

Mr. Newman defers to Counsel, Mr. Russell Huntington for the Applicant.

Mr. Huntington refers to the last meeting stating they were in the midst of cross examining their Engineer and since that time, they have made some adjustments to the plan in response to some of the questions that were posed here. He would recommend with the Board's cooperation and consent, they bring Mr. Missey back up for additional direct testimony about the changes...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) agrees and explains to the public that Mr. Missey is not yet finished with his testimony because he now has new information to present. We will let him finish and then they will have the opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Missey steps to the Podium.

Mr. Newman asks him to please state his name.

Mr. Andrew H. Missey (previously sworn) Project Engineer for the Applicant.

Mr. Missey prepares a Board Exhibit. Entered into evidence,

Exhibit-A16- Consisting of 6 Sheets, each of which is revised as of November 3, 2014.

Mr. Missey refers to Exhibit A16 and states he will run through a ½ dozen items which have been revised.

Mr. Missey begins his testimony by stating the 1st sheet of the plan that has been revised in response to their appearance last month, is the sidewalk, shown from Century Road & the Dunkerhook extension northerly into the site linking up with the sidewalk along the front of the building to the entry point. There previously was no sidewalk and this was requested at the last meeting.

ADA accessible ramps are shown graphically all along this route, (points to Exhibit) but they now have 62 parking spaces to serve 104 rooms with 123 beds, so they meet both the RSIS Parking standards and Fair Lawn parking standards.

The Delivery Area has been further refined to provide a Loading area with sufficient room to allow the backup movements for the single unit vehicle which is the expected delivery vehicle that the Operator would request.

In addition, the Generator location is shown adjacent to the Basement level depicted on the plan.

The Historic portion of the Vanderbeck House continues to be shown to be re-located along Dunkerhook Road but they have turned it so it will continue to face south which is the present configuration.

Sidewalk improvements are shown along the minor Dunkerhook spur down to the County Parking area to connect that Pedestrian route from where it terminates at Commerce Bank. (Now TD Bank) It will now link up with their sidewalk down to the County Park area that was previously on the plan.

A 2ft. Pavement widening is depicted along Dunkerhook Road on the easterly side, this is a very limited right of way at the present time but this 2ft widening include curbing to further offer edge protection in this location.

Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) asks if it is possible to be wider than 2ft.

Mr. Missey replies it is possible if the County is willing to work with them to widen it in this direction, to the east....they have had on going communication with the Parks Department and the Bergen County Planning Department requesting the consideration of widening in this direction.

Mr. Huntington clarifies with Mr. Missey just for the record, they can get the 2ft. widening most certainly and exploring the ability to get more.

Mr. Missey replies correct.

Mr. Missey continues....the location of the Retaining Wall on the southerly side of the access on the Dunkerhook Road spur has been shifted away from the Naugle House to further protect this dwelling from the impacts of any construction.

Mr. Missey refers lastly to the Zoning Chart, explains the right of the sheet has been amended to reflect what he has just described as the plan changes and explains.

Open Space will now be now be 52.7%
Maximum Impervious coverage will conversely be 47.3%.

Mr. Missey explains they had noted because they have two business signs and variances required, the Board Engineer has determined if they have a Commercial business, one sign is permitted. In this case they proposed a sign both along Century Road and along the minor Dunkerhook spur so that the 2nd sign and variance is noted and they required a variance for a Retaining wall height because they are in a residential use back in the loading area and this is noted on the plan.

Mr. Huntington asks Mr. Missey to please show to the best of his ability how the backup area will work.

Mr. Missey testifies he does have an Exhibit to show this.

Marked as Exhibit A-17 (New Exhibit)

Mr. Missey testifies this is a computerized generation of the movements of the single unit vehicle he described previously accessing this delivery area. What they have done because they need 62 Parking spaces to satisfy the Zoning Ordinance and to satisfy the RSIS, they have reallocated where these spaces are at this location. The northeasterly corner of the building and the site. The vehicle can now make the movement back to the Refuse area or the loading door (Delivery Door) and make the movement in, back up, load off the back and drive straight out in either direction and go back to Century Road, etc...

Mr. Huntington would like Mr. Missey to clarify that a Truck that is backing up in this location is segregated from patients and customer cars.

Mr. Missey testifies it is segregated from all vehicles. Refers to the Exhibit and shows the backup location on the exhibit and the parking area. He believes this is an improvement to the concerns noted relating to the vehicle backing up all the way up the driveway and this has been resolved with this refinement.

Mr. Missey refers back to Exhibit A16/Sheet 2. The changes have been marked in orange on the plan. As they can see there are not many adjustments on Sheet 2 of 6, which is the Drainage/Utility plan. They have added the Sanitary Manhole detail and they have adjusted the Storm Drain profile per the Board Engineer's previous review.

Mr. Missey moves to Sheet 3. They have noted the Wall heights on the tables as requested by the Engineer and the grading of the service area has been refined so as to better accommodate the back up movement...

Mr. Missey goes to Sheet 4 of 6 - Landscape Plan. The Landscaping has been adjusted in the Loading area (points to Exhibit location) seasonal plantings are continued to be proposed at the two signs. Tree locations and sizes were adjusted to satisfy exactly which trees they are proposing as mitigation for their proposed Tree removal. The Tree removals on this plan and the proposed Tree Plantings are fully coordinated with the Tree Removal Plan submission that has been made to the Shade Tree Commission.

Mr. Missey explains Sheet 5 of 6- Lighting Plan. This has been revised to include the specifications and the (inaudible) analysis for the bowered leveled (inaudible) being a 42inch high pedestal lighting that is proposed along the walkway solely for the use of the residents. In addition, the photometric analysis for the balance of the site has been super imposed onto the plan which was not on the plan in August submission. They have the calculation summary table filled out.

Testimony continues on the lighting plan...they are now proposing an average foot candle level of 1.86 ft. Candles within the paved areas on the site and along the rear walkway, there will be 2.8ft. candles, a very comfortable lighting level for this type of use. The spill over onto the adjoining residential properties to the North, west & south are negligible. All zeros...a very effective photometric analysis. No lighting impacts off of the premises.

Mr. Missey refers to the Erosion Control Plan. The adjustments are relatively minor.
Inaudible, (A lot of static on recorder)

Mr. Missey concludes his testimony on what the revisions and changes were since the last meeting.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) opens to the Board Professionals.

Mr. Newman swears in: Jennifer Beahm (Acting Board Planner)
Mark Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer)
Paul Azzolina (Board Engineer)

Mr. Azzolina has no questions or concerns with Mr. Missey summary. The only exception would be to the lighting plan. There is some spill light to the Southwest and this is a residential property so if he could look a little closer at this section.

Mr. Missey testifies what they will do is perform an analysis that takes into account the 6ft. fence that is proposed there and present this to him. With this further analysis, it will demonstrate the impact is not perceptible. If it is not, they will further shield this.

Mr. Azzolina also would like to point out on the Summary table, he notes the numbers appear to be reversed on the max to min...

So noted...

Mr. Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer) would like to commend the revisions to the Loading area because the turnaround is a strong improvement to what had been shown prior to this. The only question or comment would be; would they have any objection to connecting the sidewalks to this Loading area with a cross-walk & handicap ramps at the top of the driveway so the sidewalk that heads down to Dunkerhook Road would be connected to the site?

Mr. Missey reviews the location and testifies they could stripe these for crosswalks. This would not be a problem.

Ms. Beahm (Board Planner) does not have any questions at this time.

Mr. Azzolina (Board Engineer) asks if Mr. Missey could go over the Tree Removal Plan.

Mr. Missey (Project Engineer) agrees to do so and refers to Exhibit A-18. (Tree Removal Plans)

1. 1st sheet of the Plan set is entitled; Tree location plan with an initial issue date of February 28, 2014 & a revision date of November 3, 2014.
2. 2nd Sheet is entitled; Tree Removal plan with an initial issue date of 11/3/14
3. 3rd Sheet is entitled; Mitigation Tree Replacement plan dated 11/3/14

Mr. Missey reviews the 1st sheet testifying what it shows is the significant Trees on this site and also on the adjoining properties where the driveway runs through and along the Century Road frontage. They have not attempted to survey all the trees on the Borough's property. Explains there are very thick walls of Bamboo there and very difficult to survey through Bamboo.

Mr. Missey explains the 2nd sheet shows which trees are proposed for removal. They have a (inaudible) in the right hand column which shows graphically how they have depicted on the plan the trees being removed, stating they have super imposed the footprint of the building, the parking and the driveway. The improvements are expressed in this plan so they can identify where these trees proposed to be removed fit within the confines of the Tree Removal Ordinance.

Mr. Missey continues...they have cited the Ordinance as they went through the plan so they can get a tabulation which is a separate Document and has been submitted, documenting how many trees in each of the categories that are pertinent to this site are applicable.

Mr. Missey continues to testify.... the trees that are within the footprint of the building and the right-of-way are exempted from mitigation. Trees that are within the parking area or within 15ft of the building are not. Trees that are bad or safety hazards are also permitted to be removed but are subject to mitigation. This is how they have identified the trees within this site fit within these various categories.

Mr. Missey moves to the 3rd sheet. States this sheet presents exactly the same Landscape Plan he pointed out to them on Exhibit A-16. It is the exact same Planting plan that is on that sheet. Based on the Tree Removal Ordinance, a total of 29 mitigation Trees are proposed. This plan proposes 16 Mature Trees and 29 Minor Trees per mitigation, and in addition this plan shows an additional 16 (inaudible) trees, so they more than meet the Tree Removal guidelines for this particular site.

Mr. Missey refers to the right hand column box (lower right) states certain trees on this site, if they are a good candidate for relocation, they will have the option of relocating these trees onto a location where they will do well and would not require additional planting. It is difficult to pull off and they are not proposing this for any tree at this point in time but if there is a specimen out there as the Project proceeds forward, that is suitable for relocation, they will do this..

Mr. Missey concludes his testimony.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) clarifies with Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) that it was submitted to the Shade Tree Commission.

Mr. Huntington states; there was feedback from them but he does not believe there is an Official approval of the mitigation plan as of yet but there has been positive feedback but there may be some details yet to be worked out.

Mr. Huntington comments there is an email on this subject from the Shade Tree Commission which was submitted.

Discussion...

Mr. Azzolina (Board Engineer) refers to the calculations Mr. Missey spoke of in Sheet 2 entitled Tree Removal...he does find these calculations to be in accordance with the requirements of the Ordinance but for the Board and the Public's information, Mr. Missey indicated that 16 mature trees were being planted, by mature, Mr. Missey is speaking of a 12inch caliber tree which is a very significant tree as far as a new planting goes...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) asks if there are any questions from Board Members regarding Mr. Missey presentation this evening.

Mr. Naveh (Board Member) would like to clarify the changes on the Zoning Chart for the Site plan because there are different numbers from the previous plans.

Open Space was 53.7% which is now 52.7%.
Max. Building Height was 36.8ft. Which is now 38ft.

Mr. Missey clarifies the building height was and will remain at 38ft.

Max. Impervious coverage was 46.3% and now is 47.3%?

Mr. Missey testifies it is higher because of the pedestrian routes that has been requested.

Minimum Parking spaces was 63 and is now 62?

Mr. Missey states correct because it comports with the Ordinance requirements for the number of beds.

Mr. Naveh asks if there are any other changes on these Chart numbers that he missed or this covers it.

Mr. Missey notes they have added two categories based on the Board's Engineer's review.

Mr. Naveh clarifies this would be the Business signs and the Retaining wall.

Mr. Missey testifies he is correct.

No further questions from Mr. Naveh.

Mr. Newman asks if there are any other questions from Board Members. Seeing none,

Mr. Newman opens to Residents living within 200ft. for questions of Mr. Missey based on any testimony given here this evening as well as testimony he gave at the last hearing.

Mr. Newman comments that most probably have been sworn in but because it is hard to keep track, he will swear everyone in.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Paul Wittenberg**
15-09 Saddle River Road
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Wittenberg first thanks the Applicant for the addition of sidewalks on Dunkerhook Road, although he is still concerned about the size of the street.

Mr. Missey explains the minimum width will be 4ft. with 2ft of pavement on the other side.

Mr. Wittenberg notes this street will then be even narrower...

Mr. Missey states it will not. It is currently 20ft. in pavement. There is room on the westerly side to add the curb and sidewalk. The street will not get wider; it will get 22ft. or 2ft. wider than it is presently.

Mr. Missey is asked what a typical street size is. He testifies it would typically be 28ft. or 30ft.

Discussion....

Mr. Missey reiterates they have made the request to the County....

Discussion continues...

Mr. Wittenberg clarifies; but as it stands it is still a substandard road.

Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) interjects to state he would like to clarify that "substandard" this is kind of a technical term. There are standards that vary depending on the type of roadway...explains the standards of the RSIS. There is a sliding scale depending on the nature of the street.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Wittenberg asks what Professional he could ask if it fits within the standards of the RSIS.

Mr. Missey notes he would be the one to ask and it does. It fits into the "Special Purpose" street. Explains... it serves as a parking area for the County Park, it serves as an access route to the Naugle House and serves at the present time the access to the Fair Lawn's Water Department Facility on Dunkerhook which has a driveway off of this spur.

Mr. Wittenberg asks about the plan to add more traffic to an area with minimal traffic & can it handle all of it.

Mr. Missey testifies they are not planning on adding a number more, but Mr. Troutman who will be testifying after him will and can give him the specific quantity of vehicles...

Mr. Wittenberg thanks him and states he will hold his questions for Mr. Troutman.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Simon Fridman**
15-08 Dunkerhook Road
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Fridman first would like to say he disagrees with him in reference to (inaudible) estate.. He is an Engineer himself...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) interjects to state he cannot testify, especially as an Expert in any field. Do you have a question for Mr. Missey?

Mr. Fridman question is; Mr. Missey assumes this street will service passenger vehicles. In this case (inaudible) it would be very dangerous to pass in this area and it would be very inconvenient for someone to pass the trucks running uphill. Does he think with the trucks on this spur, the width consideration should be different?

Mr. Missey explains the widening in the easterly direction by 2ft. This was the basis for widening it.

Mr. Fridman states his 2nd question is, he does hear anyone questioning the issue of blocking the Sun in the morning with the construction running in the North/South direction...

Mr. Newman notes to Mr. Fridman there has been no testimony to any of this yet, but they probably will hear from the Planner and when the Planner testifies, he can certainly come forward to ask this question at that time.

Mr. Fridman concurs and asks Mr. Newman if he can comment on the Environmental Report.

Mr. Newman states he cannot comment but if he has a question, he can ask it.

Mr. Fridman states he simply disagrees with the findings on the report.

Discussion.....

Mr. Newman reiterates he cannot make statements at this time, but certainly at the end.

Mr. Fridman has no further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Seymour Wigod**
15-26 Landzettel Way
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Wigod directs his question to Mr. Newman (Chairman) refers to the Preliminary Flood Maps. He believed Mr. Newman directed the Engineering Department to take a look at those and see how pertinent they are in this situation. Did he get the information?

Mr. Newman states he does not know and defers to the Board Engineer.

Mr. Azzolina (Board Engineer) testifies he did say at the last meeting he would speak with the Borough Engineer, Ken Garrison which he did. Initially, he was not aware of this but after doing some digging, he found them in the Borough's archives and he himself downloaded them from the legal website. The conclusion is; there will be no impact to the Development of this property based on the revised map.

Discussion...

Mr. Wigod clarifies Mr. Azzolina is speaking to the new preliminary July 2014 Maps...

Mr. Azzolina reiterates yes and there is no impact to this project and the State case would be the FEMA maps are not used by the State of New Jersey. The new maps actually depict the same NJ Flood Hazard limits on them which is a change...

Discussion continues.....

Mr. Wigod has no further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Gary Stern**
15-16 Landzettel Way
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Stern refers to the width of the road. Have they considered if any ambulance or ambulances or Fire Trucks need to get onto these roads for safety purposes? This is a big concern.

Mr. Missey testifies they have considered this. One of the reasons they do have two access points if for just this reason. Mr. Missey points to the Exhibit and refers to the one access point being 28ft. at its throat on Century Road & Dunkerhook extension and its 24ft. along the driveway, the existing Dunkerhook road spur is 20ft. and it is being widened to 22ft.

Discussion & Testimony continues...

Mr. Stern asks Mr. Missey if this is within all the Fire Codes and Safety codes.

Mr. Missey replies, yes.

Mr. Stern moves to the Tree issue and asks Mr. Missey if he can review this once again because it is very hard to see in the back. How close will the building be to the houses that basically on in this backyard? How far away will the building be?

Mr. Missey states he did testify to this at the last meeting but he will review it again with him.

The building from the northerly property line will be 45ft.
From the westerly property line, it will be 40ft.
The building from the southerly property line will be 23ft.
Towards the River, it will be approximately 75ft.

Mr. Stern clarifies what he is saying is the closest point from where the residents live is 25ft?

Mr. Missey testifies it is a School property and points to the location on the Exhibit. There are no residents there (points to location on Exhibit) and also states there are no residents on the TD site.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Missey testifies the closest neighbor would be 40ft. minimum.

Mr. Stern asks if a Concrete Wall is proposed.

Mr. Missey testifies what is proposed is a board on board fence, 6ft. in height. It is called a Shadow Box Fence, which is boards that are offset from each other in an up and down direction by a horizontal 2x2.

Mr. Stern has concerns this will be an eyesore for the residents who live in front of this, and feels a 6ft. fence is not high enough and would he (Mr. Missey) be satisfied with this 6ft. fence if he lived there?

Mr. Missey testifies yes.

No further questions from Mr. Stern.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) asks if there are any Residents within 200ft. of the Applicant with questions for Mr. Missey. Seeing none,

Mr. Newman opens to the **General Public** for questions of Mr. Missey.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Mr. Robert Moss**
Green Acres Issues Coordinator
17 New Street
Bloomfield, N.J.

Mr. Moss refers to Mr. Missey's testimony in regards to the Historic portion of the Vander Beck House and asks him why it is Historic? Is it on a Registrar?

Mr. Missey does not know this. He believes the reason why he used this term is because it was testified to previously by one of the residents that asked a question or it may have been Mr. Milanese...

Mr. Moss asks Mr. Missey if it was his understanding that part of it was under a register or all of it.

Mr. Missey did not get this from the questioning...

Mr. Moss continues... would he be accurate in saying he is referring to the original portion of the house?

Mr. Missey testifies he thinks this would be accurate.

Mr. Moss moves to a question regarding Dunkerhook Road. Questions the expansion of the width more than 2ft. would it necessitate a Green Acres diversion?

Mr. Missey does not understand what he means by a diversion.

Discussion continues.....

Mr. Moss refers to Mr. Missey's testimony, something to the effect, if they needed to go over 2ft. the County had said they would work with the applicant?

Mr. Missey testifies he did not say this at all.

Discussion...

Mr. Missey explains what he said. They inquired of the County if they would be willing to work with them to acquire additional right-of-way along the easterly side of the Dunkerhook Road spur. This is all they have done. They made the inquiry. They asked.

Mr. Moss asks if Mr. Missey used the word Park in his testimony this evening.

Mr. Missey testifies yes. They actually asked the Parks Department because this is who holds title to this property. They have looked into the Deed history...in 1955 it was deeded from the Naugles to the County (inaudible)...so they made the inquiry to them asking if they would consider allowing them to widen in the easterly direction..

Discussion....

Mr. Moss states they have a County Park but they do not know about diversions. Is this his testimony?

Mr. Missey does not understand what he means by diversions...he is trying to answer his question, but he does not know what he means by diversion. If he would describe it, he may be able to answer this...

Mr. Moss states it is "Green Acres" protected. If they plan to use this land, they have to go to the State to get a diversion out of "Green Acres"....if he is not familiar with this....

Discussion.....

Mr. Moss has one more question. He refers to the testimony of the "substandard street" It falls under a "special purpose" street. Is a special purpose street defined by the number of vehicles or is there some other ...

Mr. Missey explains. There are a number of ways in defining this. One is the quantity of vehicles, and another has to do with what this particular thoroughfare/roadway leads to...

Mr. Moss has no other questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Steve Tichenor**
368 Saddle River Road
Saddle Brook, N.J.

Mr. Tichenor explains he originally came to ask questions regarding the house but now he is more concerned about the impervious surface. He lives along the Saddle River in Saddle Brook, and because they are developing all along the River, he is trying to figure out who is causing these floods that come up in the backyard all the time.

Mr. Newman asks what his question is.

Mr. Tichenor asks how much impervious surface is there currently with the Land.

Mr. Missey (Site Engineer) testifies, currently the property has 14,252sf of Impervious area.

Mr. Tichenor moves to his next question. Does this percentage increase when it's 47.3%?

Mr. Missey testifies yes.

Mr. Tichenor asks how much is the percentage from the difference of what it increases to what currently is to what it will be when it is developed.

Mr. Missey testifies he does not have this figure.

Discussion...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) asks Mr. Missy if he could do a quick recap for the benefit of Mr. Tichenor who is here for the 1st time in terms of runoff for this site.

Mr. Missey concurs. Explains what continues to be proposed is because they have deep sandy soils, and they are proposing two different things. What they have is permeable pavement proposed for the parking spaces. It functions as both run-off storage and water quality benefits. Points to Exhibit and shows locations...and continues his testimony. In addition, the run-off of the entire roof area of the proposed building and the parking area, as well as the driveways will be directed to a retention system which is fundamentally a large underground chamber into which the run-off flows.

Testimony continues.....

Mr. Missey moves to the secondary measure. An overflow to drain certain areas of the site which are lower (basement levels, loading areas) which he spoke to earlier this evening to the Saddle River. These areas, before draining to the Saddle River will go through a water quality filter, a jellyfish type of device that will filter the water from the storm so to insure the water quality that goes directly into the Saddle River.

By use of the retention system, both the volume and rate of the run-off limitations they were obligated to meet, and with the water quality device (inaudible) they meet the requirements this site is required to meet...

Mr. Newman asks Mr. Missey how this compares to the run-off on the site currently..

Mr. Missey testifies it reduces the rate of run-off and the volume of run-off based on existing conditions.

Mr. Newman asks if this answers Mr. Tichenor's question.

Mr. Tichenor replies, it answers the question but he has heard these statements before because every development says the retaining system always controls the rate of flow but he still gets more water backup into his backyard every time someone develops something along the river.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Newman explains to Mr. Tichenor every applicant is held to their testimony and they have to adhere to it.

Mr. Tichenor asks Mr. Newman if everyone around the development has flooding that normally does not flood, they can come and tell them about it?

Mr. Newman states if this were to happen, that would be correct.

Discussion continues.....

No further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Mr. Eric Bal**
14-35 46th Street
North Bergen, N.J.

Mr. Bal asks how many vehicular ingress and egress roads this development will have.

Mr. Missey testifies two (2)

Mr. Bauer asks if one of them the easement path across the Naugle Property that comes off Dunkerhook road and the other on Century Road? Will there be any difference with the nature of the vehicles used for each of these two different roads?

Mr. Missey replies no.

Mr. Bal asks if these will roads will both be two way?

Mr. Missey replies yes.

Mr. Bal continues....he notes to Mr. Missey, his testimony was the width of the Century Road access was 28ft. What is the average width throughout?

Mr. Missey testifies the average width would be closer to 24ft. through most of the distance.

Mr. Bal asks what the average width of the Easement road?

Mr. Missey testifies 24ft.

Mr. Bal moves to his next question. He refers to the historical portion of the house, the front portion which plans to be moved. Does he mean to imply the other portion of the home is going to be destroyed? Is this not historic?

Mr. Missey testifies he is really not sure he would be qualified to answer this question.

Mr. Bal asks if Mr. Missey is aware of when this portion of the home that is planned to be destroyed was built.

Mr. Missey testifies he does not.

Mr. Bal asks what percentage of the property would be covered by parking lots and access roads.

Mr. Missey testifies roughly 26%.

Mr. Bal asks what percentage of the property is unusable due to its proximity to the Saddle River or other terrain conditions.

Mr. Missey testifies he does not know if they have made this determination. There are a couple different factors here...explains. One is the repairing zone line which we honored along the Saddle River and the second has to do with the presence of the Transco Continental Pipe line Easement...

Discussion continues...

Mr. Missey testifies he cannot provide a rough estimate, he does not want to throw a number out and not have it backed up by calculations.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Bal asks Mr. Missey if there are any other Experts that can answer this.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) would like to know why Mr. Bal is asking this.

Mr. Bal replies he wants to get an idea of the amount of the usable lot that is being developed as opposed to the portion that cannot be developed due to the nature of the terrain.

Mr. Bal has no further questions.

Mr. Newman asks if there are any other questions from the General Public.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Ms. Ruth Weisman**
39-34 Knott Terrace
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Ms. Weisman's question is in regards to safety. They access the park from the Dunkerhook Road with strollers & bicycles on the weekends. It is all uphill when returning from the park and some residents cannot move fast uphill. She has safety concerns. She worries about the traffic from this building, refers to Ambulances and Fire Trucks racing uphill. There will be a lot of other visitors now.

Mr. Newman asks Mr. Huntington is this is a question for Mr. Missey or would he prefer their Traffic Engineer answer this.

Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) thinks this would be a question for the Traffic Engineer. He would be able to speak to the number of vehicles in addition to the configurations.

Mr. Newman explains to Ms. Weisman they will first hear from the Traffic Engineer and if this has not been adequately answered, please come ask the question again.

Ms. Weisman concurs.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Mr. Mark Colyer**
39-08 Van Duran Ave
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Colyer refers to the Fair Lawn N.J. Master Plan notes the following goals and objectives which are relevant to this application. How does demolishing half of the house and the basement, moving it to a different location preserve and enhance the Historic building?

Mr. Missey explains he is the Civil Engineer and thinks this question would be better directed to the Planner.

Mr. Colyer concurs and moves to his next question. Is he aware that 2009 Legislation declared Dunkerhook Road an historic roadway and any building on it needs to be approved by the State?

Discussion....

Mr. Colyer notes from what he understands, it's from Saddle River Road all the way to Paramus Road. It is declared one historic highway.

Mr. Missey testifies he has no idea what the implications of this are on this application or any other property on this street.

Mr. Colyer would like to clarify that the Naugle House/42-49 Dunkerhook Road is on the State & National Registry, added 1983.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) reminds Mr. Colyer he is testifying.

Mr. Colyer has no further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Ms. Peg Nooris**
1-15th Avenue
Elmwood Park, N.J.

Ms. Nooris asks Mr. Missey if it would be possible to develop this property without use of the access right-of-way.

Mr. Missey testifies in a hypothetical sense, yes.

Ms. Nooris explains to Mr. Missey it was difficult to see from the back the plans for the sidewalks and asks if they are to be to the left of the curb line if there were one?

Mr. Missey clarifies the location she is referring to, then replies yes, but notes they are putting a curb line also.

Ms. Nooris asks how many feet from what is currently the edge of the road will it go to the west with the sidewalk and curblin?

Mr. Missey testifies a minimum of 4 ½ ft.

Discussion continues.....

Ms. Nooris notes this will also bring it closer to the Naugle house....

Ms. Nooris has no further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: Mr. Walter Tuers
17 Richmond Ave
Ridgewood, N.J.

Mr. Tuers refers to the new configuration for the turn-around for the vehicles, what are the dimensions they are using for the model?

Mr. Missey testifies it has a 20ft. Wheel base and a 30ft length as depicted on A-17.

Discussion...

Mr. Tuers next question refers to the relocation of the retaining wall. How far is the Retaining wall going to be moved from the Naugle House?

Mr. Missey testifies it will be shifted approximately 2ft. to the North & East within the right-of-way.

Discussion....

Mr. Tuers would like to know what the distance will be with the proposed retaining wall and the Naugle house.

Mr. Missey using a ruler scales the Exhibit before answering and testifies; 12ft. based on the scaling.

Discussion continues.....

Mr. Tuers speaks to the new configurations with the turn-around. The impression he got with the turn-around vehicle was it would be a delivery vehicle. He has concerns the right-of-way will be used for Garbage Trucks, would this be correct?

Mr. Missey testifies no. There may be no trucks using it. It would depend on which direction the Truck wishes to go or how they would choose to exit the site.

Mr. Tuers asks how they expect to get the garbage off the premises...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) interjects to ask Mr. Missey if the Traffic Expert will be testifying to this.

Mr. Missey replies he would.

Mr. Newman explains to Mr. Tuers we should hear from the Traffic Engineer in regards to this..

Mr. Tuers in closing would like to thank all the parties involved for giving consideration to the Dutch Tradition in having the Historical House facing south.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Ms. Felice Koplik**
6 Reading Terrace
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Ms. Koplik has a question regarding the Retaining wall which in testimony was said to be moved 2ft. to the north. What is the maximum height of this retaining wall from the road?

Mr. Missey reviews...in the vicinity of the Naugle height, the maximum height is 3.4ft. as they proceed to the north and west away from the Naugle house, it has a maximum height of 5ft.

Ms. Koplik asks if this would mean it would require a Guard Rail for safety.

Mr. Missey testifies it does not in this location, the property is actually higher than the retaining wall. Fall protection may be required in some sort of fencing at the top based on the Code Official's interpretation.

Ms. Koplik explains what she meant was for the safety of the Pedestrian.

Mr. Missey testifies the Pedestrian would be on the sidewalk within the easement. If there is someone within the woods of the Borough property, and walking toward the road, then yes, fall protection may be appropriate.

Ms. Koplik asks Mr. Missey what type of fall protection he would provide.

Discussion...Code compliant fence 32inches high.

Ms. Koplik continues her questioning. Asks Mr. Missey if any type of consideration has been given to the materials and the design of this fence so that it would be in keeping with the character of the Historic house...will it be a typical metal railing?

Mr. Missey testifies he does not think it would be out of character with the setting there. At that location a metal railing probably would not be appropriate.

Discussion continues.....a Pickett Fence is discussed.

Ms. Koplik has no further questions.

Ms. Beahm (Acting Board Planner) questions the Picket fencing on top of the Retaining wall.

Mr. Missey explains he is not. Where the wall isn't of sufficient height, which is typically 28-30inches, they would have no fencing or fall protection what so ever. If the Code Official in Fair Lawn determines it was a pedestrian route through the expanse of Bamboo (points to Exhibit) shows location, they would place the fencing up there and they would do this at the offset of the project.

Ms. Beahm asks whether or not this picket fence would be visible from the access road...

Mr. Missey testifies yes.

Ms. Beahm recommends a more aesthetic alternative be selectedSuggestions are given.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Milanese (Principal of Barrister Developers LLC) states he would be happy to go with the suggestions of the Town Officials and consult with them on an appropriate fence.

Resident who has been previously sworn interjects to ask what the purpose of the Retaining wall down by the lower end of the property is, by the Naugle house.

Mr. Missey testifies the purpose of this is to allow the roadway to continue down at a mild grade in a pitch that goes from northwest to southeast and the property continues to slope to the north and east so this retaining wall makes up the difference in grade at that location.

Discussion continues....

No further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Mr. Benjamin Lang**
42-00 Cosgrove Court
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Lang refers to the 45ft. from the end of the building to the residential area, and asks if they are planning to leave any mature trees there.

Mr. Missey testifies they are.

Mr. Lang asks will they leave enough of Trees to be able to cover the height of the building so they can't see the building in the Residential area.

Mr. Missey moves to the Landscaping Exhibit Sheet. He testifies they will be leaving many Trees in this vicinity. They will be leaving a 24inch diameter Tree, a 14inch diameter Tree, a 12, a 10, and a 26inch Diameter Tree. In his opinion, he would say yes.

Discussion continues.....

Mr. Missey explains it would depend also on the time of the year. In January, they would see the building because the leaf covers would be off the trees but in the summer, it would not be the case.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Lang asks what impervious coverage means.

Mr. Missey explains impervious coverage means land area that is covered by pavement, concrete or a building.

Mr. Lang would like clarification on how much they are asking to cover with impervious, would it be 47% or 52%?

Mr. Missey testifies it would be 47.3% of the site would be impervious coverage.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Lang refers to the removal of Trees. Asks Mr. Missey what would be the percentage of trees that will be removed.

Mr. Missey does not have a percentage to offer. Explains they have not surveyed the trees in the repairing zone for instance because they can't remove trees in this area...

Discussion continues...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) requests a short recess.

Mr. Newman calls the Meeting back to order.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Gill, Mr. Seibel, Mr. Racenstein, Mr. Pohlman, Mr. Naveh,
Mr. Zharnest, Mr. Lowenstein & Mr. Newman. **Present**

Ms. Felice Koplik (previously sworn) has a question for Mr. Missey. It is in reference to the South retaining wall at the road that crosses the Naugle property and also the north retaining wall. At the last meeting she was concerned about the digging, digging down for the footings, for the wall closest to the Naugle House. Testimony was, it has been moved 2ft. further away.

Ms. Koplik continues...at the last meeting he testified it wouldn't require a footing, but if it is going to be a maximum of 5ft. would it not require a footing because it's going below the frost line?

Mr. Missey (Site Engineer) explains, it does not because they are proposing to use a modular block retaining wall which does not require the footing depth that a reinforced concrete or a rigid wall would.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) notes this has been testified to previously.

Ms. Koplik wasn't sure if it had changed or not. Moves to the next question. She asks what would be the maximum height of the northern wall. What would be the construction of this wall?

Mr. Missey testifies this wall is proposed to be reinforced concrete and the maximum height in the vicinity of the Naugle House will be 1ft at this location (points to Exhibit) and states it is approximately 50ft. away from the Naugle House and as they proceed to the North and West it would be 3ft. in height.

Ms. Koplik states she is thinking of someone who is standing on the path, in the park where currently is hills and vegetation.... Will they now see a concrete wall? How high will this wall be from the lowest grade at the River?

Mr. Missey clarifies the location she is speaking to with Exhibit and testifies he does not believe anyone could see it because of the undergrowth.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Missey explains they cannot clear the undergrowth because it is a repairing zone.

Ms. Koplik notes the Gas men came in a few years ago to clean it up because it is their Easement.

Mr. Missey agrees and explains it continues to be their easement so they cannot clear to the east of their easement nor to the more significant portion, to the west.

Mr. Newman asks Ms. Koplik what her concern is.

Ms. Koplik states her concern is; when in the Park they will see a reinforced concrete wall. They will no longer be able to see the vegetation, the Naugle House. They will see a large concrete wall from the other side of the River.

Mr. Missey testifies this would not be the case. Explains....

Discussion continues...

Ms. Missey testifies you would not be aware of the wall until you get to this point (refers to location on exhibit) of the access driveway.

Ms. Koplik states this would change the character of the site, would this be correct?

Mr. Missey testifies the fact they are proposing anything on the site changes the character of the site...

No further questions from Ms. Koplik.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Larry Koplik**
6 Reading Terrace
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Koplik refers to the wall and asks; given this wall is in the proximity of the Naugle House, could it be treated similarly like the issues with the fence, there cannot be a wall like that looking correct with this environment...

Mr. Missey testifies they have already testified to this...

No further questions from Mr. Koplik.

Mr. Newman swears in: **J. Morgenstern**
42-00 Fox Court
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Morgenstern would like to speak again to the issues of the Trees. His house is up on the North/west corner, Block 70. His testimony earlier was there weren't going to be any trees taken down in that corner. He met with Mr. Milanese months ago and they agreed there would be certain trees taken down right along his property line that present a danger and could fall on his house...he is wondering now if they still plan to remove these trees?

Mr. Missey testifies they will. They have illustrated on the plan with X's the trees proposed for removal and there are several along the property line in these areas, (Points to locations on the Exhibit) and there are dead trees along the northerly portion of the property which will certainly be removed.

Discussion.....

No further questions from Mr. Morgenstern.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Regina Klaatsch**
42-04 Fox Court
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Ms. Klaatsch states she lives to the north of the building and she noticed the other day after they had spoken to Mr. Milanese regarding the trees that will be taken down, there is another one she saw that is slanted and has a vine. What would she have to do to find out if this tree will survive in the long run or if she could have this taken down also?

Mr. Missey testifies what they should do is continue to monitor and certainly cut the vine that is restricting the (inaudible) at this time...

Discussion.

No further questions from Ms. Klaatsch.

Mr. Gary Stern (previously sworn) steps forward and asks Mr. Missey how many trees will actually be left.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) states this has already been testified to. The question was asked and he said he did not have an answer.

Mr. Stern would like to know who would have an answer to this.

Mr. Newman explains Mr. Missey's testimony was he could not come up with a number because there is a portion of the property that is inaccessible and they cannot survey the trees in that portion of the property.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Newman states they have met the requirements of the Tree Ordinance which is very important and have met it as asked.

Mr. Stern asks how they would know if they met the Tree Ordinance if they don't know the number of trees being removed.

Mr. Newman explains it is not necessary information as part of the Tree Ordinance. There is a Tree replacement calculation based on how many they take down.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Stern would like to know how many trees will be taken down. They cannot hear in the back with the poor acoustics here and the microphone.

Mr. Missey reiterates the number of trees would be 97.

Discussion continues....

No further questions.

Mr. Steve Tichnor (previously sworn) steps up to ask another question. He asks Mr. Missey if any of this would require any DEP or EPA Permits. This kind of work next to the River like this?

Mr. Missey testifies he does require a Flood Hazard Area individual permit. He has indicated this in his prior testimony. If and when this Board decides favorably for this Site Plan and use, they would then proceed to make application to the State. They have gone to the State to verify the Flood Hazard Elevation and also the extent of the repairing buffer and any wetlands associated with the River course itself.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Newman states this is all very heavily regulated.

No further questions from Mr. Tichnor.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Pamela Coles**
13-34 George Street
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Ms. Coles asks Mr. Missey if he has heard back from Transco.

Mr. Missey testifies yes.

Ms. Coles asks him to tell them what the end result was.

Mr. Missey testifies the conversations with Transco is; if and when they are successful with the Board in obtaining approval for this site plan and use, they would then go through the process where they would finalize their crossing or outfall and enter into an agreement, a License agreement to cross their Easement, the applicant would be entering into the next stage of the process.

Ms. Coles asks how far down is this Gas Line.

Mr. Missey testifies at the present time Transco has gone to the site, and agreed with the limits of the Easement, located their pipeline and found it was 36inches deep.

Ms. Coles notes, they are planning to put their drainage across the easement 24inches above this...

Mr. Missey testifies no. They would go below this. They have ample opportunity to go below the Pipeline with this kind of depth. We would go underneath the pipeline.

Discussion...

It is determined they would go 5ft. in depth below the surface which would not jeopardize the Gas Line in any point in time. The Transco personal are there and much of the work has to be accomplished by hand digging.

Ms. Coles asks Mr. Missey if there is a massive rain like they had a couple of years ago, and the water backed up, it would not cause any jeopardy for the Gas Line?

Mr. Missey testifies no. Two separate distinct systems.

Ms. Coles moves to her next question. Being this is an R-1-Zone, safety said this is approximately 7500sf?

Mr. Missey replies yes...

Discussion continues.....

Ms. Coles reviews zoning calculations...vs. dwellings.

Discussion...

Mr. Missey defers these questions to the Planner.

No further questions from Ms. Coles.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Robert Berger**
38-39 Fair Lawn Ave
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Berger questions his testimony regarding a Nursery School?

Mr. Missey reiterates a School property to the south and west of this parcel (refers to Exhibit)

Mr. Berger asks how far away this will be from the proposed building.

Mr. Missey does not have an exact measurement because he does not have a survey, but he would guesstimate it would be well over 100ft.

Mr. Berger thought he heard 25ft. was he mistaken?

Mr. Missey clarifies it is 23ft to the property line.

Mr. Berger asks if Mr. Missey is aware the building is residential.

Mr. Missey replies he is not.

Discussion.

Mr. Newman reminds Mr. Berger he is testifying.

Mr. Berger moves to his next question. Questions the noise of the Dumpsters and would he know the decibels?

Mr. Missey does not have a number but the refuse area outside will just be a storage location for refuse which is compacted inside the building and carried out in a containerized manner.

No further questions from Mr. Berger.

Mr. Newman closes this portion of questioning of Mr. Missey.

Mr. Newman asks if there are any questions from the Board Professionals before moving to the next witness. Seeing none,

Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) moves to his next witness.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Mr. Jay Troutman (Applicant's Traffic Engineer)**
105 Elm Street
Westfield, N.J.

Mr. Troutman states he was previously sworn at the June 26th Meeting and certified by Mr. Newman and the Board.

Mr. Huntington notes to Mr. Troutman since his last testimony, he has done some additional studies and additional analysis....

Mr. Troutman concurs and explains. They have been following very closely the plan revisions from a Traffic and Circulation standpoint. All of the changes represent the answers to a lot of the issues that were raised the last time he testified.

Mr. Troutman continues...he explains another analysis that was conducted was a weekend, a Saturday to Sunday weekend analysis to get maximum usage (inaudible) road and also to model the traffic from this site...all of the numbers were lower than the worst case hour they already analyzed and testified to on weekday afternoon peak hours....

Testimony continues....

Mr. Troutman refers to the newly improved changes to the plan. One item they discussed was the circulation down in this loading area (points to location on exhibit) that Mr. Missey reviewed...there is now a turn-around area and they did the Truck circulation plan to show this functions acceptably.

He does not know if there were any other specific items needing to be addressed besides answering questions..

Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) refers to the change in the driveway out on to Century Road, did this alter his conclusions or had he made provisions to this

Mr. Troutman testifies he has always analyzed this property as having full movements from the Dunkerhook spur onto Century Road extension...where all turning movements would be permitted just as the intersection functions today and he always assumed the new driveway into the property would be right in/right out only in his analysis. His analysis does not change when it becomes a right in and right out.

Mr. Huntington asks him if he could reiterate based on the questions from the citizens here, to characterize the proposed building as far as traffic generator goes.

Mr. Troutman testifies it is an extremely low traffic generator. These uses have been counted time and time again by the (inaudible) Computer Transportation Engineers, by Adult housing Agencies and have been independently verified by his office....

Testimony continues...very few residents own vehicles, the ones that do, do not drive them... The Main traffic generated at these sites are employees or at the shift changes and the delivery vehicles which are extremely low.

Mr. Troutman testifies the main truck which would come regularly would be the refuse truck which would be 1-2 times weekly depending on the volume. There is a compacter so it would minimize these visits...

The next main delivery would be Dietary. These trucks would come 2-3 times a week.

All the other vehicles would be UPS type vehicles for linens and nursing, etc..

Mr. Huntington asks Mr. Missey if he is satisfied with all the turning templates for all these types of vehicles on this site.

Mr. Troutman replies yes. He independently verified the maneuvering of the single unit truck Mr. Missey testified to and he can affirm his testimony and his circulation plan.

Mr. Huntington continues his cross, stating the site contemplates two means of ingress and egress, one out through the easement of what is called the Dunkerhook extension. Asks Mr. Troutman to characterize the adequacy of this road for a means of ingress and egress off this site.

Mr. Troutman testifies the road that goes through the easement is 24ft. wide for two way traffic and is more than adequate for the volume this road will carry as well as any delivery vehicles that may use it.

Mr. Huntington asks Mr. Troutman to characterize how much or how little traffic on any day or any given time that will be going in and out of this site.

Mr. Troutman testifies that an average single family home generates 10 vehicles trips per day, this is a 3.5acre site....calculates site would have space for approximately 20 homes, this would be a similar volume of what the site would generate.

Mr. Mark Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer) refers to Mr. Troutman testimony indicating his analyzing of the driveway on Dunkerhook Road, the main driveway to the site as right-in, right out only. Has he had any further discussions with the County regarding this configuration of the driveway?

Mr. Troutman testifies he has not had discussions, but his understanding from the Applicant's discussions are this driveway would be a right in/right out as he had suspected when he testified in June.

Mr. Kataryniak clarifies the intent would be, the left turn egress would be restricted from this driveway...

Mr. Troutman testifies this would be correct.

Mr. Kataryniak asks if he would recommend any modifications to the configuration of this driveway to further restrict...

Mr. Troutman testifies yes. He thinks some kind of mountable curbing, or an island to further mark this as a right in/right out...

Discussion and testimony continues.....

Mr. Kataryniak suggests where the driveway apron flares to 28ft. in width, this striped area could be modified to a curbed island?

Mr. Troutman testifies yes.

Mr. Kataryniak directs his statement to Mr. Newman (Chairman) noting he would concur with this and notes at the June hearing, they did speak to the Site distance for left turns exiting the site at that driveway is substandard with respect to the speed limit along Dunkerhook Road and he recommends that left turns be restricted from this driveway.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Kataryniak refers to the last meeting in June, and notes to Mr. Troutman; with left turns restricted out of the site, some of the traffic would now be diverted to the Dunkerhook extension driveway. Does he have any recommendations regarding any additional measures that should be taken along that roadway from a design standpoint given its proximity to the Naugle House? He is speaking to the stability with trucks at the Naugle House...

Mr. Troutman testifies his recommendations have been implemented into the plan. The sidewalk and the widening of the extension.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Kataryniak questions Mr. Troutman whether he feels there is sufficient separation with the retaining wall and if there could be issues with trucks traveling that close to the Naugle House?

Mr. Troutman testifies no.

Mr. Kataryniak has no further questions.

Mr. Newman asks if there are any questions from Board Members.

Mr. Lowenstein (Board Member) questions Mr. Troutman if there is any provisions or proposal for a bicycle lane?

Mr. Troutman replies; there is not.

Mr. Lowenstein asks Mt. Troutman in his opinion, does he feel there is sufficient room for two cars to pass one another....one entering, one leaving?

Mr. Troutman replies yes.

Mr. Lowenstein continues....is there sufficient room for one car and one truck to pass one another?

Mr. Troutman replies yes.

Mr. Lowenstein asks if there is sufficient room for two trucks.

Mr. Troutman replies yes.

Clarification on what road the questions are referring to...

Mr. Troutman states the width of the Dunkerhook spur is 22ft. but the answers are still the same.

No further questions from Mr. Lowenstein.

Mr. Racenstein (Board Member) questions Mr. Troutman on the egress from the property onto Century Road, is there a left hand turn permitted.

Mr. Troutman testifies there will be no left hand turn permitted.

Discussion....

Mr. Racenstein comments on how high the traffic volume is here. During the weekdays from 4:30 to approximately 6pm, traffic is backed up from Saddle River Road to Paramus Road, even to make a right turn is a struggle...

Mr. Troutman testifies he did study this at this time, the testimony from June regarding the patterns of this use....the peak hours of this use are offset from the roadway at peak hours... Speaks to the Employee shift changes happening at 3pm, before the rush a\happens...even in the 4-6 hours, he was out there, it ebbs and flows. The traffic signal provides those gaps...people move in and out of the Dunkerhook spur...

Mr. Racenstein refers to the trucks and if they will have trailers going into the site.

Mr. Troutman testifies there will be no tractor trailers serving this site.

Mr. Racenstein asks if a Fire Truck would have enough of room to back out.

Mr. Troutman testifies they have full circulation for a Fire Truck.

No further questions from Mr. Racenstein.

Mr. Seibel (Board Member) questions Mr. Troutman on the left hand turn out of the site, clarifies the only way he could make a left hand turn would be to come down the easement and keep going down to Century Road, this would be the only way to make a left hand turn, correct.

Mr. Troutman testifies this would be correct.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Seibel notes theoretically the trucks, if they have to make a left hand turn, they would be coming out of that area?

Mr. Troutman states yes, but reiterates they are talking about 1-2 Refuse trucks and 2-3 Dietary Trucks a week. This is 5 Trucks the whole week....

Mr. Seibel asks if there will be a Laundry Service or will they do their own Laundry.

Mr. Milanese (Principal of Barrister) replies they will do their own laundry.

Discussion.....

Mr. Seibel notes so there will be laundry chemicals and supplies delivered to the building?

Mr. Troutman clarifies and states the other types of trucks would be UPS sized trucks, Linen trucks would be like a UPS truck...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) interjects to ask if it would be unreasonable to restrict truck traffic on that access road and require trucks to exit the site through the other egress and make a right out of the site. This would be the only way they could leave, they could not use the other road...etc.

Discussion....

Mr. Troutman replies he would have to discuss the impact operationally, but it is certainly something worth discussing...

Discussion continues.....

Mr. Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer) comments to Mr. Newman (Chairman) that it would be physically possible because there would be right in/right out access off of Dunkerhook Road alone and it would alleviate the concern of having truck traffic near the Naugle House but it would impact circulation, delivery routes into Paramus. Enforcement always becomes an issue with these types of things too so it may necessitate some type of control structure on that side driveway to physically prevent trucks from using that driveway...maybe a gate or a bar at the top of the driveway near the loading zone to restrict these movements but it would also be subject to the Fire Department's approval.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) suggests to the Board an alternative, which would be to reserve the right for the Police Department to impose this requirement if it turns out to be necessary on construction...it may be they would be misdirecting trucks. The Board could consider a condition that would say; if it is a problem, the Police can impose this.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Rosenberg (Board Attorney) respectively disagrees with Mr. Huntington because they made a Use variancethe issue will become whether or not the Board has the right to invoke reasonable conditions and it will be up to the Board whether or not in the context of the (inaudible) entire application whether it is a reasonable condition...this is his opinion on this.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) notes it may be something they could think about and they could discuss it next time...

Mr. Huntington concurs.

Mr. Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer) has one follow up question with respect to the Food Delivery. He has only seen the trucks turning templates so far from the Exhibits presented, he has not seen them in Plan form yet, but was a Tractor Trailer run on this site at all?

Mr. Troutman testifies no.

Mr. Kataryniak asks Mr. Troutman what information he has to substantiate or back up the fact that Tractor Trailers would not be used for the food service here.

Mr. Troutman testifies the Applicant can control the food deliveries. They are routinely delivered by SU's...he did check a WB50 on the site, it will work but would not be recommended...

Discussion & Testimony continues...

Mr. Kataryniak asks if the applicant would be willing to a restriction on Tractor Trailer deliveries onsite, even recognizing it may mean a slightly higher frequency of deliveries with vehicles...would he be agreeable to a restriction it would be single unit trucks only.

Mr. Milanese (Principal of Barrister) agrees to this.

No further questions from Mr. Kataryniak.

Mr. Seibel (Board Member) would like to know why they will not allow a left hand turn out of the front.

Mr. Troutman explains in his opinion and he believes this is how the County feels, is that the site distance to judge a gap for a left turn maneuver, which takes more judgment is much better at this location...(refers to exhibit)

Discussion...

Mr. Seibel notes this is a very hard thing to do, to make a left hand turn. His concern is when a truck is coming in to make a delivery & goes to leave...explains. There are kids on bicycles, hikers and walkers, this is a recreation area going down this road and it is narrow. It is not the safest cart way in Bergen County.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Troutman notes this and this is why the sidewalk system will be completed. Right now the sidewalk puts pedestrians right into the cart way. This is why the cart way will be widen at least 2ft. if not more...

Mr. Seibel questions the times and shifts of the employees.

Mr. Troutman testifies the Employees will come off at 3pm/ 11pm and 7am.

Discussion continues....Total number of employees for each shift is questioned.

Mr. Troutman testifies he does not have the total number of employees for each shift, but the Planner does have them.

Mr. Seibel questions the 11pm shift. How many employees would be coming off at 11pm?

Mr. Troutman testifies the 3-11 shift will have/8-10 employees for 123 beds.

No further questions from Mr. Seibel.

Mr. Newman asks if there are any other questions from Board Members.

Mr. Pohlman (Board Member) asks Mr. Troutman if there was any consideration for a signal system by the Century Road extension where Dunkerhook Road exits...a traffic signal of some sort.

Mr. Troutman explains it would not meet the requirements for a signal, the volumes are so low.

No further questions.

Mr. Newman asks if the Board Professionals have any further questions. Seeing none,

Mr. Newman opens to Residents living within 200ft. for questions for Mr. Troutman but before doing so, he would like again to set the tone for this evening. This is a time for questions only of the witness based on the testimony the witness has provided. He understands how frustrating it is for a resident who has a lot of questions and concerns about different things and waiting for multiple things to come up and it has yet to come up. This is usually because the appropriate witness has yet to take the stand. He cannot allow their frustrations to affect the proceedings in a way that is unfair to the Applicant and to the Board. The proceedings have a certain order in which they are carried and he respectfully asks the residents to be respectful of this order. They will have an opportunity at the end to make public comments of any type. He will no longer continue to give the latitude he has been giving to the questioning where he has been sitting and waiting for them to stop disguising statements as questions, he will not continue to do this. If they have valid questions, and there have been plenty tonight and he respects this and thanks the residents, but those of you who have come up here & try to lead the witness by stating facts with a question mark after them are no longer going to be able to do so. If you have a questions, please feel free to ask them, if you don't, do not come to the Podium and try to disguise statements as questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Shelley Wittenberg**
15-09 Saddle River Road
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Ms. Wittenberg asks Mr. Troutman if he had done his traffic study at all at 7am in the morning when there is a lot of traffic down at this intersection and down onto Century Road with their employees coming and going? What was his findings?

Mr. Troutman states his findings were as testified to in June. Level of service A (inaudible) B under existing conditions, Level of service C in the future, adequate capacity. The reason being, there is extremely low turning movements in the morning of the park and this use is an extremely low generator as well....

Discussion continues...

Ms. Wittenberg asks if they have taken into consideration the citizens that will require additional care other than the staff that is already employed at the facility. For example, Home care workers or Supply trucks bringing Oxygen or Medical Supplies. Have they considered any of this?

Mr. Troutman replies he considered all of the traffic the facility will generate...employees, visitors, deliveries, all have been considered.

Ms. Wittenberg asks if there will be an overflow of parking onto side streets if there is not sufficient parking?

Mr. Troutman states there is sufficient parking and he testified to this in June.

Ms. Wittenberg notes she was not here in June.

Ms. Wittenberg has no further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Jay Morgenstern**
42-00 Fox Court
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Morgenstern asks Mr. Troutman if he did a Traffic Study during the hours of 9am and 5pm. On weekdays, more employees at an Assisted Living would work these traditional working hours than the ones who are more of a Medical Staffer that would work a 7-3pm shift.

Mr. Troutman testifies this is a statement that is not really true. The main shift is the hours he described. 7-3pm and 3-11pm and 11-7am.

Mr. Newman interjects to state he thinks the question is; has he done studies at 9am-5pm?

Mr. Troutman testifies he studied this area an entire weekday...

Discussion...

Mr. Newman stops Mr. Morgenstern to remind him he is testifying.

Mr. Morgenstern has a question regarding parking. He believes there will be 62 parking spaces. Have any been designated for the handicap or employees of the facility who would want their own parking space?

Mr. Troutman testifies there are no designated spaces on the plan except for the ADA requirement.

Mr. Morgenstern asks if any will be dedicated for Residents.

Mr. Troutman testifies there will be none dedicated to residents.

Mr. Morgenstern has no further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Brenda Kaplan**
15-27 Landzettel Way
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Ms. Kaplan asks what month he studied the traffic he described just now.

Mr. Troutman replies April & July.

Ms. Kaplan asks Mr. Troutman if Bergen Community College is in session in July.

Mr. Troutman testifies the July study was on Saturday, but Bergen County College was in session in April.

Ms. Kaplan asks if he recently had an opportunity to study this intersection of Saddle River Road,/Century & Fair Lawn Avenue.

Mr. Troutman testifies he has been monitoring it since they started the application. He is in Bergen County quite often and it has been basically the same condition from the day he looked at the site.

Discussion.....Ms. Kaplan asks Mr. Troutman is it his opinion then that the traffic when Bergen Community College is in session is equal to the traffic during the summer months when no schools are in session.

Mr. Troutman testifies no, it certainly would be different, Paramus Road will be the main impact, But here (points to exhibit and shows location) he took counts while in session just to be safe.

Discussion....

Mr. Troutman reiterates the additional volume would be undetectable at the intersection.

Ms. Kaplan moves to her next question. Given that most Nursing facilities/Assisted Living facilities have parties for birthdays, Mother's Day, Father's Day, Christmas, etc...what kind of influx and visitors does he anticipate on these days?

Mr. Troutman replies; sadly to say, there really is no significant peak that occurs. He has done observations on Mother's Day and it is extremely spread out...

Discussion continues...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) interjects to ask a question. Mother's Day is a Sunday, Christmas, everything is closed, Holidays such as this, is the traffic comparable to when the studies were done?

Mr. Troutman testifies the roadway traffic, this is the lowest day of the week.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Troutman testifies there will be no capacity issue at all.

Ms. Kaplan has one question regarding snow. Where do they propose the snow will be removed when we do get our snow? Where of the 62 parking spots that are available, where will the snow go?

Mr. Troutman testifies he will leave that to the Professionals, this is not his study.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Troutman notes this site has an overabundance of spaces, so they will know they will be using 30, not 62. In this case, if they needed to take a spot or two for snow, it will not be a problem.

Ms. Kaplan refers to the width of the road being 24ft. It will be reduced...what does he anticipate in terms of the width of the road?

Mr. Troutman testifies he would anticipate it will be 24ft. They will plow right up to the curb for the main ingress and egress...A site like this, they would need to keep it clear.

Ms. Kaplan has no further questions.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) asks Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) if it would be reasonable to ask for them to provide the Board with a Snow Removal Plan based on the questions that were just raised, in addition to the sensitive environmental impact at the repairing zone. We do not want snow being dumped just anywhere. Perhaps it would make sense to make it part of this application.

Mr. Huntington concurs and notes they cannot plan for 8ft. of snow...

Mr. Newman replies no, but with whatever reasonable Snow removal plan consists of.

Mr. Huntington agrees.

Mr. Seibel (Board Member) asks how it will affect the road going down to the park.

Discussion...

Mr. Newman notes it is a County Road so he would think the County...

Mr. Azzolina (Board Engineer) notes, typically the County asks the Municipality take care of the County roads that are in their zone...most times it would be done by the Borough.

Discussion.....

Mr. Newman asks Mr. Huntington to please consult with the Borough Officials and we will have this in the Plan as to who will plow this extension.

Mr. Huntington states yes.

Ms. Jennifer Beahm (Acting Board Planner) asks Mr. Troutman if the Residents need to go to the store, the Doctor's, will the residence be taking them in a Van, a Bus..

Mr. Milanese (Principal of Barrister) replies a Van...

No further questions.

Mr. Paul Wittenberg steps forward. (Previously sworn)
15-09 Saddle River Road
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Mr. Wittenberg asks if there is any reason why the current property could not be developed for the current zoning...for traffic reasons. Can they put houses?

Discussion...

Mr. Newman notes there is no answer to the question...it does not make sense.

Mr. Wittenberg notes it makes sense to him.

Mr. Wittenberg moves to his next question. Were the Traffic Studies done prior to the "No turn on Red" at the corner of Saddle River Road and Fair Lawn Avenue or after?

Mr. Troutman reiterates they were done in April & July of 2014.

Mr. Wittenberg comments he does not know when the signage was put in so he does not know the specifics...but there is “no turn on red” at the corner where the light is. Would this impact his Traffic studies?

Mr. Troutman testifies no.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Wittenberg continues...he refers to Mr. Troutman’s prior testimony. He did a traffic study at the bank...when this was done, he believes there were supposed to be turn signals done for the Bank, and does he recall this?

Mr. Troutman does not recall. It was over 10 years ago.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) interjects to state this is not part of this application.

Mr. Wittenberg has no further questions.

Mr. Newman asks if there are any more questions from residents within 200ft.

Mr. Simon Fridman steps forward...

Mr. Fridman asks Mr. Troutman how many employees were considered for traffic purposes between 3pm & 7am shifts.

Mr. Troutman replies they already had testimony on the number of employees at the beginning of the application...the 7-3pm shift is 18-20 Employees/the 3-11pm shift is 8-10 employees and the 11pm to 7am is 3-5 employees.

Mr. Fridman asks where these numbers come from.

Mr. Troutman replies he believes they are coming from the Architect who testified on this.

No further questions from Mr. Fridman.

Mr. Newman asks if there are any other questions from Resident’s living within 200ft. Seeing none,

Mr. Newman closes this portion.

Mr. Newman opens to the **General Public** for questions.

Mr. Robert Moss steps forward.

Mr. Moss clarifies with Mr. Troutman his testimony in reference to the traffic generated from an average 1 family home. Did he say it was 10 vehicles trips per day?

Mr. Troutman testifies yes. That would be the average daily trips. Anytime you enter is one trip and exiting is another trip.

Mr. Moss asks Mr. Troutman about the discussion regarding bicycles and the sidewalk on Dunkerhook Road. Did he intend for the sidewalk to be a solution for bicycles?

Mr. Troutman testifies no. He was speaking to Pedestrians. There was mention about pedestrians..

No further questions from Mr. Moss.

Mr. Eric Bauer steps forward.

Mr. Bauer states Mr. Troutman's testimony was this building would have extremely low traffic generation. Being the building is yet to exist, what does he base this opinion upon?

Mr. Troutman testifies with hundreds and hundreds of observations of these types of facilities.

Mr. Bauer asks how he characterizes the proposed facility in terms of its use.

Mr. Troutman replies it is noted as an Assisted Living Facility.

Discussion continues....

Mr. Troutman states he has done his studies in other parts of New Jersey. He did not do any in the Fair Lawn area. They all come back with the same numbers...The Institute of Transportation Engineers studies them throughout the Country, there are senior housing groups that do studies throughout the Country...they all have the same patterns and all operate the same...

Discussion continues...

Mr. Bauer asks Mr. Troutman if he himself have done any traffic studies on an Assisted Living Facility in Northern N.J.

Mr. Troutman testifies he probably has, he cannot remember off the top of his head but yes, he believes he has. He has done studies in the Somerset County area...names the Bridgewater Facility in Bridgewater and also in Hillsborough...

Mr. Bauer asks what are the primary studies done that he is relying on.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) interjects to say it has been answered already...

Discussion continues....

Mr. Troutman testifies the Institute of Transportation Engineers publishes data on all types of

Commercial and residential land uses. They have a whole book called Trip Generations...

Mr. Newman (Chairman) asks Mr. Bauer what he is trying to ascertain here.

Mr. Bauer replies he wants to understand the basis for this Traffic Engineer's opinion.

Discussion....

Mr. Newman explains to Mr. Bauer, Mr. Troutman has been qualified and certified and the Board has accepted him as an Expert witness in Traffic Engineering. He has all the appropriate credentials. He has used all the appropriate references and measures and his reports have been reviewed by our Board Traffic Engineer who we hold in the highest regard and it sounds like he is trying to discredit the witness.

Mr. Bauer asks Mr. Newman if he is saying he cannot ask questions to discredit this witness.

Mr. Newman replies if you are trying to discredit him, no.

Mr. Bauer states in this case, he will refrain from any such questions but will object to this type of limitation of the proceedings.

Mr. Bauer moves to his next question. Asks Mr. Troutman if he would know if there are age limitations that would allow to be residents.

Mr. Troutman testifies no.

Mr. Bauer continues...what is his expectation as to the number of visitors per day at this 123 bed facility would have?

Mr. Troutman replies; a handful. 0-5

Mr. Bauer asks if the residents will be allowed to have their own cars.

Mr. Troutman replies yes. The typical pattern is they do not own vehicles...

Discussion continues....

Mr. Bauer comments this is an important opportunity to clarify and confront this witness for the basis of his opinion. I just would like to say this because of the limitation the Board Chair has imposed on the line of questioning.

Mr. Bauer has no further questions.

Mr. Newman calls for a 5minute Recess.

Mr. Newman reopens the hearing.

**ROLL CALL: Mr. Gil, Mr. Seibel, Mr. Racenstein, Mr. Pohlman, Mr. Naveh,
Mr. Lowenstein & Mr. Newman, Present.**

Mr. Newman reopens to the General Public for questions.

Steve Tichenor steps forward. (Previously sworn)

Mr. Tichenor just had a question. Testimony states that two trucks can pass each other but does he think Dunkerhook is wide enough to have 2 trucks pass each other and a kid riding a bicycle down the side?

Mr. Troutman testifies if there is a kid on a bicycle, the truck in the lane would probably yield that situation. This has been his experience.

Mr. Tichenor has no further questions.

Mr. Newman swears in: Kevin Gunn
354 Maple Avenue
Oradell, N.J.

Mr. Gunn just has a question in regards to truck traffic as well. He mentioned the Garbage Trucks would be going through once a week...Mr. Troutman clarifies once or 2x weekly.

Mr. Gunn would like to know about the Food Service Trucks. How often would then run?

Mr. Troutman estimates 2-3 times per week.

Mr. Gunn questions services such as Access-Link, with their vehicles to take residents in and out?

Mr. Troutman replies he does not think they even know this yet. They are not at that point in the operation.

Mr. Gunn questions other types of trucks, Fed-X/Postal trucks, UPS...Landscaping trucks, Snow removal/Plows, etc... if these vehicles are all passing the Naugle House, are there any studies or information regarding these large vehicles, what impact would they have on the integrity of the Naugle House due to the fragile 18th Century structure? Would it have any impact on the home with these large trucks going by so frequently?

Mr. Troutman testifies he does not have any studies on this. It may not necessarily be the case because it is not the only way in and out.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) interjects to offer some information. Directs his question to Mr. Azzolina (Board Engineer) and clarifies he stated the Borough plows this road.

Mr. Azzolina replies he believes they do.

Mr. Newman asks does he have any idea how much those trucks weigh?

Discussion..

Mr. Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer) states it could weigh upwards of 20,000pds.

Discussion....

Mr. Newman explains it is one of the heavier vehicles and it is something they have been doing for a number of years with no damage that we know of to the Naugle House, so it seems like the road as it exists now supports a significant truck weight.

Discussion continues....

No further questions from Mr. Gunn.

Mr. Mark Colyer (Previously sworn) steps forward.

Mr. Colyer refers to Mr. Missey's testimony regarding the trucks that are going to be using this facility are 20ft. wide and 30ft. long.

Mr. Troutman clarifies a 20ft. wheel base and 30ft. long and are 7-8ft. wide.

Mr. Colyer refers to Mr. Lowenstein's question. Two trucks can pass the Dunkerhook spur? With only a foot or two, they are going to be able to pass? They won't smack mirrors?

Mr. Troutman testifies no, they will not. He explains all these lanes and all these cart ways are equivalent to lanes that are on highways where two trucks pass each other every day...

Discussion continues....

Mr. Colyer states he was under the understanding the Dunkerhook Spur is substandard, it's narrower than normal?

Mr. Troutman testifies it is not substandard for the volume it carries. It fits right in to the characteristics based on volume situations....the recommended cart way for this volume of traffic is 18-20ft. and it is 22ft.

Mr. Colyer clarifies it is proposed to be 22ft. It is 20ft. now, correct?

Mr. Troutman replies he is correct. It is proposed to be 22ft.

No further questions from Mr. Colyer.

Ruth Weissman steps forward. (Previously sworn)

Ms. Weissman would like to question the safety precaution they will take for this Dunkerhook Spur for kids who go down with bicycles. Coming back from the Park is uphill and she understands there will be a retaining wall. What visibility will the trucks have? She is especially concerned with the weekend traffic where there will be visitors....a car coming down from the driveway into this hill where there may be children on bicycles...

Mr. Troutman explains the safety precautions really are the widening of the road and the provision of the sidewalks. The volume characteristics will not significantly change so everything described happens today with cars going in and out, so if you add another car every 10 minutes, it does not change it, it would just be safer with the design they are proposing.

Ms. Weissman questions his statistics. There are about 10 parking spaces in the parking lot for the park access. She would think on a Saturday she would expect more than 10 visitors at 3pm coming out possibly from this facility. When you go with a Bicycle and go uphill, there is a concern that a truck will not see them...

Mr. Troutman replies he has tried to answer this the best he could. He can testify as a Professional Engineer with 27 years' experience that based on the volumes and what he has observed because he has seen all that she is describing, it will be safe.

Discussion continues.....

Ms. Weissman refers to Saturdays...

Mr. Troutman reviews his numbers at Peak hours on a Saturday..

Ms. Weissman asks if it would be possible not to have any heavy vehicle on the weekend on this small road.

Discussion continues....

Ms. Weissman asks if there can be Stop Signs. Signs to warn of Bicycles.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) asks Mr. Troutman if he has any suggestions for Bicycle circulation.

Mr. Troutman (Applicant's Traffic Engineer) suggests they could do a yellow warning sign to advise of the activity.

Discussion continues...

Mr. Newman asks the Board Traffic Professional if he has any suggestions.

Mr. Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer) states; given the restriction of the roadway, he thinks it would make sense to provide a bicycle lane, the volumes would not necessarily warrant it. He thinks signage would be appropriate for Bicycle and Pedestrian activity along that area.

Mr. Newman asks if this would increase the safety by doing so.

Mr. Kataryniak testifies he thinks it would. If they look at the residents that use the Park, know the park is there. The Park is not necessarily visible as an entrance by Dunkerhook Road, so by placing the signage there to indicate it is a Recreational area would be appropriate.

Mr. Newman defers to Mr. Huntington (Applicant's Attorney) and asks if they would be willing to work with Mr. Kataryniak's office to provide this type of signage.

Mr. Huntington replies, yes.

Mr. Newman swears in: **Anne Goldberg**
39-25 Knott Terrace
Fair Lawn, N.J.

Ms. Goldberg's question has to do with when someone is coming out of the facility and need to go to the left towards Paramus Road and Midland Avenue, is it correct they would have to make a right turn and somehow turn around to get back that way?

Mr. Troutman explains they could make a left out of the Dunkerhook Spur.

Discussion.

Ms. Goldberg understands but questions if it would create more traffic in that area.

Mr. Troutman testifies yes, this is what he analyzed in his study. He put all the left turns on that spur and analyzed the capacity to be sure there was room to do this.

Ms. Goldberg has no further questions.

Benjamin Lang steps forward (Previously sworn)

Mr. Lang asks who is responsible for putting Traffic Signs on their property. Would that be his or the Town?

Mr. Troutman testifies Traffic Signs for the property will typically be done during the design phase shown on the Site Plan, verified by the Town and installed by their Contractors. Is this what he is asking?

Mr. Lang asks if they will have a Speed Limit Sign on the property.

Mr. Troutman testifies there are no Speed Limit signs proposed.

Mr. Lang asks if there will be any Stop Signs leaving the property.

Mr. Troutman believes there are. He would have to double check, but he believes there are.

Mr. Lang also questions if there will be “Right only signs when leaving the property onto Century.

Mr. Lang asks if the 28ft. egress, will be shaped into such a form so only a right turn could be made because a car or a truck coming east bound wanting to get into the property might want to cross the double line which is there right now and go straight into the property if it were a perpendicular street but if the street was curved in such a way that it could not get in, they wouldn't need a sign to say “No Left” because it would be a deterrent.

Mr. Troutman testifies this would be correct and that is what the County requires us to do and that is what the Board's Expert recommended. They will be doing something like this.

Mr. Lang questions if on the Dunkerhook Spur, if a line can be painted on the street to show it as a two way street, maybe a center line? Maybe a straight line and only brake where it turns left onto the easement?

Mr. Troutman states it could be, it's not their road.

Mr. Lang asks whose responsibility would it be, the Town's?

Mr. Troutman replies it would be the County.

Mr. Lang states if anyone is listening, this would be a recommendation.

Mr. Lang has no further questions.

Mr. Kataryniak (Board Traffic Professional) just has one question on the signage. Will the Applicant be willing to apply for Title 39 Status on the site?

Mr. Troutman testifies yes.

Mr. Kataryniak explains this would allow Police Enforcement of Traffic Regulations on the property.

Mr. Newman states he will close the portion for questions at 10:15PM.

Simon Fridman steps forward.

Mr. Fridman asks what a yellow continuous line signifies in terms of traffic.

Mr. Troutman explains it signifies opposing flows of traffic. No passing.

Mr. Fridman asks if one can cross the yellow line.

Mr. Troutman explains to make a turn, yes.

No further questions from Mr. Fridman.

Pamela Coles steps forward. (Previously sworn)

Ms. Coles refers to the number of employees. From 7am to 3pm, there are 18-20 Employees. From 3-11pm shift is 8-10 employees and the 11-7am shift is 3-5. Does this include all the Laundry Service Personnel, Cleaning service Personnel and Kitchen Personnel and Medical needs Personnel?

Mr. Troutman replies yes.

Ms. Coles states she is having a tough time doing the math. For servicing the people who will be residents of the facility. If there is an Emergency and there are 3-5 personnel people on Staff, this means they will need assistance and the rest of the 123 beds will be left unattended?

Mr. Troutman defers this to the Planner.

Ms. Coles next question refers to the number of Employees. A minimum of 29 total employees per day and a maximum of 35 employees a day. Will this equate to a minimum of 70 turns per day, not including lunch or dinner? When he stated one home equals 10 trips per day in and out, it's the equivalent of 29.5 homes or residents. Will it equate to 295 trips per day. She is not sure if the gap is too wide for her....she is not sure which one to reference.

Mr. Troutman testifies the statement was; the daily traffic on this use with all the employees is about the same as the number of homes this acreage could hold.

Discussion continues.....

Ms. Coles clarifies the numbers and has no further questions.

Kevin Gunn steps forward (Previously sworn)

Mr. Gunn asks if there were any studies done as to the likelihood or if it can be done, projected, the number of people who are exiting. Will they be making left turns or right turns? Will most people be going towards Paramus or west towards Paterson?

Mr. Troutman testifies it actually is an even split because both directions can take you to a lot of places and a lot of highways and a lot of population densities.

No further questions from Mr. Gunn.

Felice Koplik steps forward. (Previously sworn)

Ms. Koplik was just wondering have any inquiries or any discussions were done with the County in regards to putting a light at one of these intersections, either at the Dunkerhook Spur or the new road?

Mr. Troutman testifies the County cannot put a (inaudible) on because the traffic volumes do not warrant it. They have to have a certain amount of turns in and out and these don't come close. There is no discussion to have because it is based on numbers.

Discussion continues...it is based on the exiting volumes and the site volumes.

Ms. Koplik asks if the County has expressed any concern about the traffic volume.

Mr. Troutman testifies yes, the County wants a right in/right out driveway on Century and Dunkerhook will continue as a full movement access as it exists today.

Ms. Koplik has no further questions.

Mr. Newman (Chairman) closes this portion of questioning from the General Public of Mr. Troutman.

Mr. Newman asks Mr. Kataryniak (Board Traffic Engineer) if he has any further questions of Mr. Troutman.

Mr. Kataryniak does not have any questions.

Mr. Newman asks Mr. Huntington the date for the next hearing they have scheduled.

Ms. Peck (Assistant Zoning Officer) notes it is December 18, 2014

Mr. Newman asks Mr. Huntington to re-notice for December 18th, 2014

Clarification on date...Mr. Milanese is not able to make this date. Some confusion to the date.

Mr. Newman states they will have to re-notice regardless...notice to residents living within 200ft. will be noticed again and the appropriate notice will be in the paper.

Resident comes forward to ask how many more witnesses will there be.

Mr. Huntington states it will be one more, the Professional Planner.

Mr. Newman asks for a motion to adjourn.

Adjourn:

Mr. Racenstein makes a motion to adjourn and Mr. Pohlman seconded the motion.

All Present: AYE

Time: 11:p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy F. Bozza
Zoning Board Clerk