to you that the grading plan for the project allowed for the building to step and basically be split in half. What the east elevation is depicting is how that would look in elevation. Basically what we have done is, at approximately the halfway point of the building, we stepped the building by 4'. The building plan is set up so that it enters a grade at the same level both front and back so we have a dual lobby now, which allows for the building to kind of fall back within the lot so it is further back from the roadway and visually you see less of it. Because it steps up with the grade, it is not over impeding on the site.

There was a comment in the engineer's letter about brick. He indicated that the previous design had brick on to the second floor and this only showed it to the first floor. I just want to show you the elevation that was previously shown to the Board, which was previously marked Exhibit A-8, and there is sort of a combination of brick that was stepping so it didn't really do the entire second floor; it only did it in small areas of it. The reason we eliminated it was from an aesthetics standpoint now that we were breaking the building in half that it was less important to do it. If you recall the previous building had three separate entrances and I had testified that the original design was actually three separate buildings and each one had a separate entry. Now that we are trying to highlight the center of the building, which has the front and back entry with the cornice, and that cornice stands out differently than the other cornices on the building to kind of define the entry. We think that from an aesthetic standpoint the adjustment in the brick was warranted to help separate the buildings as well as kind of keep it balances because we had to play with the center coordination.

Some of the features that I have previously testified that the Board has requested and just to remind you the original design was three separate buildings, each with a single stairway in it. This is now an elevator building so there is a common lobby to the building and then there are internal fire stairs. In the original design, a resident only had access to one fire stair, now they actually have access to three. The building, from a life safety standpoint, is greatly enhanced and the building also will continue, as testified previously, have a fire sprinkler system and fire alarm system throughout.

I am now putting up a drawing ST100, which is in the packet that was submitted to the Board, and is marked as Exhibit A-28 - ST100 Conceptual Ground Floor Plan. On the bottom of the drawing, we have two charts; one is the original unit mix and then the

second is the unit mix that we propose. You may recall originally, and Engineer Keenan testified to, there were 34 units and 66 beds that was made up of 4-one bedroom apartments; 28-two bedroom and 2-three bedroom apartments. The new plan calls for 36 units, but it actually reduces the amount of beds by 6, down to 60 and we now have 12-one bedroom units; 24-two bedroom units and we have eliminated the three bedroom units. The original design on the third floor on the wings, or sides, of the building had a unit that spanned the front and back. Those units were over 1600 square feet and we have eliminated them and by doing this it allows us to pick up additional one-bedroom units.

The units have reduced in size primarily because we now have three fire stairs, an elevator and a central corridor that runs throughout the building. Having said this, it is my opinion that the sizes here are appropriate and comparable for what we see in suburban areas in New Jersey in terms of a typical one-bedroom and typical two-bedroom unit. The unit mix is appropriate as well. We have 12-one bedroom and 24-two bedrooms so essentially 1/3 of the project is one bedroom units and 2/3 are two bedroom units.

Referencing the floor plan, although I testified that the building steps and one side is 4' higher than the other, we have created a lobby that opens front and back at the same level. Engineer Keenan has done a great job, in my opinion, developing the grades of this new concept that allowed the entries of the center of the building to be the same so it doesn't matter if you are on the north parking or south parking lot you are coming into a common lobby that is connected by a corridor, there is an area for mailboxes, an elevator and there is a central stair that can take you to all the floors within the building. If the Board approves this plan, there will be additional rooms such as utility rooms, meter rooms a sales and marketing office and all the things that a building of this type needs to function.

Vice Chairman Grygus questioned how does the 4' difference go away on the first floor? I am looking at that doorway at the end of the lobby coming in from the south side, there wouldn't need to be any stairs there, or anything?

Architect Jarmel stated no. If you follow along with me, this entire corridor is all at the same elevation as the northern side of the building. Everything to the right of this wall or the lobby is all on the same elevation and to the left (or to the south) is 4' lower.

Everything to the right (or to the north) is on the same elevation as the lobby.

Chairman Dunning stated when you pass the elevator you have a doorway and stairs to that would bring you to the next level.

Architect Jarmel stated correct. It does down and up. The elevator has a double door (front and back door). If I go to the upper floor plan, it might be a little clearer for you. Referencing Exhibit A-29, you will notice there is a central corridor that runs through the building, but right smack in the middle there is an elevator and an elevator that will have a door on the front and the back. So essentially what the elevator will do is, although it is a three-story building, the elevator is going to have 6 stops. It is going to have a 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, etc. You can enter the elevator from any level of the building and go to any level of the building. The stairs in the center of the building will also allow you to traverse either between floors or between half-floors. If I am on the northern side of the building on the second floor and I want to go to the southern side of the building on the second floor, which is 4' lower, I can actually take the elevator up, can enter the stairwell and go down 4' feet .

So the central vertical circulation of elevator and stair allows you to hit all 6 levels of the building, which are really 3. Then there is a north stair and south stair that are fire stairs that only serve either the north wing or south wing.

Regarding fire safety of the building, previously, every unit had access to one stair, which I had previously testified was allowed, but under this design every unit actually has access to three fire stairs.

Member Covelli commented that you said the north stair services the north end and the south stair services the south end, but conceivably I could be in the south end of the building, run up a few steps, go into the north end and still go down the north side. Architect Jarmel stated that is correct.

Referencing the first floor plan, we have situated the stairs, I will call them cattycorner (the north and south stair), so that the north stair exits to the east side of the building to the east parking lot; and the south stair exits to the west parking lot so that there is equal balance between the floors. We sort of made it reverse symmetrical. This will encourage people to park on both sides of the building and they have equal opportunity to get in and out of the building so we don't discriminate. We have made the building equally accessible from all sides.

This is essentially my testimony. I think I have talked to you about the life safety, the unit changes and how the stairs and elevators work. Everything that I previously testified to regarding fire safety with fire alarm, fire sprinkler, a request from the Board to increase the fire rating on corridors that we had previously agreed to do as a condition, would remain the same.

Member Levine questioned if the elevator was big enough to handle a gurney going into it? Architect Jarmel stated it is.

Vice Chairman Grygus, referencing the lobby, what is the square attached area? Architect Jarmel stated it is intended for the mailboxes.

Member Hoffman is still a little confused about the vestibule. If you look at ST200, your drawing, on the south side of the building, that double door is the vestibule and it is on the lower side. So that is on the south elevation side, the 4' low side, and what you are saying is that the lobby, if you look at ST100, is level with the north side.

Architect Jarmel stated that is correct. There seems to be an error in the delineation in the north arrow; it is flipped on the drawing. You are correct. The south side is lower than the north side; it steps up. There is a vestibule on both the east and west sides and the vestibules is on the lower level. From the lobby, you can only go up. I apologize you have to essentially flip the plan.

Vice Chairman Grygus questioned what do you believe the size of the bedrooms will be in the units?

Architect Jarmel stated I believe the size of the bedrooms would be comparable to what they were previously and I think they are going to be somewhere between 110 +/- square

feet to 120 square feet (10x12 / 10x11). Maybe the master, if it is a two bedroom, will be a little bit larger.

Chairman Dunning commented that, in this case we don't have a true ordinance to follow, but our basic standard for apartment units is a single bedroom to be 750 square feet and the two bedroom would be 950.

Architect Jarmel stated, on our plan, we have one bedrooms that are just shy of 700 square feet from about 670 square feet up to about 786 square feet, which is pretty standard for the New Jersey market. Then we have two bedrooms that are in the +/- 1,000 square feet. This plan was done to prove that the units work in the sizes; the walls may adjust a little bit as it develops in the actual layout of the apartments. However, the overall size of the building, the envelope of the building and square footage of the building has remained unchanged throughout the process.

Member Hoffman is still a little concerned about that fire stair by the elevator. So now the way it looks, if you come down that stair to the ground floor to the south side of the building, you have to make a turn, go up eight steps to get to the north elevation and get out. So you go down to the bottom, turn around and going up a couple of steps to get to the elevation.

Architect Jarmel stated no. Once you are in the lobby, you are at the level of exit discharge and that is the lowest level of the building. I apologize. My drawing is wrong and when I turned it upside down it kind of really shows the way it would be. When you come out the south door of that center stair, you are at the lobby. The building code allows a stair to exit into a sprinkler lobby so that you are not going down to go up; that is not allowed. You can go up to go out, but you can't go down and then back up.

Chairman Dunning questioned in your interior design each unit will have its own HVAC unit? Is each unit going to have a washer/dryer or is there a central laundry room?

Architect Jarmel answered yes. They will probably be magic-pak units. The intent is for each unit to have a washer/dryer and independent air conditioning and heating. The tenants would also have their own gas and electric meters. They units will probably not have their own water meters and the reason for that is most municipalities or water companies only allow one meter per building. Typically there is only one domestic water meter and a second meter for the fire system. The cost of the water, which is small compared to the other utilities, is built into the rent.

Chairman Dunning asked if you checked with the sewer authority to make sure there is capacity?

Architect Jarmel has not, but I believe Engineer Keenan has gotten letters from utilities. Engineer Keenan said yes, I believe we had previously submitted a letter indicating that capacity was available for this project.

Engineer Nash stated I had an aesthetic comment in my letter, #3 on page 2, regarding the plumbing roof vents. It is just a request that the plumbing vents not visible on the Ringwood Avenue side of the building; that should vent out the back roof.

Architect Jarmel stated we could certainly accommodate that.

Engineer Nash stated it is something the Avalon Bay in Bloomingdale did it that way.

Architect Jarmel stated the idea is, this building up on the hill and then up higher, you will never see them. Plumbing vents are 2” in diameter.

Engineer Nash said you will see them because there are a lot of them. It is just a nice touch. Architect Jarmel stated we can accommodate that. We can put them on the other side of the ridge.

Vice Chairman Grygus questioned Attorney Mondello. Does a municipality or a board in a building like this have the authority to restrict the installation of satellite dishes? I think they just destroy the look of a building, especially a brand new building.

Attorney Mondello stated typically the code will take about where the placement of satellite dishes are. I am not familiar with if we have anything that addresses that.

Attorney Lorber stated I don’t think we are going to have satellite dishes.

Architect Jarmel typically happens is whoever the local provider is, Cablevision, Verizon Fios or Comcast, is given the opportunity to bring into the building and the tenant is given those choices and that is it. That will be written in the lease.

Attorney Mondello commented the applicant wouldn’t have an objection if I put a condition in the Resolution that there are going to be no satellite dishes.

Attorney Lorber stated we can put it into the lease as well. I have it in my lease and we get to choose from two different suppliers.

Any questions, of the public, only on the Architect’s testimony?

Hearing none, seeing none, we close the public portion.

Attorney Lorber stated he is not going to make another summation; I did one last time. We have moved the building. You’ve heard the testimony tonight and you have all listened very carefully for the last six months and I don’t think I need to say anything more. We’ll agree to all the conditions that I said we would agree to and I think that is any condition that we could basically think about.

Any comments, of the public, on this application?

Attorney Mondello stated we do recall the comments that were made at the last meeting, but you are certainly welcome to repeat those comments, but we would appreciate it if you don’t.

Robert Anderson – 1025 Ringwood Avenue -

Mr. Anderson remains sworn in. We swore you in for your testimony last month.

No repeats – The only concern we have is, and a lot of people have expressed it, is the traffic access. The concerns that Member Covelli has brought up. That is the only issue we have.

Attorney Lorber has not questions for this resident.

Any other comments – hearing none, seeing none, we close the public portion.

Chairman Bruce Grygus would like to commend the applicant and his professionals. I think this was a good example of the collaborative effort by both this board and this applicant on what is recognizably a difficult piece of property; nonetheless, one that the owner has the right to develop within the scope of the ordinances. I believe that we've reached a compromise here that addresses the issues that were raised by applicant, board, members of the audience and residents and I believe it will be a good fit for the community.

MOTION MADE BY MEMBER VICE CHAIRMAN GRYGUS TO APPROVE THIS APPLICATION WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT WE GET BACK TO THE 83 PARKING SPACES; NO SATELLITE DISHES; CONDITION THAT THE STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN AND MOVING THE RECREATION AREA GET WORKED OUT BETWEEN THE BOARD'S ENGINEER AND THE APPLICANT'S ENGINEER; THE ADDITION OF THE WOODEN GUARD RAIL TO THE EAST PARKING LOT; CONDITION OF THE 90 DAY EXPLORATORY PERIOD COUNSELOR AGREED THAT HE WOULD EXPLORE THE ALTERNATE ACCESS TO THE SITE; SOME TYPE OF MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT BOND FOR THE LANDSCAPE OR IRRIGATION SYSTEM; AND THAT THE ISSUES IN THE LAST ENGINEER'S LETTER AND PLANNER'S LETTER ARE INCORPORATED; ;

Vice Chairman Grygus questioned if he had to go into the things we agreed to in the previous testimony regarding fire safety and all that?

Attorney Mondello stated no and we are very fortunate and lucky that the board secretary takes almost verbatim minutes, which I have never seen in 20 years, so the record will be more than adequate.

Member Covelli would also like to second Vice Chairman Grygus' assessment and evaluation of the application, the cooperation, I am going to second the Motion and counselor I am going to say I am counting on you on that – Attorney Lorber stated do not worry about a thing

MOTION TO APPROVE APPLICATION: made by Vice Chairman Grygus, seconded by Member Covelli. Voting yes were Chairman Dunning, Vice Chairman Grygus, Members Covelli, Hoffman, Levine, Henderson and Karp. Motion Carried.

Recess 9:54:10

Reconvened 10:04:45

Let the record show that everyone is present that was present before the recess, except for Member Suzanne Henderson.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: Let the record show there was no one to come forward.

RESOLUTIONS: None

CORRESPONDENCE: None

VOUCHERS: submitted by Ronald Mondello, Esq. for attendance at the February 3, 2016 in the amount of \$300; and for attendance at the March 2, 2016 Meeting in the amount of \$300.

MOTION TO APPROVE: made by Member Covelli, seconded by Vice Chairman Grygus. Voting yes were Chairman Dunning, Vice Chairman Grygus, Members Covelli, Hoffman, Levine and Karp.

VOUCHERS: submitted by Planner Kenneth Albert for attendance at the February 3, 2016 Meeting on 1049 Ringwood Avenue, LLC Application in the amount of \$658.75

MOTION TO APPROVE: made by Vice Chairman Grygus, seconded by Member Covelli. Voting yes were Chairman Dunning, Vice Chairman Grygus, Members Covelli, Hoffman, Levine and Karp.

VOUCHERS: submitted by Boswell Engineering on the John Crilly Shed Application in the amount of \$190.

MOTION TO APPROVE: made by Vice Chairman Grygus, seconded by Member Covelli. Voting yes were Chairman Dunning, Vice Chairman Grygus, Members Covelli, Hoffman, Levine and Karp.

FEBRUARY MINUTES: Will be voted on at the April Meeting

ENGINEER'S REPORT: Both the Crilly Application and the AT&T Cell Tower Application have been reviewed, deemed complete and both will be on the April Agenda.

DISCUSSION: Vice Chairman Grygus questioned if you have to recuse yourself from the hearing if you are a customer of AT&T. Attorney Mondello stated no.

815 Ringwood Avenue was purchased by a Church. Churches are permitted anywhere and are protected by federal statute.

MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 10:10PM: made by Vice Chairman Grygus, seconded by Member Hoffman. Motion carried by a voice vote.

Jennifer A. Fiorito
Board of Adjustment Secretary