

December 12, 2011

A regular meeting of the Allendale Planning Board was held in the Municipal Building on December 12, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 8:10 PM by Mr. Quinn, Chairman, who announced that the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act were met by the required posting and notice to publications.

The following members answered to roll call: Mr. Quinn, Mr. Barra, Mr. Zambrotta, Mr. Sirico, Mr. Fliegel, Ms. McSwiggan, Ms. Sheehan, Mr. Sasso, and Mr. Walters

Absent: Mr. Strauch

Mr. Quinn opened the meeting. Minutes will be discussed on Thursday. The only other item on the agenda is the continuation of Calvary Lutheran Church major subdivision. The Planning Board had some questions from the last meeting that the applicants were going to be prepared to answer tonight, and some members of the public hired an expert who will testify, and he will be cross-examined by the attorney for the applicant. The Planning Board will also hear some testimony from the Borough professionals. There will also be an open comment period for the public on the overall application. That is the order of how things will proceed this evening. Mr. Quinn reminded the public that the Planning Board usually stops these meetings around 11:00PM.

Calvary Church

Mr. Whitaker, the applicant's attorney, started the night by saying members of the public had asked about the impact of sidewalks at the last meeting. There is a report that has been submitted to the Board dated October 29th from Conklin Associates. Tibor Latincics, from Conklin Associates, was reintroduced to the Board. Mr. Latincics discussed the impact of sidewalks for Ivers Road on the Storm Water Management Plan. There is a slight increase of peak at run-off for the 100 year storm. The sidewalks are down-sloped or below the detention basin, but the robust design of the detention basin compensates for the additional impervious surface. He discussed the 100 year storm in regards to the run-off.

Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Yakimik if he had any comments on the report and Mr. Yakimik responded he was concerned about the parking. He asked Mr. Latincics if he could go over the parking section of his report as Mr. Yakimik had a question in regards to that part. Mr. Quinn asked if he had any questions about the Storm Water run-off. Mr. Yakimik said he might, but he was more concerned about the parking situation. Mr. Latincics said the question from the past meeting was about the impact of adding parking stall buffers which front onto Ivers Road. Two attachments on the letter given to the Board were included. One attachment was from the 1986 site plan of Calvary Lutheran Church where twelve parking stalls were to front on Ivers Road and be 9 by 19 in size. The parking stalls and pavement extend over the right of way line with parking stalls up to the curb line with a five foot island. Another attachment was a survey done

by Conklin Associates on the ten striped parking stalls along Ivers Road with space for two additional stalls that are not striped and vary in length. The concrete island is seven feet wide. Putting in buffers would reduce the length of parking spaces. Mr. Yakimik said if there is a reduction in size of parking stalls that the Church would no longer meet the code and that the applicant would have to find some mitigation to address this need. Mr. Whitaker commented that there was testimony from the Church that the amount of required parking on the site on a day to day basis is much less than what exists there for the use by the Church. Mr. Whitaker commented that through testimony given previously, the Church is not using all of the spaces that are required by the Borough code. The Church would remove a pew if needed, and that all this is being discussed because the Board had requested a sidewalk installed there. Mr. Yakimik believed that the applicant needed to go a step further. He felt that if the sidewalks were to be introduced the parking spaces are to be reduced in size and configuration and the parking has to be reconfigured in order to be safe. It is possible right now that some of these vehicles could stick out in the driveway. The previous site plan shows a minimum approved driveway width of eighteen feet which is going to become compromised and become much less. So, as a result of the changes, the applicant has to go a step further and show how this section of the lot is going to come into conformance with acceptable parking design standards and conformance with what was previously approved for this site plan as far as space sizes are concerned. As a result of the sidewalk, the space sizes are substandard and Mr. Yakimik didn't recommend that the board allow this to be left as such if the Board approved the application. Mr. Whitaker said that on condition of approval that the applicant would provide an acceptable parking configuration plan. Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Dunn if a variance would be needed. There was some discussion between Mr. Dunn, Mr. Whitaker, and Mr. Latincsics about the changes needed. Mr. Dunn decided a variance would be needed. Mr. Yakimik suggested that the Board get the new configuration before voting on the application. Mr. Quinn concurred with that statement.

Mr. Yakimik then asked about the Storm Water section in the report. He wanted to know if the rate reductions on page one were the result of the sidewalk being treated as an impervious surface in the development site only. Mr. Latincsics replied the rate reductions were just in the project site and not the entire watershed as they were routed through the detention basin as currently designed. The chart on the second page had run-off and rate reduction with or without the sidewalk. Mr. Latincsics went into the numbers on the chart based on a 100 year storm. Mr. Yakimik asked about the table on page one and how Mr. Latincsics calculated the rate of reduction. Mr. Latincsics explained about the 1.97 and compared that to the 4.91 in the hundred year storm and it would be 40.1% of the existing CFS. Mr. Yakimik said he did the numbers and came up with 48% and wanted Mr. Latincsics to confirm or deny that number on the two year storm. Mr. Latincsics said it was 52% of the existing rates. Mr. Zambrotta clarified that it is 48% reduction or 52% existing and that it is all in how you present it.

Mr. Quinn asked if there were comments on the second question on the volume of run-off and the potential impacts on the Celery Farm. Mr. Latincsics said the point of interest was the Ivers

Road B-inlet and we identified the volume of run-off through various storms by an increase of 4000 cubic feet due to the project. To give you a visual it is similar to a swimming pool that is 20 by 40 by 5 foot deep in size. When we compare that to a 100 year storm, the watershed volume is 60,000 cubic feet and we are adding another 4000 cubic feet to that number. If the visual is a swimming pool during a major storm event that would be the impact. When routed through the detention basin the rate of run-off is reduced. The next question was what the impact would be on the Celery Farm. The Allendale Brook flows upstream into the Celery Farm. If you took that 4000 cubic feet and if you put it across the normal water surface area of the Celery Farm of 35.4 acres, that 4000 cubic feet, if all of it flows upstream, is 3000th of a foot or 300th of one inch increase in the water surface of the Celery Farm under a short duration of time. Mr. Yakimik concurred with the numbers. Mr. Barra asked about the impact on the homes that are on Franklin Turnpike near the Celery Farm. Mr. Latincsics replied that the culvert goes under the driveway of one of the homes. He said the homes are impacted by the upslope watershed of the Celery Farm not the 4000 cubic feet that is finding its way there. He mentioned that the Celery Farm has a drainage area of 502 acres. The development is 1.9 acres and you make the assumption that when it enters Allendale Brook, 50% flows upstream and 50% flows downstream, therefore 2/10 of one percent would be the amount of impact on those homes. Celery Farm acts as a huge detention basin for the greater watershed. Since the water flows upstream it actually is positive because more water is going into this defacto detention basin. The biggest impact on the Celery Farm is the industrial park. There are two major storm sewers which discharge from 30 and 36 inch pipes coming from the industrial park. Mr. Barra wanted clarification on the impact on the homes but Mr. Latincsics said they only did the big picture of the Celery Farm and did not focus on those specific homes.

Mr. Quinn wanted to move to the public to let their professionals present information and allow the public to comment or testify on what they had heard.

The meeting was opened to the public and Mr. Nicholas Agnoli, 108 Ridge Road in Little Falls, was sworn in. He was representing the Fyke Nature Association, John Pastore from 77 Ivers Road, and some neighbors in the area. He has Bachelor's Degree from Virginia Tech in Environmental Science and Civil Engineering and a Master's Degree from Rutgers in Civil and Environmental Engineering. He worked three years for the DEP in the dam safety and flood control program; five years in private practice; five years working as the Chief Engineer for the Meadowlands Commission overseeing the development, variances, and flood control around Giants Stadium; as well as working as Chief Hydrologist for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. He has spent most of his career in flood control and he prepared a review for the Board of the most recent submission from Conklin Associates.

Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Agnoli if he had attended all the meetings that the Planning Board has had in connection with this application. Mr. Agnoli replied that he had attended all the ones related to Storm Water except November 14th where he received an audio on the testimony related to Storm Water. Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Agnoli if he received the tape from the

Borough of Allendale or if it was provided by someone else. Mr. Agnoli stated that it was provided by Jim Wright from Fyke Nature Association. Mr. Whitaker remarked then that he had not heard the official record of the whole hearing that night. Mr. Agnoli said the section he heard was only related to Storm Water. Mr. Whitaker felt that he wouldn't know what was related to Storm Water if he didn't hear the transcripts from the whole evening. Mr. Whitaker asked about his attendance at other meetings. Mr. Whitaker thought that Mr. Agnoli was not at all the meetings. Mr. Dunn questioned his line of questioning. Mr. Whitaker wanted to make sure that Mr. Agnoli's report was based on the facts from the meetings. Mr. Dunn commented that Mr. Agnoli had not even given his report yet. It is essential for the Planning Board members to be at all the meetings but not a witness.

Mr. Agnoli had written a report on November 30, 2011 on his technical review and findings. He wrote another report after receiving the Conklin Associates report which is why he had a December 1, 2011 update. Some of the issues he had in his first report were addressed in the letter from Conklin Associates. Mr. Agnoli stated the first issue that he looked at was the potential for impact on the changes in run-off coming from the site as result of the development. The only lingering concern was the peak flow coming off the site. The review of the 10 and 100 year storm production met the storm management rules and other standards. The concern was the two year event whereby peak productions during pre-construction vs. post construction for the area were being impacted. When they are compared the required reduction is 50% where 48% was proposed. He was worried that the potential impact downstream for smaller storms as well as larger storms could pose an impact.

The second item in his report was the potential for volume increases to have an impact downstream to the Celery Farm Natural Area. Their numbers were basically the same as Conklin Associates where there would be a small rise in volume to the Celery Farm Natural Area. The way that was deduced was the volume coming from the detention basin and placed over the Celery Farm Natural Area during a large storm event. When the two pools were compared the line that Mr. Latincsics was proposing in a way of analyzing was a small rise. However, that was in the natural area itself as the concern is the homes directly downstream from the natural area if the peak flow increases it could have an impact unless shown otherwise. The second concern related to flows heading down towards the Celery Farm. Should insecticides be used within the new wetland area for mosquito control there was concern that any insecticides could enter the system at the Natural Area and have devastating consequences there.

The third issue raised was specific to 77 Ivers Road in that the height of screening proposed for the vegetation is a sufficient height to block the view from across the street from the elevation of the first floor. The fourth concern was the design of a trash rack to protect the small outlet of the constructed wetland from clogging. Should the outlet clog instead of having a shallow pool you may have a larger pool of water. He was looking for conformity to the Storm Water Management rules which was a demonstration that the velocity of flow through a clean trash rack wasn't very high. The benefit of having a slow flow through that outlet is it makes it harder

for the debris to cake onto the trash rack. The way you get low velocity is to make the trash rack really big. Number five was about the site triangle at the corner of Ivers Road and Couch Court to make sure added vegetation wasn't blocking the view of someone entering or leaving Couch Court.

Mr. Agnoli was also asked to look over the proposed variances. The one that was a concern involved the front yard setback on 17.03 which had a reduction from the 35 feet along Couch Court to 15.5 feet. He didn't see how the benefits outweigh the detriments by granting the variance.

Mr. Whitaker started to cross-examine Mr. Agnoli. Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Agnoli which meetings he had attended and Mr. Agnoli replied to his best recollection he had attended all the meetings with the exception of November 14, 2011. Mr. Whitaker asked if he took notes at all of the meetings. Mr. Agnoli replied that he did take notes at the meetings but did not have them with him. Mr. Whitaker questioned Mr. Agnoli about the recording from November 14th. Mr. Agnoli stated that the recording was about the drainage. He did not hear the testimony from the Borough Planner. Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Agnoli if he had read through the Hatch Mott report and he said he believed so. Mr. Whitaker inquired whether Mr. Agnoli had read the reports of the applicant's planner and he said that he wasn't familiar with the most recent report but had read the reports in the past. Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Agnoli if he had reviewed the landscaping plans for the site and Mr. Agnoli answered that he had not. Mr. Whitaker asked a few questions about Mr. Agnoli's report. One question was on whether Mr. Agnoli thought any insecticide that would be used should be approved by the Borough of Allendale which was a suggestion from Mr. Agnoli's report and did he hear any testimony from the applicant consenting to that in any of the prior meetings. Mr. Agnoli declared he had not. Mr. Whitaker questioned the vegetation part in Mr. Agnoli's report as Mr. Agnoli had not reviewed any of the testimony by Burgis Associates.

Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Agnoli about the trash rack size. Mr. Agnoli said he is used to seeing on Storm Water Applications when there is a trash rack involved the maximum velocities of water flow through the trash rack during peak events. He is used to seeing that because key criteria for trash rack submissions is velocity. The lower the velocity, the less likely it is to clog. The standard from the DEP is that a trash rack should not have velocities more than 2.5 feet per second because higher velocities tend to clog more. Mr. Whitaker replied that what he was looking for was calculations to substantiate based upon what has been stipulated as a net area of 4.7 square feet. Mr. Agnoli agreed. Mr. Dunn asked about the NJ administrative code and Mr. Agnoli said it was the right one. Mr. Dunn wanted to know if they had met the standard and Mr. Latinsics said they had. Mr. Zambrotta asked about the cubic feet per second as per the peak flow for a hundred year storm. Mr. Latinsics said that it would be 11.8. Mr. Quinn wanted to know what size trash rack was proposed. Mr. Latinsics said the smaller one would be enlarged.

Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Agnoli about his comments on the site triangle and the drainage. Since Mr. Agnoli had not heard the testimony, Mr. Whitaker questioned whether he knew the borough engineer had said he was reasonably confident that the adverse effects would not be exacerbated by this proposal and he is satisfied that the improvements would help both upstream and downstream. Mr. Agnoli confirmed that the peak productions and volume increase that were discussed for the Celery Farm Natural Area itself, the quantity would not have a noticeable impact and the area directly downstream with proper study will most likely be able to demonstrate that as well.

Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Yakimik if he had any comments on any of the three reports. Mr. Yakimik said he wanted to know more about the 50% production in Mr. Latincics' report. Mr. Latincics referred to his October 18th letter. He explained that originally the detention basin was designed only for the 1.9 acre site. He then read from an Allendale ordinance that there are three options for a design engineer. Option three was for the initial site, but the Board asked us to do better, and we looked into the 13 acre watershed area. We shifted to option two which states demonstrate proof that there is no increase as compared to preconstruction condition to the peak run-off rates in storm water leaving the site for the two, ten, and hundred year storm events. In the summary charts on his November 29th letter, there shows a reduction which is not something according to the standard that is needed. There is no increase for the larger drainage area. We have met the Allendale ordinance. Mr. Yakimik commented that Mr. Latincics would then agree with Mr. Agnoli's assessment that 48% is not okay but is something that could be adjusted but it is a minimal adjustment to the design of the retention pond. Mr. Latincics agreed but said the physical aspects of the pond would not change. The question was then how the Board wished the volume to be allocated; did they wish to favor the two year storm or reductions in the hundredths. Mr. Yakimik recommended he stay with the two year storm.

Mr. Zambrotta asked if there was a peak flow reduction for any particular type of storm wouldn't there be a peak flow reduction for any storm. The answer was yes but Mr. Zambrotta wanted to know how to get a peak flow reduction for a two year storm but get an increase for the 100 year storm. Mr. Latincics replied that it goes to the distribution of storm water storage path. In this case a required reduction for a two year storm would be 50%. Mr. Zambrotta wanted to know how that happens. Mr. Latincics told him the capacity is dependent on the head or the amount of water that builds up above it or the pressure head. The volume increases for the greater storms as you have greater flows going through. Mr. Zambrotta clarified that it increases the rate it passes through. Mr. Whitaker stated that they could meet all the requirements for the 10 and hundred year storm, too.

Mr. Yakimik asked if the applicant could come back with a resizing of the orifice to meet the minor adjustment. Mr. Whitaker said it could be accommodated. Mr. Fliegel asked Mr. Latincics about the C-2 standard which is when you don't have to reduce the peak flow. But you are reducing the standard for the 2 year, 10 year, and 100 year storms. Mr. Latincics agreed. Mr. Fliegel continued to say that it is in compliance, but it is not optimum. Mr. Yakimik

explained that the chart needs a very minor adjustment. Mr. Agnoli addressed his own comment and discussed the differences between C-1 and C-2.

Mr. Barra commented that he was concerned with the downstream impact. He asked Mr. Agnoli his opinion about the down flow of water and the effect on the houses on Ivers, the Tallman area, the Celery Farm as a whole, and the homes right near the Celery Farm. Mr. Agnoli has seen the Celery Farm affected from the large storms that people were alluding to at the meetings. His main concern was with increase in volume and the impact downstream. The areas immediately downstream would suffer from a peak increase. The further you get downstream the more important volume becomes as to how much water is going to flow up into the area. When you are directly across the street you are worried about peak and the onslaught of water that overwhelms the system, backs-up, and your property becomes flooded. An effort has been made to help this situation with the fifteen inch pipe to be installed and the reductions that Conklin Associates has come up with recently and therefore he was not worried about the houses directly across from the proposed development on Ivers. Mr. Agnoli felt that once you got out of that area with the fifteen inch large pipe and closer to Franklin Turnpike he said that there wasn't enough information to deduce an answer on that matter. Right now there was no increase in the peak flow and that has been achieved because you changed the timing as it will take longer for the water to get off the lot than it has before. The farther you get downstream the more that doesn't matter anymore. The gray area for him was the area between Ivers and Franklin Turnpike. Mr. Agnoli thinks there won't be a major impact on the homes there but as to no impact he wouldn't say that at all.

Mr. Barra asked if he heard the testimony from a resident on Tallman who has flooding on her property due to the drainage of the pipe that comes under Ivers and comes down through Tallman. Mr. Agnoli said he hadn't heard the testimony but was familiar with the area from previous trips here. Mr. Barra asked about the culvert under Franklin Turnpike that leads into the Celery Farm. Mr. Agnoli felt that the clogging in the culvert was causing problems and any increase in volume could impact those homes. Mr. Barra questioned if clearing out the culvert would improve the situation, make it worse, or keep it the same as it is now. Mr. Agnoli had looked at the area and told Mr. Barra that it would improve the situation. He also suggested clearing out the stream so the culvert would not relog again. Mr. Barra asked about the impact of the development to the Celery Farm and Mr. Agnoli said it should be minor. Mr. Barra asked about the homes closest to the Celery Farm and the impact on those homes. Mr. Agnoli replied that without further study he was concerned about what would happen with an increase in volume. It is not a flashflood river but if the area is already saturated any volume that approaches that area will exacerbate the existing flooding problems. Mr. Barra stated doubling the volume of run-off after a development would concern Mr. Agnoli vs. the rate of flow and Mr. Agnoli agreed. Mr. Barra asked what study Mr. Agnoli would do to make sure there was not a negative impact on those homes. Mr. Agnoli thought a lot of work had been done already but that finding out how deep the water is during a major event and looking at where the water

impacts those homes and finding what the incremental impact there would be. Mr. Barra asked Mr. Yakimik for his opinion, and he replied that the applicant was not required to do any study on those homes. The applicant has met the standards in our codes and asking the applicant to do this study would be above and beyond what is required. He agreed with Mr. Agnoli's general concerns. Mr. Barra said that the applicant did comment on the effect on the Celery Farm but not on the homes. Mr. Yakimik said the two are distinct and different. Mr. Yakimik felt the impact on the entire Celery Farm would be deminimis. Mr. Barra thought it was important for those homeowners to know how this development would have an effect on their homes. Mr. Yakimik responded that this was absent of any cleaning of the culvert and as how conditions are today.

Mr. Fliegel asked Mr. Yakimik how far downstream properties go and Mr. Yakimik said it was up to interpretation. Mr. Yakimik said that he was initially concerned about groundwater conditions. There was some discussion on the C-2 code and that the applicant had met the code. Mr. Whitaker replied that the applicant had gone beyond the site and looked at the entire watershed and provided a great deal of information to the site and surrounding area. Mr. Barra brought up his concern about the three homes and Mr. Whitaker remarked that the applicant had not been asked to look at those homes before tonight. Mr. Barra thought homes should have been automatically included in the applicant's report about the Celery Farm. Mr. Whitaker looked at the transcript and said just the Celery Farm was requested not the homes.

Mr. Yakimik concurred with the revisions to the trash rack. Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Lydon from Burgis Associates if he wanted to comment on Mr. Agnoli's report. The first comment was on screening the basin from 77 Ivers and suggested some plant materials that would work. The second comment was on the shade trees and the third was on the variances.

Mr. Quinn opened the meeting up to public for comments.

Sarah Novak from 64 Talman Place commented that her family has lived in Allendale for 34 years. She has been through numerous storms and her family has put in drains around the house because of the water. She doesn't want the water situation to get worse.

Mark Savastano from 22 Vreeland Place (who also owns homes at 85 West Crescent Avenue and 103 West Crescent Avenue) wanted the Board to know that his residence will not be affected by the development but his other two homes on West Crescent Avenue will be. Mr. Savastano believed that he was affected by the Nadler Court development as he has had severe flooding on these two properties since the development was designed. He commented that there is a very high water table in the area and felt that Nadler Court was poorly planned. He said there were many storms and that there was no remediation for the amount of water that property owners were experiencing. He stated that one of his properties becomes a lake after storms. Mr. Savastano was worried about run-off water affecting his properties. Mr. Whitaker asked him if he came to a meeting before and Mr. Savastano said that this was his first meeting.

Lorie Mahoney from 486 Franklin Turnpike told the Board that she lives at one of the homes by the Celery Farm. She has drains and sump pumps because of the amount of water she has on her property. Mr. Barra asked which home was hers and she explained that she lived in one of the two ranches that border the Celery Farm on Franklin Turnpike.

Margaret Onesios from 133 West Crescent spoke to the Board about the water studies that were done for Nadler Court and that things had gotten much worse since those homes were developed. She stated that the Nadler Court homes may not have water but all the homes around them now do. Mrs. Onesios said the ground is saturated and the water has no place to go now. She has bought a generator and sump pumps and that there is nothing else her family can do at this point. She also was concerned about the Church's ability to maintain the detention pond but had no problem with the houses themselves being built.

John Workman from 227 Walthery Avenue in Ridgewood declared that he was a longtime volunteer of the Celery Farm and was representing a number of people who did not live in Allendale. He felt the key issue was the homeowners but wanted to let the Board know that Allendale had something special- a very unique nature preserve. He thought that the development was an additional threat to the functioning and the integrity of the Celery Farm. It is far more than a retention basin as it was called by an engineer. He believed the subdivision would increase the storm water run-off volume especially during heavy rains and concurrent rain storms. He was worried about the water quality from the run-off affecting the plant and animal life of the Celery Farm. He had doubts about the retention basin and was concerned about mosquito problems because of the wetlands. He told the Board that some of the suggestions given by the engineers to rid the mosquitoes would not work. He was concerned that the development was more complex than people realized.

Kathleen Sullivan from 184 Myrtle Avenue remarked that she had lived in Allendale for 25 years and that the infrastructure regardless of the type of storm cannot handle any type of rain. Myrtle and Talman are flooding and the storm drains cannot handle the rain and are bubbling over with water.

Charles West from 30 Wilton Drive asked if the Celery Farm was owned by the Borough of Allendale and Mr. Barra said that it is owned by the Borough but managed by Fyke Nature Association. He moved to Allendale because of the Celery Farm and wanted to make sure the Board made the right decisions on the development based on the Celery Farm.

Lauren Hirsch from 34 Crestwood Mews said that one of the things the Board should consider when making its decision is what the town itself can do from the result of the next development. She told the Board the creek behind Crestwood Mews gets the run-off from many streets and when the street is flooded the town doesn't do anything. Can the town handle anymore?

Mr. Quinn brought the meeting back to the Board. He asked Mr. Dunn about the next steps. The applicant agreed to extend to Thursday. Mr. Dunn stated that if the Board had any other concerns this was the time to address them as they would have to vote on Thursday. He also told the Board that besides the drainage issues this was a major subdivision with a few variances. He would go over the standards in regards to the variances and subdivision before the vote on Thursday. Mr. Whitaker replied that they had two things to provide to the Board on Thursday including the parking plan and review of the three homes by the Celery Farm. Mr. Dunn asked about the plantings and Mr. Whitaker said they concurred. Mr. Quinn reminded Mr. Whitaker that they may need another variance due to the parking lot changes and Mr. Whitaker said he expected as such. Mr. Dunn asked Mr. Whitaker to provide him with an updated evidence list.

Mr. Quinn commented that there was a lot of testimony on impacts to the Celery Farm. His understanding was that this property drains away from the Celery Farm and other than some of the large storms that might provide some level of backup to the Celery Farm which has been described as deminimis by the professionals. Most of this water flows off this property and down Ivers and Talman and wanted to know if that was correct. Mr. Latincsics responded by explaining the back-up of debris and the flow of Allendale Brook upstream. Mr. Yakimik suggested that the applicant address the other homes briefly at the next meeting. Mr. Quinn felt they had already heard that testimony and Mr. Whitaker responded that many residents were not here for all the meetings and the Nadler Court development was not his client's problem. Mr. Yakimik wanted to know what made the three houses near the Celery Farm unique versus all the other homes in the area. Mr. Whitaker said that it was based on questions from the Board. Mr. Barra said he wanted to know about the upstream of the culvert and the impact of those three homes. He wanted to know about the expert the homeowners' hired and whether he should be allowed to testify again. Mr. Dunn felt that it was not necessary at this point due to the standard procedures of how things should be run at the meetings. He also mentioned the time constraints. Mr. Barra questioned the fairness. Mr. Whitaker said Mr. Agnoli could be allowed to testify, but the question was about the Celery Farm originally and not about the homes. Mr. Whitaker said they would have the information about the three homes at the next meeting.

Ms. McSwiggan asked Mr. Yakimik if he could give a brief overview of the storm water management system. Mr. Yakimik explained his report in shorter terms. He thought the applicant satisfied the Borough code and the DEP regulations due to Storm Water Management. He did say that all of these are based on models developed over decades, but storms have been increasing. He listed some concerns that he had such as constrictions in the ditch, substandard pipes in the ditch, and this might lead to some exacerbation of conditions that are happening there. What level of exacerbation he did not know as that was a gray area. He then asked the question of how far does the applicant need to go to satisfy the Board and/or that there will be no problems whatsoever in the future. The applicant has responded to the major concern which is water leaving the site and peak run-offs that are leaving the site. The applicant has demonstrated that we will see some improvements to those in close proximity to the development.

On a motion from Mr. Sirico, seconded by Mr. Zambrotta, the meeting was carried to Thursday.
On a motion from Ms. McSwiggan, seconded by Mr. Sasso, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Knispel