

June 16, 2011

A regular meeting of the Allendale Planning Board was held on June 16, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 8:10 p.m. by Chairman Quinn, 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 roll call: Mr. Quinn, Mr. Sirico, Mr. Fliegel, Mr. Sasso, Mr. Walters, Mr. Zambrotta, Ms. Sheehan and Ms. McSwiggan. Mayor Barra arrived at 8:15 p.m. Mr. Strauch was absent.

On a motion by Mr. Sirico, seconded by Mr. Fliegel, the minutes of the meeting of April 21, 2011 were approved as amended. Ms. McSwiggan abstained.

On a motion by Mr. Sirico, seconded by Mr. Walters, the minutes of the meeting of May 19, 2011 were approved as submitted.

Continuation of Calvary Lutheran Church application

Mr. Whitaker, attorney for applicant, said that Mr. Latincics, engineer for applicant, concluded his testimony with the understanding that this evening he would answer any questions pertaining to that testimony.

Mr. Whitaker said he was asked if he had received input from various Borough departments. He received a response from the Fire Department indicating they basically have no problems. He received a response from the Shade Tree Department with recommendations. There was no input from other departments.

Mr. Whitaker said he received a letter via fax from the Board Secretary, Ms. Knapp, transmitting a copy of an engineer's report from Nicholas Agnoli to Mr. Pastore and Mr. Wright. He wrote back to Ms. Knapp and copied Mr. Dunn, the Board Attorney indicating that the letter is not admissible and the Board members should not receive or review that letter. Mr. Dunn said he immediately advised the Board members through the Board Secretary that it is not appropriate for them to review or consider materials that are submitted outside of the context of the public hearing and requested that they disregard it before it is addressed at public hearing. He further advised the Board members and the Board Secretary that it is important in these applications that only the materials submitted at the hearing be considered.

Mr. Whitaker said Mr. Latincics will address Mr. Yakimik's report dated June 14, 2011 this evening. Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Latincics to address the request for a supplemental soils report pertaining to the high ground water elevation issue.

Mr. Latincics said additional test holes were performed by Johnson Soils and subsequently four ground water monitoring wells have been installed on the property. They are noted on Exhibit A-1A, 1, 2, 3 and 4 and follow up report by Johnson Soils has been provided identifying the seasonal high water level. He believes this was done in early May and they have been monitoring them since that period. Generally speaking, the ground water level has been dropping about 6-8 inches.

Mr. Whitaker said this is per the report of May 12, 2011. He asked if there has been an additional submission since then. Mr. Latincics replied affirmatively. He said he believes he has provided sufficient and adequate soils information by those two reports.

Mr. Whitaker said on page 5 of Mr. Yakimik's report, he suggests that the applicant's engineer should define the proposed storm water basin more accurately. Mr. Latincics said he has provided two designs for the detention basin – one is a project specific detention basin and subsequently a watershed wide detention basin. He said that ultimately he needs direction as to which is preferred. The second question is the surface/landscape treatment of that basin and what is the most appropriate basin. Mr. Latincics said the conditions indicate that a wetland planted detention basin is preferable. Such basins are referred to in the Borough of Allendale Ordinance 06-14. He said this type basin has aesthetic and water quality benefits. In his opinion the preferred treatment is the planted wetland basin.

Mr. Whitaker said paragraph 7 on page 5 of Mr. Yakimik's letter asks for expansion and explanation of potential improvement on page 9 of the original stormwater management report. Mr. Latincics said in the original design they had a project specific detention basin but there is a trapped wetland in the middle of the lawn area so to mimic that trapped wetland area the outlet control port of the detention basin was set above the bottom of the detention basin to essentially create a similar trapped wetland area. He pointed out that it is a better utilization of that storage to allow the outlet control port to drain it. That trapped area builds up early in a rainstorm well before the peak hits so it is not effective storage. By lowering the outlet control port they recapture that storage. He believes that is a benefit but he will leave it up to the Borough Engineer and the Board to choose what they prefer.

Mr. Whitaker asked if the revisions to the plan requested in paragraphs 15 and 16 can be made. Mr. Latincics said they can but he needs direction as to which is the preferred detention basin.

Mr. Whitaker said he had addressed paragraph 11 at an earlier meeting when he said the owner of lot 2.01 would be responsible for maintenance. He added that generally when an approval is granted by a Board, they make it a condition that there is a maintenance agreement prepared based upon the input provided by the Borough Engineer. He said applicant has accepted that and has made that as a stipulation in this application. Mr. Whitaker asked if the applicant's proposal at this point meets the requirements of the Allendale storm water management ordinance. Mr. Latincics said it does specifically by focusing on reduction in peak rate of runoff to downstream properties. Mr. Whitaker asked if it does in some instances exceed the requirements of the storm water management ordinance and will the applicant's proposal improve the current drainage within this drainage basin. Mr. Latincics said generally speaking it will reduce the peak rate of runoff to downstream properties by 25% and that is on a watershed wide basis – not just the project site but the entire 8.3 acres of offsite/upslope areas as well as the entire church and its proposed subdivision site. He said it is a significant improvement over existing conditions.

Mr. Whitaker asked if there will be any adverse affects on the downstream drainage as a result of what the applicant is proposing. Mr. Latincics said it will improve downstream drainage by reducing peak rates of runoff to that drainage.

Mr. Whitaker asked if it is correct that some part of that downstream drainage leaving the site does not go downstream but into a municipal system. Mr. Latincics said that is correct. It goes from a B inlet that connects directly to a 24 inch RCP pipe that was constructed in approximately 1960 and replaced an 18 inch pipe. That pipe crosses Ivers Rd. to contiguous properties. It goes under the trolley line embankment discharging into an open channel.

Mr. Whitaker asked if this detention facility will interfere with or affect the existing surface waters on the site. Mr. Latincics said they will be draining the existing surface water on the site. There is a clogged and inadequate drain on the church parking lot which this project proposes to upgrade and discharge into the detention basin. Currently what happens is that due to the inadequate piping, water collects at the upper portion of the property and then spills over and ponds in the open lawn area, so they are collecting that surface water, bringing it to a proper pipe and discharging it into the detention basin. He said they are having a positive impact on existing surface water by collecting these waters, putting it into the detention basin and ultimately discharging it into the municipal system. He said there will be no adverse impact but a positive impact.

Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Latincics to explain the difference between a wet detention facility and an infiltration basin. Mr. Latincics said this is a wet detention facility. It is not an infiltration basin. An infiltration basin facility is constructed within highly permeable soil which they do not have here. Generally speaking infiltration basins are not used in North Jersey because of the soil conditions. They work well in South Jersey where there are much sandier conditions. He said he believes the applicant's proposal pertaining to the drainage plan meets not only the Borough standards but the RSIS standards and the overall drainage facility proposed improves upon what currently exists.

Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Latincics to summarize what he is looking for in direction from the Board. Mr. Latincics said they are looking for feedback regarding what can be done to improve the drainage. He said they revisited the drainage on a watershed wide basis in an extensive study which was presented to the Board and off site up hill and down slope investigations which had nothing to do with this project were prepared and provided to the Board. He said there is a project specific detention basin and a watershed wide detention basin. At the first meeting there seemed to be some concern as to why the detention basin is so large. He said it is large because it has a benefit of reducing the runoff to their point of interest. He said they need direction as to the preferred basin.

Mr. Quinn asked if there was another concern about the height of the outlet in the detention basin. Mr. Latincics said he can create a trapped wetland in the bottom of the detention basin or he could drain the bottom a little bit more so they have 8 inches of water sitting in there all of the time. Mr. Quinn asked for Mr. Yakimik's comments.

Mr. Yakimik said he believes everyone has a copy of his report dated June 14. He said under item VI, Storm Water Management, he is still concerned about the affect on ground water. He asked if there have been any supplemental readings for ground water after the last reading on May 12 which established seasonal high ground water at 2 ft. 2 in. below the surface. Mr.

Latincsics said that as of this morning it was 6-8 inches lower than in the last Johnson Soils reading. Mr. Yakimik asked for a copy of that information. He said it was his understanding that readings were to be taken weekly. Mr. Yakimik said he would like to see those readings to make sure that it peaks at the 2 ft. 2 in. level which is currently the highest ground water elevation. He asked if it is correct that the basin as currently designed will be wet. Mr. Latincsics said that is correct. Mr. Yakimik asked how many inches and Mr. Latincsics replied ten inches. Mr. Yakimik said if that basin were there this past spring it would have been filled 3-4 months with that amount of water. Mr. Latincsics said they could raise the bottom of the basin and eliminate that storage. He said he has referred to it as a robust detention basin. It is much larger than this project requires. They have looked at it on a watershed-wide basis. The basin provides 14,728 cu. ft. of storage. The requirement for this project is 9,600 cu. ft.

Mr. Yakimik said his advice to the Board is that he would like to have the larger basin to handle the most amount of detention possible. He believes what the Board has to come to accept is what this detention basin is going to look like. Is it going to look like a swamp or is it going to look like the dry basin on the pictures that were distributed two meetings ago of the Saddle River project at Boroline Road. What he is hearing now is that the proposal on the table with the larger basin is going to have to be a wet basin and that basin is going to be wet for maybe one-third of the year. This is not the smaller basin that is taking care of the development but the larger one that is taking care of the watershed problems. Mr. Latincsics said it will be a planted wetland basin with herbaceous vegetation at the bottom. He said that actually it is no different than what happens there today.

Mr. Yakimik asked if there is any way to handle the storage and make it a dry basin 12 months of the year. Mr. Latincsics said they could take the bottom ten inches and backfill that with crushed stone and raise the bottom of the detention basin so that 40% of that volume would still be available during the dry period. Mr. Latincsics said a constructed storm water wetland basin has a 90% TSS rating as opposed to an extended detention basin which is usually a dry basin which has a 40-60% TSS removal rate. Mr. Yakimik asked the meaning of TSS removal rate. Mr. Latincsics said it is a water quantity component of storm water management. He said in the Borough's ordinance there is almost a preference for planted wetlands. Mr. Quinn asked if Mr. Yakimik would agree with that statement. Mr. Yakimik said he would. He said one of the critical things this Board has to determine is whether they are going to be comfortable with the aesthetics of this detention basin. Now it will be a wetland for one-third of the year. Before they were talking about it being a dry basin being mowed but that was a smaller basin.

Mr. Quinn asked if this is something that would be protected with a fence. Mr. Yakimik said he believes the proposal is for a split rail fence with metal meshing. He said he remains concerned about the ground water. Applicant referred to two reports by Johnson Soils, one from January 14 which was in the original submission to the Board. He asked, "Could you lead me to where there is a recommendation here that there will be no adverse affects to ground water as a result of the development, either in this report or the subsequent report." Mr. Yakimik asked what will happen with the basement of the resident across the street. Mr. Latincsics said this was addressed in his Exhibit A-17 which he handed out to the Board. He understands that the concern is will this detention basin introduce more water into the sub-surface than currently exists. He addressed this on the last page of Exhibit A-17 where he pointed out what currently

happens on the site. 8.3 acres drains to this trapped wetlands area at the upper end of the site. When that fills up it spills over and flows across the lawn area and sits in the lawn area depression and ultimately it flows over the curb. He said the low permeable soil in this area is one reason for the runoff over the curb. He said we have a large infiltration surface here and a water supply to it. The proposed design is to intercept that water. If the concern is that we are putting more water into the soil, we are addressing that concern. The detention basin is actually reducing the area of infiltration.

Referring to the non-permeable soils, Mr. Yakimik said it is his understanding that the soils will be excavated out as part of the project. He asked if the sand is permeable and Mr. Latincics said it is. Mr. Yakimik asked what will be the condition at the bottom of the detention basin with that sand layer. He believes there will be more water going into the ground than is getting there currently as a result of removing those soils. Mr. Latincics said if this a concern of the Board he would be willing to line the basin but he would not recommend that. Mr. Yakimik said he would not recommend it either. Mr. Latincics said as long as the municipal piping is clear and functioning properly, this runoff will be piped directly past the lots that front on Ivers Rd. Mayor Barra said his concern is also for the homes downstream. He said there are quite a few homes on Myrtle Ave. that have a pond in front of them. Mr. Latincics said the 1964 aerial topographies show that there is a natural depression there and the water naturally collects in that depression. Mayor Barra said he is also concerned with the comment that this project will result in twice as much discharge off the property and the impact on all of the homes downstream of the project.

Mr. Latincics said they meet the requirements of the municipal ordinance at the point of interest where they reduce the peak rates of runoffs as per the ordinance. He described the path of the watershed. Mr. Latincics was asked if we will be seeing more frequent flooding in this watershed as a result of this development. Mr. Latincics said he believes the answer is no. In addition to reducing the peak rate of runoff they are also providing a lag in the timing of the rates of runoff. He said not only are they reducing peak rate of runoff to the municipal piping system but they are releasing the reduced peak rate later in the storm which allows the central and lower portions of the watershed to drain to the available capacity in that system and they would not have that benefit if this project was in the central portions of the watershed. They have the benefit of creating a lag in the peak discharge. Mr. Latincics asked if Mr. Yakimik agrees and Mr. Yakimik said he does.

Mr. Yakimik said at that point of Talman and Myrtle there are other flows of water coming into the system, not just the upflow from Ivers. Mr. Latincics said it would pick up everything southwest of the trolley line, Talman and portions of Vreeland. This project is reducing the peak rates to that pipe. Mr. Yakimik said that is basically true, at least on the reports that have been submitted. He always cautions everyone that storm water management is not an exact science and conclusions and recommendations are based on models that are based on empirical data, but the applicant has demonstrated that theoretically it will reduce peak runoffs from the development. If this Board is comfortable with this detention basin then it should improve storm water management conditions along this watershed. He added that he still remains concerned about the ground water and understands what the applicant's engineer is saying, but he would feel more comfortable if the Johnson Soils report addressed the permeability issues and if this

has a detrimental affect on the ground water. Mr. Yakimik said up until this time he did not know this was going to be a wetlands type detention basin with organic soils at the bottom. He did not know what it was going to be and that is why he kept asking for this information about this detention basin; however, the applicant needs to get some input from the Board as to whether or not they feel comfortable with the detention basin.

Mayor Barra asked if it is correct that we will be doubling the amount of water coming off the site and that the detention basin retains the water and slowly lets it out in a matter of hours and not days or weeks. Mr. Yakimik said that is correct. Mayor Barra said his concern is that we have flooding in many areas within hours of a major storm. His concern is that if we are doubling the amount of water coming off this site, even though they are reducing the rate of release of that water within a matter of hours, double the amount of water is finding its way south.

Mr. Yakimik said he needs more specific information on the basin because that is key to the application. More qualifying statements with regard to groundwater would be helpful because he is still skeptical about conditions with groundwater. He said he included item No. 15 based on the aerial maps showing that this water course was an open ditch at one time. The second proposal about getting rid of the constriction of the 6 inch diameter pipe is definitely a step in the right direction, but he asked for a further step to make an open channel from the isolated wetlands at the top under the new detention basin and eliminate the piping. He asked if that would improve things or would it be detrimental. Mr. Latincics said from an aesthetic perspective and a maintenance perspective it is not feasible. He believes a pipe is easier to maintain than an open ditch. Mr. Yakimik asked if we would get more capacity from the basin with an open ditch. Mr. Latincics said yes, that is one of the reasons they oversized the basin. Mr. Yakimik said he has no further questions.

Mr. Quinn asked if Mr. Yakimik is basically agreeing with the testimony of the applicant. Mr. Yakimik said yes, with regard to satisfying the ordinance and with regard to the volume and quantity of water. With regard to ground water, he is still skeptical. He would like to see some more information, i.e. further ground water readings past May 19 and some more definitive statements preferably from a soils expert and the effect the development would have on ground water. Mr. Whitaker said they have those readings from May 12 forward and will provide them. They will also address the permeability issue.

Mr. Zambrotta said that what he has heard in testimony is that the amount of storm water that will drain off will be increased because of increased impervious coverage. He is concerned that we could be underestimating that number. As he sees it the plan moves water from north to south far more efficiently with that detention basin. He asked if the amount of runoff is going to increase dramatically quicker. Mr. Yakimik said it will fill up very quickly but it is going to hold the water back and will let it out gradually. Presently the water does flow more quickly into the Ivers Road system. The detention basin will have a weir that will hold it back and it will have more storage. The sides of the detention basin will be higher.

Mr. Snieckus, the Borough's planning consultant asked if option B requires more of a detailed planting design in order to deal with the fluctuation in water levels. He said we really need to

have someone who understands hydrology. If you have basins that drain in 6 hours there are different types of plant materials and there is also different types of techniques for planting related to the amount of material that is stored over periods of time.

Mr. Yakimik said right now we are looking at a basin that will have water in the bottom anywhere from one-quarter to one-third of a year. Mr. Snieckus said it also impacts how you clean the basin because it is important to keep out certain types of plants. He said he would like to work with applicant's expert on this.

Mr. Quinn opened the meeting to the public for questions directed to the applicant's witness.

Jim Wright, Vice President of Conservation for the Fyke Nature Association which maintains the Celery Farm and Nicholas Agnoli, engineer, 108 Ridge Rd., Little Falls, NJ. were present. Mr. Agnoli said he looked at the plans presented by applicant and especially the detention basin. He asked what type of basin it is. Mr. Latincics said it is a wetland planted detention basin. Mr. Agnoli asked how it is getting rid of 90% of mobile suspended solids. Mr. Latincics said he will provide that information. He said the basin is only 3 ft. deep and they would prefer not to over-excavate it to 6 ft. Mr. Agnoli said it is his understanding there will be approximately 3 hr. detention time for the 100 year event. Mr. Latincics said the total drain down will be 6 hours. The majority will be 3-1/2. The detention basin is oversized. The requirement is 9600 and they have up to 19,500 cu. ft. They feel it is better as active storage. Mr. Agnoli asked if the bowl area that is wetlands now will not be replaced. Mr. Latincics said it is being replaced but the question is how is it being replaced. They are going to replace it so it drains down.

Mr. Agnoli asked if at this point they have not submitted suspended solid stream calculations. Mr. Latincics said they have not. They are waiting for the preferred basin to be chosen and then they will fine tune a planting program and other such details.

Mr. Agnoli asked if the downstream system is adequate and the water will not back up. Mr. Latincics said they are capturing the entire watershed.

Mr. Quinn asked for questions from members of the public.

Mr. Anton, 50 Ivers Rd. said right now it is all rough land where the houses are going to be built. There are potholes, leaves, etc. so the water in a storm sits in that crown right now but what will happen when the houses are there. He asked if the houses will have seepage pits. Mr. Latincics said a series of inlets are provided. The roof leaders are connected directly to the inlets which drain to the piping that goes into the detention basin.

Mr. Anton asked if he is guaranteeing that the water that runs off the new houses will actually be retained by the basin and the water will never run from the street onto Ivers. Mr. Latincics said he has used the term robust many times. RSIS standards require a pair of catch basins every 400 ft. for the roadway. They actually have two pairs of catch basins – one at the end of the road and one in the middle. There is a catch basin at the end of the culdesac which is a connection point for a catch basin in the rear of the properties. Where state standards would allow two catch

basins they have provided five. Roof leaders are connected directly to those catch basins and they are connected to the piping and there are two discharge points. He said it is a robust design.

Mr. Anton asked if those catch basins would take all of the water if it rained for a day and a half straight and there would be no problem. Mr. Latincics said that is correct.

John Pastore, 77 Ivers Rd. said at the last meeting there were questions asked as to whether we have other dry detention basins in town and the answer was yes and most of them were maintained and in pretty good working order. His question is do we have other examples of a wetland planted basin in town. Mr. Yakimik said he does not know of any in Allendale.

Mr. Pastore asked Mr. Whitaker if applicant agreed there would be a maintenance plan for the basin. Mr. Whitaker said that is correct. He added that the maintenance plan cannot be submitted until a selection has been made as to the style, type, size and caliber of the basin itself.

Mr. Pastore asked if the isolated wetlands on the northern part of the property that has not been well maintained over the years will be included. He said he assumes the Borough Engineer can review that maintenance plan as well as the attorney to assure that their are remedies for compliance. Mr. Yakimik said the maintenance plan has very particular mandated provisions in the ordinance. Because they have had problems with maintenance before this ordinance was passed they have made this ordinance extremely strict.

Charles West, 30 Wilton Drive, asked how the watershed area is determined. Mr. Latincics said it is determined by topographic mapping. He said the upstream portions of this watershed are very well defined. Basically it is properties all the way up West Crescent, the rear of Nadler Court and the upper end is at West Crescent and Franklin Turnpike. One of the problems from this watershed is gutter flow from West Crescent entering this watershed when it should be going into the W. Crescent storm sewer system. If and when this project is built and the curb and sidewalk program goes forward there will be additional benefits within this watershed.

There being no further comments, the meeting was closed to the public.

Carl Glaser, Mahwah, N.J. was sworn. He said he is President of the church council. He has been a member of the church for over 10 years. He said the church council is the governing council for the church. He said the church has been in Allendale for over 50 years. He said he is very actively involved in church activities as well as in the community. He said about 50-60 people attend church services on Sunday. In a normal Sunday there is one church service. There is nursery school, Sunday school and the church bible hour during a 3-5 hour time block. He is familiar with activities conducted by the church as well as other organizations. Mr. Whitaker asked that he describe the parking arrangements in the parking lot and whether it is overcrowded.

Mr. Glaser said as with most organized religions in the United States, they probably use one-third of their parking space on Sundays. On festival days or church holidays they probably use 75%. Mr. Whitaker said there are 73 spaces on the site according to the plan. He asked if Mr. Glaser has ever seen all of them used. Mr. Glaser said not in 10 years. Mr. Whitaker asked what prompted the church to take this step as it pertains to seeking this subdivision approval.

Mr. Glaser said they looked at the church and its assets and prepared a long term plan. They discussed where the church has been, where it plans to go and also what they need to do to make the church sustainable over the next 20-25 years. They looked at their undeveloped land as an asset for the future. They felt this would be the best use of that asset so the church could survive and be a viable part of the Allendale community.

Mr. Whitaker asked if they took into consideration the membership and growth of the church. Mr. Glaser said the church has been stable for about five years, meaning they have more than adequate facilities for the present and into the future. Mr. Glaser said in their constitution and title the local church owns all the property and all the assets. Mr. Glaser said the church has looked at this long range plan and has directed him to proceed with this proposal. Mr. Glaser said they are currently a voting site for the Borough. They sponsor three Girl Scout troops and one Brownie troop, two Boy Scout troops and one Cub Scout troop, as well as Camp Acorn which is a program for mentally and physically challenged young adults. During the summer they use their facilities for a summer camp 5 days per week. The XYZ senior group uses their facility as well as other groups and it is also used as a regional homeless shelter serving families with dinners 3 times during the year.

Mr. Whitaker asked if the amount of property the church is currently using is the only property that the church and its congregation actually needs. Mr. Glaser said it is more than adequate right now.

Mr. Dunn questioned the reason for the presentation of this testimony. Mr. Whitaker said the Borough has an ordinance that says you need a certain amount of acreage for a church to exist in Allendale. He is presenting testimony to show that sometimes you can have a facility where you do not need that amount of space and that is one of variances they are seeking.

Mr. Glaser said they have been contacted by two real estate brokers and one congregation who are interested in buying the church in its entirety. They feel that the property gives them a nice base to expand their operations to supplement their community interests and also have festival days during the week.

Mr. Whitaker asked if the primary goal of the church is to remain in Allendale and to remain in the facility on the property that would be retained on the basis of this subdivision. Mr. Glaser said they have been in Allendale for over 50 years and it is their object to stay in Allendale as long as possible.

Mr. Whitaker said one of the stipulations discussed pertained to the church taking over the maintenance of the drainage facilities. He asked that Mr. Glaser confirm that this would be the church's obligation. Mr. Glaser said the church understands its obligation and as part of this process has put adequate funding in a trust account for this to occur.

Mr. Quinn asked if the parking lot is sometimes used for overflow parking for the restaurant across the street. Mr. Glaser said it is and there is a gentleman's agreement. Mr. Fliegel asked if the current lawn area that would become the basin is used for any functions. Driving by he has

observed some activities on that property and where would those activities relocate. Mr. Glaser said there is adequate lawn in the front. Mayor Barra said he appreciates the fact that the church is utilized for a lot of community activities but he has observed occasions when the parking lot was full. Mayor Barra added that the church is no longer used as a polling place.

The meeting was opened to the public for comments and there being none, the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Sasso said that Mr. Glaser had mentioned an unsolicited offer was received from another congregation to buy the property. Mr. Glaser said they have had two brokers call with regard to purchasing the entire property. Mr. Whitaker said a broker came to them on a confidential basis in terms of the congregation they represented that was looking for a location. He added that the concept behind coming here was because of the expansion possibilities on all of the acreage. They were not interested in the church's expansion, but rather to use the facilities that are there now and then to expand to have a large social hall or perhaps have another church built and to use what is there now for social activities and use the land Calvary is proposing for a subdivision for other buildings or outbuildings for their activities.

Mr. Whitaker said this is a church that functions appropriately and from a planning aspect one of the considerations the Board members have to make is whether it would be wise to see residential development buffering the church that exists now or to see the potential for a church to expand and use all of the property. He added that he feels it is appropriate from a planning aspect that they are looking at constructing these homes on these lots which would serve as a buffer to the parking lot that exists.

Mr. Whitaker said they will have their planner present for the next meeting.

Mr. Quinn said the next regular meeting of the Board is scheduled for July 21. Mr. Zambrotta asked if it would be appropriate to use a work session for an additional meeting. Mr. Whitaker said that is an excellent idea. Mr. Dunn said we would need the applicant's consent to carry this to the next month. Mr. Whitaker said he will consent through the July 21<sup>st</sup> date. He asked if it would be possible to hold the public meeting on Monday, July 18<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Dunn recommended to proceed with that schedule. Mr. Quinn said the meeting will be carried to Monday, July 18<sup>th</sup>. If the matter is not completed on that night it will be carried over to July 21.

Mr. Dunn said if a Board member misses a meeting, he needs to sign a certification that he has read a transcript or listened to a recording of the hearing in order to be eligible to vote.

On a motion by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Zambrotta, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Knapp