

**BOROUGH OF FAIR LAWN**  
**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
**Special Meeting**  
**of August 7, 2007**

Following are the minutes of the Fair Lawn Zoning Board of Adjustment's special meeting held on **Tuesday, August 7, 2007**.

Chairman Scott Levy called the special meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and declared that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law.

Roll Call: Present were: Mr. Karas, Mr. Sacchinelli, Mr. Diner, Mr. Meer, Mr. Blecher and Mr. Levy.

Absent were: Mr. Salerno, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel and Mr. Charipper (Mr. Salerno is participating in "National Night Out Against Crime" Ms. Spindel recused herself, Mr. Newman is on vacation and Mr. Nakashian is ill).

Mr. Charipper arrived at 7:25 p.m.

Also in attendance were William Soukas, Board Attorney; Cheryl Bergailo, Board Planner; Mark Kataryniak, Traffic Engineer; Paul Azzolina, Board Engineer; Ann Peck, Assistant Zoning Officer; Karen Kocsis, Court Reporter; and Carol LoPiccolo, Zoning Board Clerk.

**Commercial Old Business:**

1. Application #2006-038, 37-10 Broadway, LLC (Zap Lube)  
37-02/37-10 Broadway, Block 2201, Lot 2, Zone B-2  
The placement of a billboard sign on the property located at 37-01 through 37-10 Broadway. The billboard requires a use variance as the service is provided at another location RGO Section 125-57(d)(1), 125-41.F(8) and 125-41B(4)(b).

Ronald Mondello [attorney for the applicant] came forward. Mr. Mondello stated that at the last meeting Mr. Fox gave testimony, but in regards to Mr. Kataryniak's comments, Mr. Fox made some revisions to the site plan based on Mr. Kataryniak's report of 7/9/07. Mr. Kataryniak submitted a recent report of 8/6/07 in response to the revised plans.

Mr. Fox stated that they have added some landscaping and fencing to provide a better buffer between the property and the residents. Lighting has also been added with shielding. Any building lighting would be faced downward. These changes have been made according to meetings that have been held with the residents. A landscaping and lighting plan has been submitted as part of the revised plan. The circulation of the property has been revised. Currently the plan shows the lane specification as to where the cars would be located.

Mr. Mondello stated that cars can no longer enter or exit from Yerger Road. Mr. Fox stated that the Fire Dept. wants to maintain access from Yerger Road.

Mr. Karas asked where is the drop curb on Yerger Road in response to the Fire Dept. Mr. Fox referred to the site plan and indicated where the drop curb is located. Mr. Fox stated that it is possible to leave one of the drop curbs from Yerger Road, but there would still be one directional of traffic. Mr. Karas asked if the drop curbs are necessary based on the comments of the Fire Dept. Mr. Fox responded yes.

Mr. Levy opened the meeting to the public. Dennis Cummins, attorney for Broadway Improvement Corp. came forward. Mr. Cummins had concerns over cars coming out of the car wash and referred to Exhibit O-1 and has a concern over safety. Mr. Mondello responded that the cars in the Right of Way [ROW] would not occur in the future. Mr. Cummings felt that sometimes the car bumper would be out into the roadway and is a concern of safety. Mr. Fox stated a painted stop bar could be put before the sidewalk. Mr. Cummins asked if an employee drives the car out or the customer. Mr. Moshe Winer, principle of 37-10 Broadway, LLC came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Winer stated that the employee takes the car out of the building. Mr. Cummins asked if the stop bar would apply to the employee. Mr. Mondello stated that Mr. Winer will instruct his employees not to park in the ROW.

Mr. Karas referred to the Birdsall Report of 8/6/07, page 2, Item C2 indicates that the changes on the traffic flow requires a permit from NJDOT. Mr. Mondello stated that the traffic expert will testify to that and will not be a problem. Mr. Karas stated if everything is subject to NJDOT, then this whole application may be for nothing.

Ms. Suzanne DiGeronimo, architect and planner, asked if this is a combining of 2 properties, regarding traffic flow, why isn't this a reverse subdivision. Mr. Mondello stated that it is not necessary.

Mr. Levy closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. John Rea, professional traffic engineer for the applicant came forward at this time. Mr. Rea assisted Mr. Fox in the plans submitted. Mr. Rea felt the plans provide for a safe flow of traffic and has maximized the number of traffic spots. On Lot 3 the access is from Yerger Road. Lot 2 the access is from Broadway with vehicles entering from either way. The plan does not show egress to Yerger Road. The drop curb recommended by the Fire Dept., would also benefit from the drop curb for traffic to exit that way and angled in a way so that traffic from Yerger Road could not enter the site. With the exit traffic from the site to Yerger Road, it would allow the traffic to proceed to Broadway traveling west and would eliminate traffic traversing through the neighborhood to accomplish this.

Mr. Karas asked if the cars could make a left out of the site onto Yerger Road. Mr. Rea responded no. They would only be able to make a right turn.

Mr. Mondello asked if the signs make the site safer for traffic traveling down Broadway. Mr. Rea stated that with working with BIC, it was determined that there is too much signage and it needs to be cleaned up. The new sign would say entrance 100' ahead and will provide for safe signage and would clean up the site.

Mr. Mondello referred to 4F and is a result of recommendations of BIC. The sign has been redesigned based on comments and some of the length has been reduced and it has been made wider and is a safer sign that what was originally proposed. Mr. Rea agreed and that the sign indicates where the entrance would be which is 100' ahead. **Exhibit A-4** was marked as the drawing of 4F3. Mr. Rea felt that the proposed sign makes the site safer for motorists indicating where the entrance is. Mr. Mondello asked if the applicant could adhere to the Borough Ordinance for the size dimensions. Mr. Rea stated that would be extremely difficult due to the speed of traffic traveling on Broadway and the sign needs to be reasonably sized.

Mr. Levy asked if the size proposed is for all the signs. Mr. Rea stated yes.

Mr. Mondello stated that most motorists do not see the car wash until it is too late and enter through the exit. Mr. Rea stated that the building on the corner does block the car wash and felt the proposed signs help direct the traffic.

Mr. Rea stated that the curbs would remain in the current configuration between Lots 2 and 3 and does not create additional traffic in trips generated and a Letter of No Interest would be filed with NJDOT and would not be a problem receiving approval.

Mr. Kataryniak agreed with Mr. Rea and the NJDOT would review that proposal and allows for businesses to make minor changes. Mr. Kataryniak referred to the Yerger Road exit and is in favor of an egress only driveway onto Yerger Road. Because the parking serves some of the business on Lot 3. It must be designed in such a way so it does not encourage an entrance from Yerger Road and one of the concerns with respect to the driveway from Yerger Road as it currently exists relative to the ramp which could encourage the traffic to enter the site from that location. With respect to Item C4 of Mr. Kataryniak's report, this is a combination issue between planning and traffic and would require an additional permit from NJDOT due to the commingling of the lots. Mr. Mondello stated the applicant has no problem with a cross easement.

Mr. Kataryniak referred to S1 in Exhibit A-1 it shows a layout of the proposed signage, the pylon sign would be modified. Mr. Mondello stated that sign 5A and 2U may be repetitive and the applicant is open to recommendations. Mr. Levy asked if 5A is changing. Mr. Mondello stated no and it is there now.

Mr. Kataryniak referred to the parking circulation comments and recommends some do not enter signs and stop guards and proper signage should be provided to indicate the different uses that are offered by the car wash. The revised site plan that show channelizing islands and is not clear on the plan whether it is striping or curbing. Mr. Fox stated the existing site does not have any curbing on the site and does not want to add it, but would add striping to indicate circulation patterns. Mr. Fox indicated that curbs could be added between the bay and the back of the office. Mr. Kataryniak felt that in the areas where there is drive aisles, curbing is appropriate to separate between the aisles and parking. Mr. Levy agreed with Mr. Kataryniak. Mr. Kataryniak felt that would organize the traffic flow on the site. Mr. Kataryniak referred to the westerly side of the office and the area between the handicapped stall and the ROW, the testimony of the applicant indicated that the employees drive the cars out of the oil change area. Mr. Winer stated that an attendant drives the car out of the bay area when the job is done. Mr. Kataryniak stated that the customer parks in the parking space and is parked back there upon exiting of the bay. That would require a clockwise traffic circulation pattern out of the bay area and provide the appropriate signage. Mr. Rea agreed with Mr. Kataryniak and will provide a circulation plan and will provide additional signage and striping and this is in regards to the service bay only and not the car wash area. Mr. Rea stated the car wash area could only make a right turn only onto Broadway. The lubrication facility discharges a vehicle every 15 minutes, where the car wash discharges a vehicle every 30 seconds. Mr. Kataryniak agreed with Mr. Rea and that the discharge from the bay is further setback and could accommodate the turning safely. Mr. Rea stated the attendant would move the car out of the bay and back into a parking spot.

Mr. Kataryniak referred to his report of 8/6/07 and Mr. Mondello stated the applicant agrees with all remaining comments in the report.

Mr. Levy asked what the bays are used for. Mr. Winer stated it is used for detailing.

Mr. Kataryniak referred to Mr. Bender's report. Mr. Mondello stated he would contact Mr. Bender that egress only should be recommended as per the Board's and applicant's professionals, and not ingress and egress as Mr. Bender has recommended.

Mr. Levy asked if the Broadway building would still have residential uses there. Mr. Winer responded yes and there are 7 apartments and 4 stores. Mr. Rea stated that most of the parking spaces during the week are vacated when people go to work. The store is not open before 9 a.m. and the residents return home 4-6 p.m. and there will be some commercial activity on the site at that time, and would have to find a parking spot, but would not create any safety issues. Mr. Levy asked if any spots are indicated for residential parking. Mr. Mondello responded no. Mr. Levy asked what happens when there is a conflict between the business

and the residential use. Mr. Mondello stated that none of the spaces are reserved for the residents now. Mr. Kataryniak asked how many spaces are proposed. Mr. Fox stated that the existing parking is 21 spaces and 23 spaces are proposed. There is an increase in 2 spaces.

Mr. Sacchinelli asked if there is a minimum turning radius needed between spaces 32 & 33 and thought a larger vehicle could not make the turn. Mr. Kataryniak stated the applicant is going to have to look at the turning radius and curbing may have to be installed along the sidewalk. Mr. Winer stated the bays are drive through and if the car is very large, the attendant can also back the vehicle out as opposed to going out toward the sidewalk. Mr. Sacchinelli felt that a vehicle coming out of the bay could not make a left hand turn with the handicapped spot there, without crossing onto the sidewalk. Mr. Kataryniak stated the applicant has to look at that. Mr. Fox stated that space number 33 (the handicapped spot) could be moved to allow for a larger turning radius. Mr. Sacchinelli felt curbing should be installed along the sidewalk.

Mr. Diner asked if the bays in the middle are self-service. Mr. Winer responded no and are used by the attendants and is low volume of only 10 cars per day.

Mr. Cummins asked if the pylon sign can continue to exist with safe turning coming out of the car wash. Mr. Kataryniak stated the turning problem would be in reference to the cars coming out of the car wash, not the cars coming out of the service bay and is not an issue for those bays. Mr. Cummins asked if the pylon poses a problem for traffic circulation within the site. Mr. Kataryniak stated that the newly revised plan is an improvement and does not interfere with the pylon sign. Mr. Mondello stated that the traffic cannot exit from the car wash to the left as Mr. Cummins and the BIC had desired because both traffic engineers stated it would not work that way.

Mr. Kataryniak had to leave the meeting at this time of the meeting. It was 8:20 p.m.

A 5-minute recess was taken at this time. The meeting resumed at 8:30 p.m. Roll call was taken and all were present as previously called.

Mr. Levy asked if the customers that use the facility are repeat customers. Mr. Rea thought that more than 50% are repeat customers. Mr. Levy felt that most of the customers know where the facility is. Mr. Rea agreed, but that transient customers from Broadway are entitled to knowing where the entrance is. Mr. Mondello indicated that since the sign has been put up, there has been an increase in customers to the business.

Mr. Levy asked if the signs proposed are appropriate. Mr. Rea stated that the DOT has standards for state signs, but do not have standards for business signs. Mr. Rea felt that appropriate size signage would be if it is consistent with the

surrounding signs in the corridor and has to compete with other businesses and felt the proposed signs are appropriate. Mr. Levy asked if there are any other signs that announce the entrance prior to the business. Mr. Rea did not know. Mr. Levy asked if there is clutter. Mr. Rea felt the bigger the sign, the more reaction time you are giving the motorist. Mr. Rea referred to 4F where the sign facing the west is at least as big, if not bigger than what is proposed. Mr. Levy felt there was a lot of signage on the building and if people are going to the site, there are landmarks that would be given when they are given directions. Mr. Mondello stated that one of the residents who live next door complained that going up the hill, you cannot see the sign until it is almost too late. Mr. Levy stated that the business has been there for 15 years and most people know it is there.

Mr. Rea stated that even though if most of the people know it is there, but there is a percentage of people who use it for the first time and need to know where the access is. There is a building that blocks the view of the access point traveling east. Mr. Levy stated that the sign that is up there now does not indicate the access, but the car wash itself. Mr. Rea referred to Sign 4F3 that does indicate that the entrance is 100' ahead. Mr. Levy asked if the buildings that are west to the site, if they are in the way. Mr. Rea did not know if signs or buildings were blocking the signage to the site.

Mr. Charipper referred to 4F3 and asked if the applicant could add on to the signage that Iron Choppers has next door. Mr. Mondello stated Iron Choppers would have to consent to that and did not see that as a viable option.

Mr. Sacchinelli asked if the signs would be illuminated on the building at night and would conflict with the traffic light at that corner. Mr. Monello stated that the white lettering of the sign would be illuminated only.

Mr. Karas asked if the sign proposed would be a fluorescent sign. Mr. Mondello stated no – it would be L.E.D. Mr. Karas referred to Exhibit A-2, page S-1, it shows 3 signs 1B, A and 2U and asked if they had any relation to traffic safety. Mr. Rea responded yes and is a safety concern as it is an identification sign to indicate the location so the motorist can make a u-turn.

Mr. Karas asked how far down the road traveling west on Broadway do you have to go past the car wash to come around east. Mr. Rea stated you would go down to Fairlawn Parkway to make the u-turn – approximately ¼ mile. Mr. Karas stated that 2U is not on the building and if a car traveling west would not see the facility and if the car went past the facility and did not see the sign there is no safety concern. Mr. Rea disagreed.

Mr. Karas asked of the safety factor of sign 1B. Mr. Rea stated that is to indicate the exit of the building. Mr. Karas felt that sign 1B is not necessary since it is the attendants that move the vehicle. Mr. Rea felt that if a customer pulled into the

sign and did not know the operations of the business, could pull into the bay, instead of parking the vehicle.

Mr. Karas referred to sign 7A on the exit of the car wash and does not say anything about exit. Mr. Mondello stated that the sign is existing. Mr. Rea stated that exit could be added to the existing sign.

Mr. Karas referred to 4F3 and asked what is the size of that sign. Mr. Mondello stated the sign expert would answer that. Mr. Karas asked if the size is necessary in relation to a safety standpoint. Mr. Rea stated he did not say it is necessary, but appropriate in relation to the other signs along Broadway.

Mr. Meer stated that 2U heading westbound – is just a sign on a building and does not indicate anything and it should indicate something like “next u-turn”. Mr. Rea stated it is an identification sign and if u-turn were added, it would increase the size of the sign. Mr. Meer felt there is too many signs for the property. Mr. Mondello stated that the present plan is a result of the BIC – not the size – but the wording.

Mr. Blecher referred to 4F3 and 5A. 4F3 shows 100’ ahead, but does not see sign 5A in the background. Mr. Mondello stated that 5A is there now. Mr. Levy stated that it does not show the relationship between the 2 signs. Mr. Blecher asked if a motorist would see the 2 signs, and if not, then why have the 2 signs. Mr. Mondello stated the sign expert would answer that.

Mr. Diner referred to Sheet 2 of 6 of the revised plan. Mr. Mondello stated that is an error and should have been revised.

Mr. Sacchinelli asked why the signs would be lit, if the business is not in operation in the evening. Mr. Rea stated that at certain times of the year it is dark during rush hour traffic. Mr. Mondello stated that the signs would be lit until 10 p.m. when the business is open until and then shut off.

Mr. Cummins asked if a traffic study was done at the facility. Mr. Rea stated no, and that he assisted Mr. Fox in engineering the traffic circulation, and a formal traffic study is not required. Mr. Rea felt the consolidation of the 2 lots would be safe as proposed. Mr. Cummins asked if a study was done on Route 4 in Fair Lawn. Mr. Rea stated no, but is a commuter road. Mr. Cummins asked if it is repeat traffic. Mr. Rea stated although it is primarily a commuter road, there is transient traffic on the road. Mr. Cummins asked if there is a need for the proposed signage. Mr. Rea stated there is a need for the proposed signage for a safety concern over the traffic on Broadway. Mr. Cummins asked if Mr. Rea has asked his client regarding the needs of his clients. Mr. Rea stated he has had many conversations with his client and it is irrelevant to the amount of traffic that is repeat business, but that the proper signage has to indicate the location of the facility. Mr. Cummins asked if the majority of most people know where the

facility is. Mr. Rea agreed, but there is a percentage that do not. Mr. Cummins asked if any observations were made from 34<sup>th</sup> Street looking east. Mr. Rea answered no. Mr. Cummins asked if he should have looked from the top of the hill to the top of the building and if from 34<sup>th</sup> Street and Yerger Road are the same height. Mr. Rea did not do that study. Mr. Mondello stated that Mr. Rea has been brought in under the recommendation of the BIC and the questioning is irrelevant. Mr. Levy disagreed with Mr. Mondello and that when the signage is viewable is relevant. Mr. Mondello stated that if Mr. Winer took over a space in the building next door, the sign would be permitted. Mr. Cummins asked what the speed limit is there. Mr. Rea responded 40 m.p.h. Mr. Rea again stated that his only task was to review the signage and the traffic circulation within the site itself. Mr. Cummins asked if going westbound, what is the first thing that is seen. Mr. Rea stated that his focus was on the traffic. Mr. Cummins asked what would be seen first, something on a second level or at eye level. Mr. Rea responded that anything that is higher is seen first. Mr. Rea believes that what is proposed is consistent with the corridor. Mr. Cummins asked how many consultations were there with the sign expert. Mr. Rea stated maybe 2 meetings. Mr. Cummins asked if the sign expert's proposal was based upon Mr. Rea's recommendations. Mr. Rea did not know.

Suzanne DiGeronimo felt a sequence of views from Broadway should be provided to show how the traffic comes into the site. Ms. DiGeronimo asked who polices all the signs. Ms. DiGeronimo felt the turning radius is critical to the site and there are major engineering changes to the site. Mr. Rea stated that the turning radius is sufficient based on the turning radius template used and he has evaluated the plans and there have been changes made, but they are not major changes to the site. Ms. DiGeronimo stated that if there are 21 spaces, by opening up the space for circulation, the residential spaces are now shared. Mr. Mondello stated that presently there are no spaces dedicated specifically to the residents. Ms. DiGeronimo asked if residential parking is required. Mr. Rea stated that some towns have specific ordinances regarding shared parking and it is good planning. Ms. DiGeronimo stated the lots are combined. Mr. Mondello stated that if the Board wants the lots to remain separate they will do so.

Mr. Sacchinelli referred to the turning radius with the handicapped spot. Mr. Rea stated the turning radius would work, but did think that the concrete curb along the sidewalk is a good idea. Mr. Sacchinelli asked if spot #33 is needed. Mr. Rea felt there is sufficient parking and if 1 spot is lost, it would not affect the site. Mr. Sacchinelli asked where the snow would be put. Mr. Mondello stated the snow would be carted away.

Mr. Levy asked if single unit trucks could circulate around the site. Mr. Rea stated they could.

Mr. Levy closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Bernard Giaraputo, VP of LS Sign Co. and manufactures signs. Mr. Giaraputo was accepted as an expert witness. Mr. Giaraputo is familiar with the site and the Fair Lawn Sign Ordinance. Mr. Giaraputo depicted the site as it is presently existing. There are 2 digitally printed banners. Mr. Levy stated those signs were put up without any permits. Mr. Giaraputo stated that the new signs would be aluminum and the front will be channel letters. The letters only would be illuminated – not the background. The lighting would be low voltage L.E.D. and would not have any spillage. The sign 4F would be 42” in height and would be 24’ from left to right. The sign facing east would be 36” x 18’.

Mr. Giaraputo stated that currently the sign next to Wayside Fence would be removed (sign 6A). The exit sign (7A) is presently existing and there are no changes to that sign. Sign 5A is only being reversed with the letters lighting up in white. The exit sign is a light box now. Zap will light up and Exit will light up. The letters only will light up. The new sign will be smaller in length than what is existing. 8 presentation boards were marked as **Exhibit A-4**. The wall facing east will have channel letters 36” in height x 18’ in length which is smaller than what is there now. The wall facing west (sign 4F3) has also been reduced. Mr. Sacchinelli asked if the traffic light will interfere with the sign. Mr. Giaraputo stated that the only colors that would be seen would be the white of the letters and would not interfere with the traffic signal.

Mr. Blecher asked if the before signs that were presented are supposed to be there. Mr. Levy stated that the signs are not supposed to be there and have been put there without approval. Mr. Mondello stated that under MLUL the Board cannot look at the illegal signs. Mr. Soukas agreed with Mr. Mondello and the Board has to look at the positive and negative criteria and should not look at the illegal signs. Mr. Mondello stated that other than the 2 banners, all other signs have the necessary permits.

Mr. Charipper asked how would Mr. Giaraputo feel the proposed signs are an improvement. Mr. Giaraputo stated it is a cleaner look. Mr. Charipper asked if it conforms better with the neighborhood. Mr. Giaraputo stated it is more aesthetically pleasing and fits better with the neighborhood.

Mr. Karas asked of the 5 proposed signs if Mr. Giaraputo checked the Ordinance and how many of them meet within the requirements. Mr. Giaraputo stated 2 on the building are over the square footage allowed. The remaining conform. Mr. Karas asked if all the signs that are existing conform within the Ordinance. Mr. Mondello stated that all other existing signs have been given the necessary approval. Mr. Karas asked when the previous signs were approved. Mr. Mondello stated that is not irrelevant. Mr. Charipper felt the previous signs that were given approval are not relevant to this application.

A 5 minute recess was taken at 10:15 p.m. The meeting resumed at 10:20 p.m. and roll call was taken. All were present as previously called.

Mr. Karas asked how many signs are permitted that are on the site. Mr. Mondello thought 3. Because there are 2 separate buildings, this is a special case. Mr. Levy stated that the applicant is asking for a variance for the number of signs and size of the signs.

Mr. Sacchinelli asked the depth of the sign. Mr. Giaraputo stated 8” deep and would be 22’-24’ feet in length and there would be no problem with heat. Mr. Sacchinelli asked if there would be a problem with ice sitting on top of the sign that could cause ice to fall to the sidewalk. Mr. Giaraputo stated that the water should run down the back of the sign along the building. Mr. Giaraputo stated that any type of sign could create an icicle. Mr. Sacchinelli felt that with the thickness of the sign due to the illumination, that could cause a problem with icicles. Mr. Giaraputo stated a drip guard could be put onto the sign.

Mr. Diner asked what is happening to the Metro Bowl sign. Mr. Mondello stated that they have not authority to ask the tenant to remove that sign.

Mr. Levy asked about sign 3B on the north side. Mr. Giaraputo depicted the sign and would all be consistent with the site. Mr. Mondello stated the signs would fit within the Ordinance.

Ms. Bergailo asked for 1B and 4F3 to show the precise measurements on the drawing. Mr. Mondello stated they would provide that.

Mr. Levy also asked for the measurements for 3B.

Mr. Levy opened the meeting to the public. Mr. Cummins asked Mr. Giaraputo if any studies were done regarding marketing needs. Mr. Giaraputo responded no. Mr. Giaraputo discussed with Mr. Winer his marketing needs. Mr. Cummins asked if from 34<sup>th</sup> Street if 4F3 could be 12’ long. Mr. Giaraputo felt the readability would not be good from the distance because the letters would be too small. Mr. Cummins asked if some lettering could be removed. Mr. Giaraputo stated no – it only says the name of the business. Mr. Cummins asked what if U2 were viewed from a westerly direction. Mr. Giaraputo stated the first thing viewed is the neon sign and that will be removed. Mr. Cummins asked what is the need for the sign on the building. Mr. Mondello stated there is some repetition between the signs. Mr. Giaraputo stated it is added signage. Mr. Cummins felt the added signage is not needed. Mr. Levy asked if a marketing analysis was done to attract more customers. Mr. Giaraputo stated additional signs always attract visibility. Mr. Cummins asked if there are any other car washes in the area. Mr. Winer stated there is one on Passaic Street in Rochelle Park.

Mr. Levy closed the meeting to the public.

**APPLICATION CARRIED TO SEPTEMBER 27, 2007 AT 7:00 P.M.**

The applicant consented to the time for the Board to act.

**Estimates:**

1. Taylor Design Group for \$1,975.00 for Zap Lube;
2. Birdsall Engineering for \$1,000.00 for Zap Lube; and
3. Azzolina & Feury Engineering, Inc. for \$3,000.00 for Zap Lube.

Mr. Charipper made a motion to approve these estimates and Mr. Sacchinelli seconded the motion.

VOTE: All Present - AYE.

**Vouchers:**

1. Taylor Design in the amount of \$52.50 for Cumberland Farms, Inc.

Mr. Charipper made a motion to approve this voucher and Mr. Sacchinelli seconded the motion.

VOTE: All Present - AYE.

**Minutes:**

1. Minutes for the July 12, 2007 and July 19, 2007 meetings.

Mr. Blecher made a motion to approve these minutes and Mr. Sacchinelli seconded the motion.

VOTE: All Present – AYE.

**Adjourn**

Mr. Diner made a motion to adjourn this meeting. Mr. Charipper seconded the motion.

VOTE: All Present – Yes.

TIME: 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol LoPiccolo  
Zoning Board Clerk