

May 16, 2013

A meeting of the Allendale Planning Board was held in the Municipal Building on May 16, 2013. The meeting was called to order at 8:00 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. Sirico, Mr. Sasso, Mr. Walters, Mr. Zambrotta, Mr. Barra, Mr. Strauch, Mr. O'Connell, and Ms. Checki.

Absent: Ms. Sheehan and Mr. Scherb

On a motion from Mr. Sirico, seconded by Ms. Checki, the minutes from the March 21, 2013 meeting were approved. Mr. Walters, Mr. Sasso, and Mr. Zambrotta abstained from voting as they were not present at that meeting.

On a motion from Mr. Sirico, seconded by Mr. Zambrotta, the minutes from the special meeting of May 2, 2013 were approved. Mr. Quinn, Mr. O'Connell, and Ms. Checki abstained from voting as they were not present at that meeting.

Mr. Quinn opened the meeting by saying that he was going to switch the order of the agenda and hear first the re-approval of the minor subdivision of Barry and Susan Poskanzer, Block 1503.01, Lots 14 and 15. Mr. Whitaker introduced himself as the attorney representing the Poskanzers. The purpose of this meeting was to review and make a request for re-approval of a resolution that the Planning Board approved on January 21, 1999. The Poskanzers owned the property back in 1999 and still own the property today. Mr. Whitaker provided the Board with a copy of the 1999 resolution. The resolution was in essence subject to Bergen County Planning Board approval. It was a minor subdivision and was not done to create a new lot but to re-subdivide two lots. One parcel was one acre and the other parcel was four and a half acres. The one acre had no structures on it and the four and a half acres had a house on it. The re-subdivision was to make the one acre lot two acres and the four and a half acre lot three and a half acres instead. All would be owned by the Poskanzer family. The Planning Board and Bergen County Planning Board granted it. Unfortunately no one recorded or filed the map to perfect the subdivision. It is on the Allendale tax map but not on the County map. There has been no change on either of the properties since that time. Mr. Whitaker said his clients were looking to re-file the map. But there is a rule that says if the map is not filed within 190 days of when a resolution has been adopted that the map has to be reapproved. Mr. Whitaker explained that the purpose of coming before the Planning Board was to get a new resolution and signatures on the map. The Poskanzers wanted to take the map back to the Vollmer Associates who made the map originally and who have been taken over by the Stantek Group and have them put new dates on the map. Mr. Whitaker said his clients would then file the map with the County and get the appropriate signatures there. Mr. Whitaker felt that this was just an administrative task that needed to be done.

Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Dunn if he had any comments. Mr. Dunn responded that this procedure was more than just an administrative task. He felt that an application had to be sent into the Planning Board and that a presentation should be made. Mr. Dunn commented that Mr. Poskanzer was not in the audience that night and Mr. Whitaker stated that Mr. Poskanzer couldn't make it that evening as he had a prior business commitment. Mr. Dunn did prepare a resolution and memorialization but expected some testimony that nothing has changed in regards to the site. Mr. Whitaker said that he felt that since this was just a re-approval and nothing has changed as it was just a reconfiguration of the lot line. He added that the vacant lot is still a vacant lot. Mr. Whitaker said they wanted the same thing that was in the old resolution. The only change to the new map will be the date and signatures. Mr. Dunn asked Mr. Yakimik if he had time to look at the property. Mr. Yakimik said he had not looked at the property as escrow was not posted and he was not directed to do so by the Board. Mr. Whitaker said that he put in his letter that he would deliver escrow when he knew how much it would be and he could deliver it tomorrow. Mr. Dunn had it as a condition for the resolution. Mr. Dunn and Mr. Whitaker discussed how long it would take to get the certification from the County. Mr. Whitaker told Mr. Dunn that he had spoke to the correct people at the County and that the office was waiting for the map. Mr. Whitaker felt that a new application was not necessary as we are asking for the same subdivision that was asked for back in 1999. There have been no changes to either parcel of land. It was put on the Allendale tax map but didn't change the tax bill. Mr. Dunn said the resolution did not speak to all of this as it calls for Mr. Poskanzer's testimony. Mr. Dunn told the Board that they had to either approve the subject with conditions or postpone to next month. Mr. Yakimik preferred a postponement. Mr. Barra was concerned that no escrow was posted. He felt that Mr. Whitaker should have called to find out what the escrow should be and then posted it accordingly. Mr. Whitaker said that he has delivered things to the Borough Hall and left messages and because the secretary has been out ill he hasn't received any responses back. He sent emails to Mr. Yakimik to let him know that things have been delivered. Mr. Barra said that he is the applicant and he should have raised the issue on Monday so the escrow was established by this meeting. He felt that Mr. Yakimik and the tax assessor should be looking at this carefully. Mr. Yakimik set the escrow for \$500. Mr. Whitaker said that Mr. Poskanzer would be here at the next session and they would deliver a check tomorrow. The Board told Mr. Whitaker that he needed to be at the June regular session meeting as they did not have to come to the work session.

Mr. Quinn introduced the next application which was the site plan of Trinity Episcopal Church at 55 George Street, Block 1604, Lot 15. Mr. Whitaker introduced himself as the attorney for the Church which is proposing to put on an addition. The purpose of the addition is to increase office space, add Sunday school classrooms, and modernize the Church. There would be three witnesses during the evening including Father Michael Allen, Mr. Remo the engineer, and Mr. Campbell the architect. The height of the church is conforming and therefore no variances or waivers are necessary. There are some pre-existing nonconformities on site due to aisle width and size of the parking spaces. The testimony will show that the main points to this application

are to modify the existing church, resurface the parking area, add lighting and landscaping, and install adequate drainage. The parking spaces have been 9x18 since inception. If variance relief is necessary for the pre-existing parking conditions his client will deal with it at the time. The witnesses will address the issues in Mr. Yakimik's memo and the Dewberry's report when testifying. Mr. Whitaker said he hoped to get through all three witnesses that night.

Father Michael Allen was sworn in as Mr. Whitaker's first witness. Mr. Allen has been the rector since September 2007 and he was familiar with the Church and the building plans. He said the congregation is in approval of the plans. Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Allen to explain what goes on at the Church on a weekly basis. Mr. Allen explained that services are held on Saturday evenings at 5:30PM and on Sundays at 8:00AM and 10:30AM. Services can last between forty-five minutes to seventy minutes depending on the day. During High Holy days they have additional services at noon. Sometimes they have services outside especially during the summer. Mr. Allen told the Board that they have about 120 families attending the church. The average amount of people who attend are eight to seventeen people on Saturday night, six to fifteen people at the 8:00AM service, and forty-two to seventy-two people on Sunday at 10:30AM. For Sunday school eleven children are registered and between four to six attend weekly. The Church has about two to three Sunday school teachers. As for parking they have never had a problem with the fifty-two allotted spaces as not all of the members bring their own cars as families arrive together. On high Holy Days Trinity Episcopal Church has about 120-130 people and they still do not have parking problems. Mr. Allen told the Board that the Church wants the 3,800 square foot addition as the members feel that the mission and ministry are affected for lack of space. They have Sunday school but no space for classrooms. There is no office space as his office is in the rectory across the parking lot. They want community organizations to come in and use space but don't have the room as they only have the fellowship. Fellowship Hall can be partitioned but they have found that it is not working to do it this way. They do not have other meeting room space. The Church helps deliver food to the Center for Food Action and helps prepare meals for the homeless shelter. They also send shoes to kids who are at the Mustard Seed Academy in Uganda. The Sanctuary is remaining the same and seats 125 people. The sanctuary and the fellowship will not be used at the same time.

Mr. Quinn asked about the kitchen. Mr. Allen replied that they are bringing the kitchen up to code and making the doorway closer for deliveries. Mr. Quinn asked about the kitchen usage and was told it is for church purposes and not commercial. Ms. Checki asked if the rooms are currently rented out. Mr. Allen said they want to rent out to community groups including nonprofit organizations. Mr. O'Connell asked if these groups will be able to utilize the kitchen and he replied yes. Mr. Sasso wanted to know more about the fellowship hall and was told it is a multipurpose room. Mr. Quinn asked if he meant using the room for things like coffee hours and potluck dinners and Mr. Allen agreed.

Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Allen about the cut trees and log debris which is on the property. Mr. Allen wasn't aware of it until he saw the report. He told the Board that it was not the Church's

and must be a neighbor's instead. He also said that the sump pump will be eliminated. Mr. Quinn opened the meeting to the public but no one came forward to question the witness.

The second witness was Marc Remo and he was sworn in. He is a licensed professional engineer in New Jersey, New York, and a few other states. He is also a licensed planner in NJ and has twenty-eight years experience behind him. He developed the site plan and the Stormwater Management report. He explained that the property was at 55 George Street on irregular shaped lot with the width of 492 feet, depth 205 feet, and on 6.49 acres. The property has a one story frame church building, two story dwelling, a parking lot and driveway, which is all surrounded by woodland and grass. There is a drainage inlet and fourteen inch storm sewer located at the southeast corner of the parking lot. It drains into twenty-four inch storm sewer that travels west to east. There are two areas of wetlands on the property. The Church is in the AAA zone district and surrounded by single family homes. To the east of the property is Lee Memorial Library and to the West is Hillside Elementary School. The Church is looking to put on an addition, resurface the parking lot, install drainage, and upgrade some lighting and landscaping. The main building addition is approximately 3200 square feet and located on the south side of the building. The existing parking lot will remain and be resurfaced and restriped with fifty-two parking spaces including two handicapped spaces. The parking lot aisle widths vary from twenty-two feet to thirty feet across.

Mr. Remo explained about the drainage subsurface detention facility located in the parking lot. The roof drainage system will collect roof runoff from the existing building and the new addition. The storage capacity of the detention basin is 756 cubic feet and will consist of 12 feet by 21 feet x 3 feet deep brentwood storm tank storage modules. The outflow structure will control the runoff from the site and will connect to the existing drainage inlet in the southeast corner of the parking lot. The runoff from the roof will be directed to detention facility and there will be no significance adverse impact on downstream areas from the development of this site. The utilities that are currently on the site will continue to be used.

Mr. Remo said that lighting will be done for the site. The lights will be on eighteen foot high poles which will be located in the parking lot. These lights are shoebox style down lights and will be directed so they do not shine on adjacent properties. The lights will be mounted on a three foot base so they will be protected from vehicles. Shade type trees will be placed around the perimeter of the parking lot and around the building. Existing trees will remain where and when possible. Variances needed are for the depth of lot, lot width, lot height, and parking spaces. Mr. Remo added that the soil permit was sent and the wetlands plan and transition area waiver were sent to the DEP.

Mr. Whitaker asked Mr. Remo about drainage and the Storm Water Management Report that was done for this application. Mr. Remo said that the drainage system being put in is an upgrade to what they have now and that they are reducing the runoff with the development. The landscaping and lighting will also be upgraded. Mr. Remo told the Board that four variances

were nonconforming and not being exacerbated by the development and that no variances were being requested based on the addition being proposed.

Mr. Whitaker wanted Mr. Remo to address the issues that Dewberry Engineering firm raised. Mr. Remo explained the basement is being eliminated so they won't need a sump pump so the black pipe will no longer be necessary. Mr. Whitaker asked about the spillage from the lighting on to adjacent properties. Mr. Remo said the lights are directed downward so there will be no spillage. One light on George Street will have a shield so there will be no light shining on the nearby property. Mr. Quinn asked if there was lighting there now and Mr. Remo said there is minimal lighting and more lighting is needed. Mr. Remo said they submitted plans to the DEP who made comments initially. The Church resubmitted plans on April 24th and was waiting for the DEP's response to the LOI and waiver. Photographs of the premises were turned in to the Board. Mr. Remo said they located the utilities but couldn't determine the sizes of any of them as they are all underground. Mr. Yakimik said they were looking for a record of the utilities and where the sanitary sewer connection was located. This information is useful to the Borough. Any further investigation would be appreciated. Mr. Sirico asked about why they couldn't find the water line. Mr. Remo said they found the valves on George Street but had difficulty finding the line. Mr. Yakimik said he didn't check his records at the Water Department but those records might indicate where the water and sewer lines were located. They eliminated the height variance which Mr. Yakimik agreed because of the topographical changes around the structure.

Mr. Remo said that on the report item three was about a variance for parking lot capacity. Based on their calculations of 125 seats in the sanctuary forty-six spaces are required and they have fifty-two. Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Yakimik what he thought about that and Mr. Yakimik said that he was concerned about the width and capacity. He said that Mr. Whitaker said in the beginning that no variance was needed due to space size because the applicant is putting back what exists already. Mr. Yakimik felt that if you are repaving a lot you are wiping the slate clean and that the space size could be revisited. He also said a 9x18 space is adequate for this type of place. He recommended a variance for this situation but also recommended granting the variance. Mr. Yakimik felt the capacity was also an issue as he looked at the size of fellowship hall and felt that it should have seventy-six spaces in accordance with the code. Mr. Strauch asked if those calculations were based on the square footage of fellowship hall and Mr. Yakimik agreed. Mr. Whitaker said that fellowship hall is there now and is not changing. Therefore it is pre-existing nonconforming use. Mr. Strauch asked about whether the hall had fixed pews. The answer was no and Mr. Yakimik explained that is why the code bases it on square footage. Mr. Yakimik suggested angling the parking to get more parking as the applicant would just need more paint. Mr. Yakimik said the Board needed to decide whether parking should be based on the sanctuary or on the fellowship hall. He also said that the expanded kitchen would expand the use of the hall. Mr. Walters asked whether they are using the sanctuary and the hall at the same time and they are not. Mr. Whitaker said that it is an assumption that if the kitchen is larger there will be more people in the hall. He added that one of the reasons to add on to the kitchen space was for

the outreach programs. Mr. Whitaker stated that if they could come up with fifty-four rather than fifty-two spaces that would work. They could also redesign the aisle widths. He disagreed with Mr. Yakimik's comment that it was a clean slate as he felt that the parking lot was just being refurbished. He said he would not debate the need for a variance. Mr. Barra asked if they were expanding the kitchen or just bringing it up to code and the answer was both because they are trying to make it easier to get deliveries out the door. Mr. Quinn replied that they weren't using it for commercial use. Mr. Zambrotta said he had heard that they were going to use this for more outreach and asked whether that would change the capacity. Mr. Whitaker said that they would use the hall and not the sanctuary. Whatever the hall is being used for the people will have to fit in there and not create problems in the space. It would have to be a reasonable outreach. Mr. Walters felt it was more a scheduling issue than a capacity issue. Mr. Walters asked about handicapped spaces and Mr. Yakimik said that there are two right now and there will continue to be two. Mr. Zambrotta was worried that if there was more usage of the building that they would need more parking. Mr. Yakimik described more about the code in regards to space and parking. Mr. Quinn said that the condition exists today and the Church was not changing it. Mr. Allen said that they have filled fellowship hall before with some of their events but have never filled the parking. The room can only hold 160 people and usually they have tables and chairs in the room. Mr. Walters asked if the Board could limit the number of people based upon the capacity limitation rather than the square footage. Mr. Yakimik said the Board can do what it wants but he is just telling them the code. Mr. Dunn said you can't limit beyond what is provided by ordinance or regulation. Mr. Yakimik felt that if the engineer went back and did a different configuration using the 9x18 spaces that he could get four to ten more spaces. Mr. Dunn suggested that the engineer look at it. Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Remo agreed to relook at the parking. Mr. Dunn asked about the variances and Mr. Yakimik said one should be for space size and capacity. Mr. Walters asked about Calvary Church and what the space sizes were there and Mr. Yakimik said 9x18. He noticed the other day that people were parking on the street for a funeral and that those circumstances are few and far between. Mr. Barra asked if fellowship hall was remaining the same size and the answer was yes from Mr. Whitaker. Mr. Whitaker said that it was pre-existing and should not be an area of concern for the parking. Mr. Barra asked Mr. Yakimik if this application had nothing to do with paving the parking lot would a variance for the parking be needed and Mr. Yakimik responded no and that it would be a pre-existing nonconforming use. Mr. Yakimik felt that it was all about whether the use was being exacerbated or expanded. Mr. Dunn felt that development of this site added pressure on parking when you combine with the repaving of the lot and it justified reexamination. Mr. Walters said he was more concerned with the drainage than the parking since the worship area was not being expanded. Mr. Quinn said that the applicant should relook at parking to see if they can add more spaces.

Mr. Sasso asked why lighting was being increased. Mr. Remo said that there was insufficient lighting out there right now. Mr. Allen said that there was one pole light at the northern end of lot and there is no lighting at the south end. He was worried about people falling as his

congregation average age is sixty or sixty-two. Mr. Sasso asked about how many lights were being put in and Mr. Remo replied eight lights with two of the poles having two lights on them. Mr. Sasso was concerned about spillage. Mr. Remo said that they will shine down. Mr. Barra asked about the northern light that was adjacent to Lot 30. Mr. Remo said that the shield will be on back of the light and that the light will go down and forward and not back to Lot 30. Ms. Checki asked if the three feet base would be included in the 18 foot pole and Mr. Remo said yes that without the base it would be 15 feet. Mr. Yakimik had some questions and comments about the lighting. He felt that the parking lot design should conform to the Code. He was concerned about spillage but pleased to hear about the shield. Mr. Yakimik also asked about the mounted light on the wall as it does shine towards a residence and about the walkway lights. Mr. Remo said the lights would be on timers. Mr. Whitaker responded that the Board can't burden religious organizations with ordinances as Churches have the right to hold Masses and religious learning activities. Mr. Yakimik also added that he thought there should be landscaped islands in the parking areas for safety reasons but realized this would take away from the parking.

Mr. Remo discussed other items. They have listed the zoning on the site as AAA and ML-3 and will change the ML-3 to all AAA. There was also an issue of a ditch behind the parking lot clogging with water behind Lee Memorial Library. There was some discussion as to whose property this ditch was on and it was determined to be the Borough of Allendale's. Mr. Yakimik said he would take care of it.

Mr. Remo talked about the drainage and the Storm Water Management Report in regards to Mr. Yakimik's memo. He told the Board about the existing roof area and the proposed roof area. Mr. Remo provided the calculations for peak runoff rates and reported that the water table is 50 inches below the grade which makes the detention system one foot above the bottom of the storage system. There is an impermeable liner so no water should come into the system. This was suggested due to the type of soil conditions in the area of the detention system. The roof runoff will be piped into the detention system. Mr. Quinn noted that this is better than what they have today. Mr. Yakimik noted that the roof water will not only collect from the addition but from the existing roof and this is more than what they are required to do. Mr. Walters asked about nearby property owners who have expressed concerns with water in the past. Mr. Yakimik said that there have been reports of downstream flash flooding conditions. He continued with this improvement should help the downstream flow but won't eliminate it. The applicant is doing more than needed under the Code. Ms. Checki asked if these properties were in the flood zone and Mr. Yakimik told her they were not.

Mr. Yakimik had suggested extending the fence around the basin and the engineer felt that could be done. Mr. Yakimik also wanted notes on how they were going to maintain and clean the system which Mr. Remo said they would provide to the Board. Mr. Remo stated that the landscaping around the basin would not conflict with the detention system.

Mr. Yakimik said that he was concerned with whether the applicant had sent copies to all the agencies for their approval. These agencies include health, fire, code official, and shade tree. It was decided that since the client or attorney drops enough copies at the Borough Hall for all of these agencies already that it is the responsibility of the secretary to make sure that the items are disseminated. Mr. Quinn opened the meeting to the public for questions.

Kim Martin from 200 Brookside Avenue was sworn in. She was concerned about drainage and more ponding happening on her property which is located downstream from the site. Mr. Remo told her that the extra water will collect in the basin and not on her property. Mr. Whitaker stipulated that Mr. Yakimik said Trinity Episcopal Church was doing more than required by the Borough Code. Mr. Barra wanted to make sure he understood correctly that the water would not increase more than it exists today because of the development and Mr. Yakimik agreed. Mr. Yakimik said he would visit her property and give Ms. Martin some suggestions.

Michael Campbell the architect for Trinity Episcopal Church was sworn in. He is a licensed NJ, PA, FL, and NY architect and working with churches is his specialty. Mr. Campbell started to explain more about the Church and what the addition will entail. Currently there is a sanctuary, fellowship hall, and some storage spaces. The sanctuary, bathrooms, and fellowship hall were added in the 1980's. The addition will give the Church more amenities for existing church functions. Nothing had changed since January when he initially showed the Board the plans. One of the top priorities to the membership when polled was bringing the kitchen up to code and in order to do that they need to make it larger. The Church wants to renovate existing spaces including making the choir room into an office. They also want to add another office, two classrooms, a meeting room, storage room for tables and chairs, and put in handicapped restrooms. The configuration of the addition is due to the wetlands in the back of the property. The façade of the building will go from a 1970's look to a more traditional look. It will probably be gray in color with different windows; columns, brackets, and arches in all of the entrances, and the new addition will look similar to the changes that they make to the older part of the building. Mr. Campbell said the basement does get water so they are going to fill it in with gravel and a three foot crawl space will remain. Therefore the sump pump will no longer be needed. Mr. Campbell added that in his experience the parking is based on the sanctuary and not on the meeting hall. Mr. Walters asked based on Mr. Campbell's experience with churches if Trinity Episcopal Church is underutilizing their space based on the amount of acreage they have surrounding them and Mr. Campbell agreed. Mr. Yakimik asked about the mounted lighting by the door. Mr. Campbell said it is a light for the exit door which will be used when people are on the property. He added that it is not a bright light. Mr. Quinn opened the meeting to the public but no one approached.

Mr. Whitaker summarized the meeting by saying that Trinity Episcopal Church wanted to upgrade the entire site including the building, drainage, lighting, and landscaping. No variances are needed for anything new. He continued with the fact that he understood if conditions were added to include revisiting the parking lot situation.

Mr. Quinn asked Mr. Dunn how the Board should proceed. Mr. Dunn stated that the Board had to decide if the application complies with design standards and ordinances, if the applicant needs a variance or not, whether to proceed without having communicated the plans to the agencies noted earlier, and if the parking situation has satisfied the Board. Mr. Quinn asked if the application could be granted with some conditions and Mr. Dunn agreed.

Mr. Yakimik questioned whether the application was for preliminary and final approval or just preliminary approval. Mr. Dunn stated that notice was given to the public for both. Mr. Yakimik wanted to make sure the bonds and escrow were complete and Mr. Whitaker had no objections to more conditions being given.

Mr. Dunn explained the voting procedures to the new members. Mr. Yakimik added that he was not concerned with the drainage and wanted to remind the Board that there will be Capital improvements to George Street in the near future.

Mr. Dunn stated that conditions were given for evaluation of additional parking spaces to the site, agencies having jurisdiction such as the DEP, agencies being notified of the site plan, escrow and bonds to be posted, and engineering comments to be considered.

On a motion from Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Zambrotta, the site plan for Trinity Episcopal Church was approved with the conditions stipulated.

On a motion from Mr. Strauch, seconded by Mr. O'Connell, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Knispel