

CHATHAM BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

September 12, 2007

7:30 p.m.

Chairman H.H. Montague called the Chatham Borough Planning Board meeting of September 12, 2007 to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Chatham Municipal Building. Mr. Montague announced that all legal notices have been posted for this meeting.

Members Present: H.H. Montague, John Hague, David Gerridge, Alison Pignatello, Bill Jankowski, Thomas Sennett, Alan Pfeil, Councilman Bruce Harris, Mayor Richard Plambeck.

Charles W. Foster, Esq., attorney for the Board, was present.

Members Absent: James Mitchell

This meeting was not televised.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes of June 13, 2007 were approved as amended. Mrs. Pignatello abstained from voting.

Ogden Memorial Presbyterian Church – 286 Main St.- a continuation

Mr. Sennett recused himself from this hearing because he had a conflict of interest.

Mr. Hague certified that he has listened to the tapes of the August 1, 2007 and August 8, 2007 meetings. Councilman Harris certified that he has listened to the entire tape of the September 5, 2007 meeting.

Mr. Montague confirmed that all of the Board members present tonight are eligible to vote on this application if a vote is taken tonight.

Mr. Montague noted that the Borough Engineer, Mr. Vincent DeNave, will be joining the meeting in a little while. He has a previous meeting tonight.

The following representatives from Ogden Memorial Church were present:

Mark Knoll, Esq.

Robert Moschello, engineer for Ogden Church

Paul Drake, planner for Ogden Church

Reverend Dale Dealtrey, pastor of Ogden Church

Mr. Knoll stated that tonight Mr. Moschello will respond to some of the questions and outstanding issues from the last meeting. Mr. Drake is present tonight to answer any additional questions the Board may have concerning the variances.

Mr. Knoll reported that the neighbors have approached the applicant with recommended changes to the plans. Mr. Knoll suggested to Mr. Montague that the applicant address those recommended changes prior to his summary. Mr. Montague confirmed with Mr. Knoll that he will present testimony concerning a drop-off plan. Mr. Knoll said he also has a statement from the church regarding what the minimum criteria will be for any drop-off plans at the property. The church has a submission it can hand in on that situation to the Board.

Mr. Moschello recalled from the last meeting that he was requested to provide the volumes of the peak flows for the stormwater management.

Mr. Moschello testified that the volumes for the run-off for the 2-year storm event were 0.32 acre feet, for the existing conditions. For the 2-year storm under proposed conditions, after the run-off has gone through the drywell system the volumes are 0.215 acre feet. There will be a reduction of .105 acre feet of storage that will be infiltrated into the ground by the system.

Mr. Moschello testified for the 10-year storm event, the total existing volume run-off was 0.55 acre feet. Under the proposed conditions, that run-off is 0.44 acre foot. There is a reduction of 0.107 acre foot volume of run-off that's infiltrated into the ground. For the 100-year storm event, the existing volume of run-off for the entire site was 0.98 acre feet. Under the proposed conditions, that volume of run-off will be 0.88 acre feet. There will be a reduction of 0.1 acre foot of run-off due to the drywells to be installed. Under the proposed conditions for the 3 storm events, there is a reduction in the volume of run-off that leaves the entire site for the project, because of the proposed installation of the drywells.

Mrs. Pignatello asked if this would be a noticeable decrease in run-off.

Mr. Moschello answered that in terms of volume, it is equal to 1500 cubic feet of water.

At this point in the meeting, 7:59 p.m., Mr. DeNave, the Borough Engineer, joined the hearing.

Mr. Hague asked Mr. Moschello if his numbers were with or without the completion of the drainage improvements to Elmwood Ave.

Mr. Moschello answered that the drainage improvements are part of this proposal in regard to what the drywells will contain. The drywells will hold that water regardless to what happens on Elmwood Avenue. Once the Elmwood Ave. improvements are in, the over-flow will go into the stormwater system.

To the Board members Mr. DeNave distributed copies of an 85% complete design of the Elmwood Ave. improvements. He had high-lighted in pink the parking across the street from the church. It looks like the Borough can install 14 head-on parking stalls. The **guard**-rail will be re-located and moved back closer to the new retaining wall that was just constructed. This will situate the cars off “the travel way”. The church property can then accommodate ten 45-degree angled stalls.

Regarding stormwater, Mr. DeNave pointed out the first inlet in correspondence to where the church’s detention will be coming out to the street. When the church’s retaining pits or basins overflow, they will overflow directly into the catch basin the Borough will be installing on Elmwood Ave. The Borough will be piping that down the road. Mr. DeNave pointed out the additional drainage structures that will go all the way down Elmwood Ave.

Mr. DeNave explained how the Elmwood Ave. drainage will be split into two components.

At Mayor Plambeck’s request, Mr. DeNave pointed out the existing inlets on Elmwood Ave.

Mr. Montague pointed to the head-in parking spaces on the design. He noted there was a set of stairs shown. Will the walk-way blocked off?

Mr. DeNave answered yes. The landscaped island will be worked on and a 5-foot path will probably be constructed through there. There also may be a walkway put in across the street in that location to tie into the church property. Mr. DeNave noted that this area is heavily utilized. Many people park in the Center Ave. West lot and walk across the street.

Councilman Harris questioned why head-in parking was being proposed instead of angled parking, as in the Borough’s portion.

Mr. DeNave explained that currently the church property utilizes head-in parking; however, the back 5 feet of the vehicles stick out in the traveled way. A congested feeling occurs at that section because currently only one vehicle can pass at a time due to the narrow width of the roadway and the existing head-in parking. The Borough plans to expand the width of the roadway to create a 24-foot uniform roadway width. An effort will be made to pull the parked vehicles in as much as possible so two-way traffic can drive through at all times.

Councilman Harris asked why isn’t the Borough portion having angled parking.

Mr. DeNave answered that the Borough’s parking will be maximized more with head-in parking rather than with angled parking.

Mayor Plambeck pointed out that the Borough owns all the property at that particular section. The church only owns a 10-ft. strip.

Mr. Hague asked for the angled parking side, who will own it, build it, and maintain it? He suggested that the church dedicate this particular property to the town and come into an arrangement with the town with an exclusive use of some of the spaces.

Mr. DeNave stated that when he had presented this preliminary plan to the Borough Council, it was a clear a decision would have to be made on this issue. There is the matter of "ease of construction". Ideally, these improvements should be constructed all at one time; however, the Borough does not have the right to go on the church's property.

Mr. Knoll pointed out that the church is more than willing to work with the Borough to make the improvements to Elmwood Avenue go smoothly. Ogden's Session (its governing body) will have to approve any dedication of this property. If the Borough can come up with actual details of what they want to do, the Session will discuss it at their next meeting.

Mr. Moschello had no further testimony on the stormwater situation. There were no further questions from the Board on that matter.

Mr. Moschello noted that at the last meeting there had been questions regarding the movement of the buses. Mr. Moschello stated that these buses can only hold 25 children or less. They are mini-buses.

Mr. Knoll clarified that Ogden Church will restrict Work Family Connection's use of any bus larger than the 25-children capacity buses. The calculations that will be given tonight are based on the largest bus that the Connection is allowed to use.

Mr. Moschello submitted Exhibit A-10, mini-bus turning exhibit dated 9/12/07. He testified that the bus's wheelbase is approximately 12 feet. The overall length of the bus is 22 feet. He explained the turning movements, shaded in grey, on Exhibit A-10. Mr. Moschello believed the bus's turning movements function well and stay within the paved areas. The bus is capable of making the wider movements on towards Main Street.

At Mr. Foster's request, Mr. Moschello further described the wheel base. Mr. Moschello stated that the wheelbase will be 12 feet from wheel to wheel, which will control the bus's movement throughout the site.

Mr. Foster asked Mr. Moschello if the applicant was planning to limit the length of the bus or the length of the wheelbase to enable the bus to come onto the church property.

Rev. Dealtrey answered that the church would limit it to the 25-seat bus, which is what this plan is modeled on.

Mr. Moschello pointed out that the typical size being proposed here will be able to maneuver the site.

Mr. Foster confirmed with Mr. Moschello that a 25-seat bus will be about 22 feet long.

Mr. Montague asked what will be the drop off point for the bus.

Mr. Knoll answered that the drop off point would be the two red doors on the Elmwood Ave. side of the building.

Mr. Moschello discussed the DOT minor access permit. He had reviewed the requirements for a minor access permit. Mr. Moschello noted that the DOT looks at the trip generation based upon the uses on the site. In the church's case, none of the actual uses will be changed. Technically there will be no increase of traffic flow with the proposed plans. An access permit will not be needed for the driveway out onto Main Street. Mr. Moschello said he had consulted Doug Piniyak, the church's traffic engineer from Dolan & Dean.

Mr. Hague pointed out that the existing driveway that the buses will be using has not previously taken any traffic from the site. The plans propose that the driveway now take this traffic. Mr. Hague recommended the applicant approach the DOT and ask that they waive off on this situation.

Mr. Moschello explained that the DOT looks at the overall site. They won't be inquiring about an existing access.

Mr. Hague said he had the opposite experience with DOT.

Mr. Montague asked the public if they had any questions at this point.

Peter Gillim, 34 Elmwood Ave., noted that he lived across the street from Mr. Lehman's residence when the drainage is seriously blocked up. He asked Mr. Moschello if he had looked at the permeability of the soil underneath the proposed catch basins. Mr. Gillim felt the existing rain basin at 33 Elmwood Avenue always has water in it.

Mr. Moschello said that when the construction is done, the soil around the drywell will be tested. Right now the assumption is being made that the soil will infiltrate the run-off. Mr. Moschello will confirm that fact once the construction begins.

Mr. Knoll indicated that the residents may have a presentation to give.

Bob Leverich, 43 Elmwood Ave., was sworn in to testify.

Mr. Leverich informed the Board that he had a document that he planned on reading into the record. This document contains the compromise proposal that the Elmwood Ave. residents presented to Reverend Dealtrey on Monday night at Ogden Church. Mr.

Leverich clarified that this proposal came from all of the residents living on Elmwood Ave. to Weston Ave. with the exception of two residents who are members of Ogden Church and one Planning Board member.

Mr. Leverich testified that tonight he had a copy of the petition with the signatures of 39 Elmwood Ave. residents. Mr. DeNave offered to make copies of the petition and the proposal for the Board members to look at. Mr. Knoll said he had a copy of the proposal, but needed a copy of the signature list. Mr. DeNave went to his office to make copies.

Mr. Leverich reminded the Board that the Elmwood Ave. residents have long opposed the parking plan which Ogden has put forth. The residents feel that the amount of impervious space is unsightly and unnecessary. Mr. Leverich said he understood that the church, by law, according to the number of pews, has a right to apply for a certain number of parking spaces. Mr. Leverich stated he and the residents believe there are enough mitigating circumstances for the Board to consider.

Mr. Leverich read aloud the compromise that the Elmwood Avenue residents have presented to the church:

“The residents of Elmwood Ave. understand Ogden Church’s long history, its contributions, and its long-standing importance to the Chatham community. As has been the case from the beginning, we want nothing more than to work with the church to find common ground in resolving its parking needs. As a sign of good faith and in an effort and desire in being good neighbors, we endorse a compromise solution that minimizes the number of parking spaces on Elmwood Ave., recognizes and respects the historic character of our block, which is just as important historically as Ogden Church itself, while providing reasonable solutions to the student drop-off and general parking needs of Ogden and its tenants. We are willing to meet Ogden part way to reach a solution all can live with, provided it recognizes that its current proposed plan, as it stands, will result in an excessive number of parking spaces for a residential zone, especially when taking into the existing parking it already owns on Elmwood Ave. As a start, we would like to put on the table for discussion the following specific improvements to the current plan:

1) The proposed parking lot, based upon points made above, should contain only one row of parking with a separate drop-off driveway in the front of the church, eliminating the need to use one for both purposes. Conversely, if this is not acceptable, parking could alternatively be placed west of the bell tower with the drop-off lane only on the Elmwood Ave. side of the property. Either way, the number of proposed parking spaces, on Elmwood Ave. must be reduced given that half the lot is not expected to be used for parking purposes during peak times anyway.

2) One of two proposed entrances/exits on the Elmwood Ave. side of the plans should be eliminated. If traffic is to enter the Elmwood Ave. side of Ogden’s property, it should be forced to flow out onto Main Street, not back onto Elmwood Ave. This is something we have asked for many times to no avail.

3) Ogden's existing gravel parking lot should be converted into parallel parking as part of the Borough's reconstruction of Elmwood Ave. in order to avoid turning the southern end of our block into a strip mall-like parking lot.

These are only a few suggestions the residents of Elmwood Avenue are open to considering other reasonable suggestions that will provide parking and student drop off relief to Ogden and its tenants, while being cognizant of the historic, aesthetic, and quality of life concerns of its neighbors".

Mr. Leverich noted that the above statement was given to Reverend Dealtrey at the church.

Mrs. Pignatello asked Mr. Leverich if the Elmwood Ave. residents think **it is** better to eliminate the spaces that are closest to the street and not the spaces closest to the church.

Mr. Leverich said that was correct. Also, the residents believe the southern Elmwood Ave. entrance closest to Main Street should be chained off.

Mr. Leverich stated that he and the residents believe the solution is to have a workable drop-off that allows traffic to flow off of Elmwood Avenue, through the drop-off area, and onto Main Street. There should not be two-way traffic coming off of Main Street into one entrance or the other with cars coming in and going out. Mr. Leverich believed queuing problems would then result.

Mr. Leverich pointed out that he and the residents went before the Borough Traffic Committee last year when this traffic problem on Elmwood Ave. was at its height. All the traffic regulations were then changed on Elmwood Ave. mainly because of the amount of traffic generated by the Montessori School. Since the imposition of those new traffic regulations, during school hours, there is no traffic problem evident on that side of Elmwood Ave. any more.

Since these new parking regulations have produced results, Mr. Leverich questioned why does this 22-space parking lot have to be built, especially on a historic piece of property.

Mr. Leverich noted that the church heeded the recommendation of the HPC to not put any parking on the front lawn, as originally proposed. Mr. Leverich pointed out that the HPC is not the rule of law. Mr. Leverich stated that it seemed to him and the residents that everything Ogden Church has done from the inception of this plan is to have a large parking lot on the Elmwood Ave. side of their property regardless of what their neighbors say.

Mr. Leverich reported that when this compromise plan was presented to the church it was met with a lack of interest.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if he was a professional engineer.

Mr. Leverich answered no.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if any professional engineer had reviewed this compromise plan and suggestions.

Mr. Leverich answered no.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if any professional engineer has informed him that the proposed plans by Ogden Church are unsafe.

Mr. Leverich answered no.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if the primary objection by the Elmwood Ave. residents was an aesthetic issue. He asked if the residents were objecting to the proposed parking being close to the street.

Mr. Leverich clarified that the issue was partly aesthetics.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if he could present any testimony to the Planning Board that his alternate proposal would improve safety for the children who use the building.

Mr. Leverich answered that he did not bring up this alternate plan as a safety issue; although, based on what was said at the last meeting, he had received the impression that most of the Board members were not comfortable with the idea of establishing a drop-off point in the middle of a parking lot. He also felt that Mr. Knoll's claim that the parking spaces closest to the church won't be occupied during drop-off hours didn't make sense.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if he had presented the proposed plans to a professional engineer who has confirmed his belief that they don't make sense.

Mr. Leverich answered no.

Mr. Knoll and Mr. Leverich discussed the driveway situation. Mr. Leverich clarified that the driveway shown on the plans were fine. He just didn't feel it should be called a driveway if it sits in the middle of two adjacent parking lots. He and the neighbors are just asking that the row of parking spaces closest to Elmwood Ave. be eliminated. Also, he and the residents are asking that the proposed drop-off point be close to the bell tower. They did not want the drop-off point at the church's red doors on Elmwood Ave.

Brenda Hynes, 29 Elmwood Ave., added that the residents also stated that if Ogden did not agree to use the bell tower as a drop-off, the residents are willing to have the Elmwood Ave. side have a drop-off lane. The 10 or 12 existing parking spaces could be put on the far west side of the bell tower. The installation of the parking spaces on the west side was part of the original plans.

Mr. Montague asked Mr. Leverich if he had a drawing of what the parking on the west side of the bell tower would look like.

Mr. Leverich didn't have drawings; however, he pointed out that the original plans had pictured the parking on the west side.

Mr. Montague asked Mr. Leverich if he knew whether 11 parking spaces could fit on that west side without changing the exit onto Main Street.

Mr. Leverich said he didn't have an answer.

Mr. Knoll confirmed with Mr. Leverich that his petition had asked that the existing gravel parking lot should be converted into parallel parking, instead of angled parking.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich how many parallel parking spaces would fit on that graveled area.

Mr. Leverich believed 5 spaces could fit on the gravel area; however, he didn't have the necessary measurements. He felt the parallel parking would improve the aesthetic situation of that section.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich to confirm that the neighbors have no objection with regard to safety concerning the church's proposed plans.

Mr. Leverich answered that at this point, he and the residents were not arguing a safety issue. He pointed out that he and the residents have gone on record for a long time in objection to the church's proposed parking plan. They do not believe it is necessary. Mr. Leverich believed the bottom line is the church's ability to keep a lessee (Montessori) happy. Intensification was brought on by the Montessori School.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if he was present when Mr. DiGiacomo, the owner of the Montessori School, gave his testimony.

Mr. Leverich wasn't sure.

Mr. Knoll asked how did he then base his assumption that this proposed parking was for the tenant.

Mr. Leverich recalled that at the last meeting, the church gave testimony that this additional parking was needed because of the Morning Mothers Out employees and other employees. He noted that the church has 23 permanent employees associated with the Montessori School. Mr. Leverich believed that situation was the driving force for this application. He felt the objective of the church "from day one" was to put as much new parking on Elmwood Ave. side as possible. Mr. Leverich felt the Elmwood Ave. residents were not properly represented in this whole discussion.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Leverich if these were the plans he had tonight were the first revised written set of plans submitted to Ogden church by the residents.

Mr. Leverich clarified that what he is presenting is not a set of plans. What he is presenting is a compromise proposal. He stressed that every single one of the suggestions made by the Elmwood Ave. residents have been met with “benign indifference” by the church.

Mr. Knoll confirmed with Mr. Leverich that he had reviewed the church’s Concept Plans of last August.

Mr. Knoll indicated he had no more questions for Mr. Leverich.

Mr. Montague asked Mr. DeNave if he had any questions for Mr. Leverich.

Mr. DeNave felt it would not be a good idea to put the driveway in too far away from the school. He believed to make the drop-off point the most effective it would have to **be** close to the school.

Using the exhibit, Mr. DeNave brought up the option of moving the drive aisle closest to the school, taking out a row of parking and shifting it up further away from Elmwood Ave. Mr. DeNave said he wouldn’t like any plans that would force children to walk through parking spaces to reach the school.

Mr. Gerridge noted that there will be a maximum of 136 children in the church’s school building. He estimated that, at best, 5 cars a minute will arrive to drop off children. It may reach up to 8 cars a minute. Some random queuing may occur onto Elmwood Ave. He asked Mr. DeNave whether the drop-off arrangements in this option would provide enough room to prevent significant queuing onto Elmwood Ave.

Mr. DeNave noted that it’s very important to know what type of queuing will occur. He pointed out that right now there no stopping or standing of vehicles is allowed on Elmwood Ave. in that particular section. A driver can be ticketed if they stop their vehicle in that location.

Mr. Knoll pointed out that the times these vehicles are scheduled to arrive at the church property are staggered. The arrival times for the Montessori School are staggered. Mr. Knoll stated that the church’s traffic engineers report that 6 cars can currently queue on the church property in that section.

Mr. Knoll said that the church is committed to its application for the number of parking spaces that it needs. He stated that the church’s needs for parking are based upon not just the school’s needs. It is the church’s needs. The church would not be comfortable presenting a plan that called for half the number of parking spaces that it’s been reduced to.

Mr. Knoll pointed out that Reverend Dealtrey has testified that the church has had parking problems well before the Montessori School entered into a lease with the church. Also, Mr. DiGiacomo had testified that promised parking for his employees was never a condition in his lease. Mr. Knoll said that the church had informed Mr. DiGiacomo before he had entered into the lease that the church planned to improve the parking around the facility, because it has always been needed. Mr. Knoll stated that the church would not be in favor of reducing the number of parking spaces even more.

Mr. Knoll addressed the idea of blocking off the Elmwood Ave. exit to the south. He pointed out that the church agreed with that proposal a long time ago. This arrangement will be reflected on the plans. A very simple traffic barrier can be put up during the drop-off and pick-up times. This would re-direct the traffic out onto Main Street.

Mr. Montague asked Mr. DeNave to give his opinion on this southern exit being blocked off.

Mr. DeNave said as long as the right-hand turn only (onto Main St.) restriction is in effect, the vehicles will move quickly out of the site and merge into traffic. Any queuing would occur on the church property.

Mr. Foster asked Mr. Leverich that didn't he testify earlier that there is no problem now with queuing on Elmwood Avenue with the new parking restrictions in place.

Mr. Leverich said he has been told by the Elmwood Ave. residents who are present in the day-time hours that the queuing problems have been largely abated since the new restrictions have been enforced.

Mr. Foster said if there is no queuing problem now, there should be no reason why the drop-off location could not be close to the Montessori School rather than over by the bell tower.

Mr. Gerridge clarified that some of the parents are parking on Center Ave. West lot and bringing their children to the school.

Mr. Leverich stated that some people are using the drive-through that exists now. That drive-through does not exist on the plans. This drive-through uses the south entrance, goes under the bell tower, then onto Main Street. Mr. Leverich has heard from his neighbors that since the traffic restrictions have gone into effect, some vehicles are currently using the south entrance route. He believed that under the church's proposed plans the drop-off procedure would become lengthier. Mr. Montague noted that further testimony is needed on this situation, perhaps from a neighbor that has actually observed this drop-off method.

Jan Boettger, 45 Elmwood Ave., noted that Mr. Leverich has admitted that he is not present in the neighborhood during the daytime hours. She asked Mr. Leverich if the neighbor's alternate proposal eliminated paving the new parking lot.

Mr. Leverich answered that he and the neighbors are proposing that half of that parking lot be paved. He showed Mrs. Boettger on the plans where the desired paving would be.

Mr. Hague noted that the church is unwilling to compromise on any alternatives suggested by the residents with the exception of the partial block-off of the south driveway and a potential movement of the drop off points, depending upon queuing over time.

Mr. Knoll agreed with Mr. Hague's conclusion; however, part of the proposal suggested by the Elmwood Ave. neighbors' concerns include parallel parking on Lot 53. This application has nothing to do with Lot 53. Mr. Knoll stated that at this time he didn't want to take a position right now whether angled parking or parallel parking is the best for that location. The church is not rejecting the notion that they can restrict access to Elmwood Ave. during peak pick-up and drop-off times during the week. The church would not be in favor of reducing the number of parking spaces by 12.

At 9:15 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:35 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Mayor Plambeck asked Mr. Knoll if he had completed his comments on all the points made in Mr. Leverich's petition.

Mr. Knoll answered yes, regarding the petition. He said he would like to call a rebuttal witness, Mrs. Pat Boettger, to testify on the current drop-off conditions. Mrs. Boettger is employed by the Mothers Morning Out Program. Mrs. Boettger is also a member of Ogden Church. She is on the church grounds every day.

Mr. Knoll stated the base-line statement the church is proposing will be presented. Also, the pick-up and drop-off plans after construction will be given.

Mayor Plambeck said he would like more information on how much traffic comes from the north. What pattern would a driver follow, after doing a drop-off, is out onto Main Street by taking a right, how do they return to the north? Would the driver use Coleman Ave.

Mr. Knoll reported that the church has conducted traffic studies over the last several years. All the engineering plans that the church has presented that compromise the present proposed plans have taken the optimal traffic flows around the property into consideration. He did not have the exact number of vehicles coming down Weston Ave. and Elmwood Ave.

Mayor Plambeck felt that the Board still needed a feel of how much traffic is coming north versus how much is coming south.

Mr. Knoll took note of Mayor Plambeck's suggestion. Moving on, Mr. Knoll stated that until the traffic flows and parking changes are instituted around the property, there can be no effective drop-off plan for the long-term for the church property. The church needs the improved driveways, traffic flows, and parking, in order to make any drop-off program workable.

Mr. Knoll stated that the church will be responsible for enforcing any pick-up and drop-off plans. Any tenants will be subject to the church's own rules and restrictions regarding use of the property.

Mr. Knoll submitted Exhibit A-11, the church's drop off plans.

Mr. Knoll read aloud a statement, dated 9/12/07, from Ogden Church, to provide for the safety of every person using the church facility and traveling on the local streets:

"The minimum criteria for the required drop-off and pick-up program for the schools will be as follows: traffic will enter the northern entrance to the lot on Elmwood Ave. It will travel in a southerly direction queuing besides the church building, so the children can be dropped off or picked up at the double doors that face Elmwood Ave. The lane closest to the building will be designated for this purpose. Restrictive signs will keep this lane open and free of parking during drop-off and pick-up hours. Violators will be towed. Traffic will egress onto Main St. To the extent feasible and safe, an additional drop-off and pick-up site may include the Main Street entrance to the church, or the proposed sidewalk that will run from the Main Street driveway along the west side of the church. Ogden will coordinate such additional drop-off and pick-up sites with its tenants after consultation and review by appropriate traffic and safety consultants. The church, as landlord, will require the implementation of drop-off and pick-up programs by each of the organizations using Ogden's property. Each organization, including Mothers Morning Out, the Work Family Connection, and the Montessori Academy will provide personnel or volunteers to escort children from their cars to the classrooms. Trained traffic monitors will ensure the smooth flow of traffic and enforce parking restrictions. The beginning and end times of each of the programs utilizing Ogden's facilities will be staggered so as to minimize the number of cars present at any one time."

Mr. Knoll stated that Mr. Moschello can testify as to the capacity for signage. Mr. Knoll pointed out that there are many resources available to the church to construct workable drop-off programs. The church will be looking at all of the resources to come up with one that works after the traffic flow improvements are made on the property.

Mr. Knoll said that any organization that does not follow the rules established by Ogden Church will no longer be a partaker of Ogden's property.

Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Moschello to address the signage issue.

Mr. Moschello stated that the church will probably be proposing 3 signs at most. One sign will be at the southern most side of the parking area. Another sign will be installed

in the middle of the parking lot. The third sign will be located on the northern side of the parking lot. The signs will be 12 inches wide by 24 inches high. These signs will have language stating that no parking will be allowed between the hours of 8 a.m. to 9 a.m., 12 noon to 2 p.m., and 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Any violators will have their vehicles towed at their own expense. Mr. Moschello testified that from where the parking stalls begin to where the parking stalls end will be able to fit 6 or 7 cars in a queuing line.

Mr. Knoll informed the Board, that, at this time, he cannot present a pick-up and drop-off plan “in stone”.

Mayor Plambeck referred Mr. Knoll to the angled parking spaces closest to Elmwood Avenue. These spaces will probably be occupied during the drop-off and pick-up times. Can the church make it possible to have those spaces used by drivers not involved in drop-off and pick-up scenarios?

Mr. Knoll stated that the church will not permit parents to drive in, park in the angled spaces closest to Elmwood Ave., and use that area as a quasi drop-off area. If the parents violate the rules of this drop-off area, they will be warned.

Mrs. Pignatello asked who will supply the traffic monitors. Who will train them?

Mr. Knoll answered that those monitors could be teachers from Mothers Morning Out. The church has experts at Gladstone Design in traffic and safety. They have been working on these plans from the very beginning. They could put a program in place that is safe and effective for everyone.

Mr. Gerridge asked how many spaces were going to be restricted for drop-off times.

Mr. Knoll answered the 11 spaces next to the building.

Mr. Gerridge went over the number of church staff and school employees. He asked where the total of 26 people will park.

Mr. Knoll answered that it was important for the Board to understand that the church does not guarantee a parking space for every person who uses the building. Also, the church does not guarantee spaces for each of its tenants’ employees. The church can restrict the number of parking spaces that they have; however, the church hasn’t reached that point yet. With the number of spaces to be blocked off during drop-off times, there will be 23 spaces that will be available for use that would not be otherwise available for use if the site plan improvements are not obtained. Mr. Knoll believed that more parking will be created on the site and better traffic flows will result if these site plan improvements come about.

Mr. Foster asked if the particular times inscribed on the parking signs are “written in stone”, or are these hours to be determined.

Mr. Knoll stated that the times to be put on the signs will be dependent upon when the church has the outer limits of the staggered pick-up and drop-off times. The hours are not presently set in stone. If the hours should change over the years, the church will get new signs giving the hours of restricted parking.

Councilman Harris asked Mr. Knoll if the church would be willing to make its drop-off plan subject to the approval of the Borough Traffic Safety Committee.

Mr. Knoll answered yes. The church is willing to consult with the Traffic Committee with respect to its traffic plan.

Mr. Gerridge felt the key number in the parking requirement is the 23 people who will be at the Montessori School simultaneously. The last few days, he has counted 29 vehicles at noon. He did not believe ten parking spaces on the other side of Elmwood Ave. could be separated from the church's parking analysis. Mr. Gerridge felt these spaces should be included in the analysis.

Mr. Knoll stated that even if those 10 parking spaces were included, the church wouldn't reach the 48 spaces that would be required.

Mr. Gerridge noted that those 48 spaces are required on Sunday. On Sunday, Ogden Church will soon have 14 parking spaces paved by the Borough, plus the Center Ave. West parking lot, plus parking on the street.

Mr. Knoll pointed out that Reverend Dealtrey has testified that the church is not just a Sunday operation. The church facilities are used for weddings and funerals. Boy Scout meetings are held on Monday night. Mr. Knoll noted that Ogden's membership has expanded and contracted over the years. He anticipates that the membership will grow in future years. He believed the "key number" of parking spaces would be 48. Even if the 10 spaces were included, the number of spaces would total only 43. Mr. Knoll suggested that Mrs. Pat Boettger could speak on that particular intensification (of traffic).

Mr. Montague asked the public if they had any questions concerning the drop-off and pick-up process.

Geoff Barrett, 27 Elmwood Ave., asked if the applicant was then testifying that the 11 spaces that aren't going to be used during pick-up and drop-off times were not going to be needed.

Mr. Knoll answered that was not the testimony. He clarified that the position of the school is that those spaces can be blocked off during pick-up and drop-off hours to facilitate a pick-up and drop-off lane. Using the site plan drawing on the easel, Mr. Moschello explained the drop-off and pick-up process to Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Barrett asked what happened to the 10 spaces after the parents dropped their kids off.

Mr. Knoll answered that when those parking spaces are not restricted, they can be used by people coming and going from the building.

Mr. Barrett expressed concern that those parking spaces would be occupied at 12:15 which is when the pick-up process begins.

Mr. Knoll told him that the parking regulations will be enforced.

Reverend Dealtrey reminded Mr. Barrett that the parking signage warns that vehicles in violation of the regulations are subject to being towed.

Mr. Barrett asked Mr. Moschello what experience did he have with pick-up and drop-off programs.

Mr. Moschello answered that he had personally worked on the drop-off and pick-up program for Far Hills Country Day School.

Mr. Barrett suggested that testimony could be asked of that school.

Mr. Barrett asked if there was an opposition to dropping off the children at the bell tower.

Mr. Knoll answered that the church is more than willing to consider several different drop off points; however, they all need to work together. He felt not everyone could be restricted to drop off at the bell tower. The bell tower is too far away for the children to deal with.

Brenda Hynes, 29 Elmwood Ave., asked when did the Boy Scouts meet at the church facilities.

Mr. Gerridge answered that Troop 8 meets at 7:00 or 7:30 p.m. on Monday night.

Mrs. Hynes asked if there were any parking restrictions on Elmwood Ave. on Monday night.

Mr. Knoll didn't believe so.

Mr. DeNave clarified that the restrictions end at 4 p.m.

Mrs. Hynes and Reverend Dealtrey discussed the hours and weekdays when funerals are held at Ogden Church. Reverend Dealtrey indicated there have been serious parking problems when funerals are held.

Mrs. Hynes asked Mr. Knoll and Mr. Moschello if they agreed that 98% of the traffic issue is between 8 a.m. and 12:00 noon.

Mr. Knoll answered no. He noted that Reverend Dealtrey has given testimony that the church has needed more parking spaces around its facility for years.

Mrs. Hynes said she was just trying to see if this proposed parking lot was really needed. Aside from funerals, she asked if there were any further events at the church between 8:00 a.m. and 12 noon which need parking.

Reverend Dealtrey reiterated that the church does not have enough parking for its own programs. In addition, the proposed parking lot will be used for big events like the Children's Exchange Sale, Fish & Chips Dinner, etc.

Mrs. Hynes asked Mr. Knoll when the church had approached Gladstone Design, did the church request of them the best possible safety plan or ask them for the smallest possible plan in compliance with the HPC.

Mr. Knoll recalled that at the very beginning, when the concept design was forming, the church asked Gladstone Design how many parking spaces could be put on the church's property, and try to preserve as much of the front lawn and the historic tree on the front lawn. Gladstone Design presented the church with a "max-use plan". After some modifications, the church came up with the original Phase I and Phase II Plan that was presented to the Board. The HPC had objections with those original plans. The church then agreed to modify their plan in answer to the objections. Mr. Knoll stated that the other imperative to Gladstone Design was to provide for a safe and effective drop-off space. Gladstone Design was supposed to tell the church how they should go about such a plan. Gladstone Design advised the church that in order to have a safe and effective drop-off system, the drop-off should be as close as possible to the entrances of the church. Children should not exit vehicles from the passenger side into a line of traffic.

Mrs. Hynes asked if Gladstone Design came up with a hybrid type system.

Mr. Knoll answered yes.

Mrs. Hynes asked wasn't it the church's idea to put in as many parking spaces as they could.

Mr. Knoll reminded her that the two objectives of the church's plans were to provide parking for the needs of the church and to provide a safe and effective drop-off method.

Michael Dean, 181 No. Passaic Ave., noted that Mr. Leverich and Mrs. Hynes have put forth a proposal. Was their proposal reviewed by the church's engineer, their tenant's engineer, or the Borough Engineer?

Mr. Knoll answered that their proposal had been reviewed by the church's engineer. He believed Mr. DeNave, the Borough Engineer, has reviewed their plans tonight. The Montessori School has their own engineering firm, but the plans weren't received in time for the firm to review.

Mr. Dean asked if the Board could hear the professional opinions of Mr. DeNave and Mr. Moschello of these proposals from Mr. Leverich and Mrs. Hynes.

Mr. Knoll said he wasn't going to ask an engineer he is paying by the hour to review plans and provide comments back. From Ogden Church's point of view, they need these particular parking spaces.

Mr. Dean asked if Mr. DeNave has given any input on the neighbors' proposal.

Mr. Montague explained that the first time the Borough Engineer had heard the proposal was when it was included in the petition which Mr. Leverich had read tonight. Mr. DeNave has answered the questions given to him; therefore, Mr. Montague felt Mr. DeNave had offered comments. Perhaps there could be more comments.

Mr. Dean asked if the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) had given their recommendations in writing.

Mr. Montague answered that the HPC, represented by Janet Siegel, came before the Board and gave their testimony. The HPC also provided their opinions in writing.

Mr. Dean asked if the Planning Board had voted to accept the HPC's recommendations.

Mr. Montague answered that the Planning Board hasn't taken any vote so far on any activity of this application.

Mr. Foster explained to Mr. Dean that the HPC serves an advisory body in regard to application. In this particular case, the HPC has presented their recommendations, which the Board is taking their comments into consideration.

Mr. Dean said he did not hear from the church's attorney and engineer that they were totally against parking being put in front of the building.

Mr. Montague confirmed with Mr. Dean if he (Mr. Dean) had neither read nor heard the testimony from the HPC. Mr. Dean clarified that he had read the newspaper account of the HPC's recommendations.

Mr. Montague briefly outlined the HPC's written report and testimony.

Mr. Dean suggested the church could still listen to and go forward with some of Mr. Leverich's recommendations. The church paid attention to the HPC's recommendations and the Commission did not have a professional engineering background either. This may achieve a fair balance.

Eileen Dexheimer, 52 Elmwood Ave., was concerned about the southern exit coming back out onto Elmwood Ave. She felt that Elmwood Ave. "is already a disaster". If the

traffic were to come back out onto Elmwood Ave., has Mr. Moschello taken into consideration the cars turning onto Elmwood Ave. with the cars entering Elmwood Ave. from Main Street?

Mr. Moschello answered yes. He stated that when the plan was designed he had taken into account the ability for cars to pull out of the southern parking area and back onto Elmwood Ave. Elmwood Avenue is going to be a 24-ft. wide road. Being 24-ft. wide will give Elmwood Ave. sufficient room to handle a vehicle pulling out onto it and travel northbound.

Mrs. Dexheimer asked how many feet away would the southern exit be from Main Street.

Mr. Moschello answered that from the center of the driveway, it measures 170 feet from Main Street.

Patrick Hynes, 29 Elmwood Ave., noted that Mayor Plambeck had remarked earlier that before he considers this proposed parking lot, he wanted to see a good plan for the drop-off system. The mayor had requested Mr. Knoll to return to the Board with a specific drop-off plan. Mr. Hynes asked Mayor Plambeck if he felt Mr. Knoll's plan "with non-specifics" addresses the concerns of the Board.

Mayor Plambeck said he would have preferred receiving specifics. He pointed out that with changes being made on Coleman Ave. and Elmwood Ave. regarding parking restrictions, people have adapted their behavior accordingly. Should there be any changes on this particular site, it will also have an impact. Mayor Plambeck said he didn't know what the final impact will be. He anticipates that the people's behavior, the amount of traffic, and the direction it will take, will change over time.

Mayor Plambeck raised the question of whether a reasonable drop-off system could be done. He believed it could be done. The fact that certain spaces will be eliminated so the children can safely reach the entrance would make conditions much safer than they are currently.

Bob Leverich, 43 Elmwood Ave., pointed out that Mr. Knoll hadn't referred to the one page document that he had distributed as a "drop-off plan".

Mr. Leverich asked Mr. Knoll if he was a traffic expert.

Mr. Knoll answered no.

Mr. Leverich asked Mr. Knoll if he was a safety expert.

Mr. Knoll answered no.

Mr. Leverich noted that Mr. Knoll had referred to Gladstone Design which purports to be experts in both fields. Mr. Leverich believed that the written statement that Mr. Knoll had distributed on his law firm's letterhead.

Mr. Knoll clarified that the statement was on the church's letterhead.

Mr. Leverich asked if anyone in the church was a traffic or a safety expert.

Mr. Knoll answered no. The church is hiring a traffic and safety expert. Ogden Church has spent a large amount of money hiring Gladstone Design.

Mr. Leverich asked if this document was a drop-off plan or not.

Mr. Knoll answered that it was a minimum criteria plan for drop-off and pick-up plan for the church property.

Mr. Leverich confirmed with Mr. Knoll that he still believed that all 11 parking spaces, during the bulk of the daytime hours, are still essential for the on-going use of the facility.

Mr. Knoll called his next witness, Mrs. Pat Boettger to come forward. Mrs. Boettger was sworn in. Mrs. Boettger stated that she lived at 11 Lum Avenue, Chatham. She is a member of Ogden Church and has been employed by Mothers Morning Out for the past 9 years.

Mrs. Boettger testified that she has observed the traffic pattern at the church because she is in the church building Monday through Friday, approximately from 8:15 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. She stated that she is a "lead teacher" and helps escort the children to and from the Mothers Morning Out facilities. Mrs. Boettger stated that the Mothers Morning Out program deals with two-year-olds. In this program, two-year-olds are hard to separate from their mothers; therefore, the mothers park their vehicles and bring the children inside.

Mrs. Boettger testified last year a drop-off/pick-up system was implemented. In the morning it wasn't mandatory; however, parents could voluntarily queue up in the driveway by the bell tower. A couple of children at a time could be dropped off at that location. One of the teachers or assistants would walk the children into the building and then return to the bell tower to escort more children. In the afternoon, it was mandatory for the parents to queue up in the bell tower parking lot and the teachers would bring the children out to the parents through the church.

Mr. Knoll asked Mrs. Boettger to describe what the typical school day like with regard to the traffic conditions around the property during the last school year.

Mrs. Boettger testified that usually she did not bring her own car to the property because parking was "very much at a premium". Between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 9:15 a.m. the traffic was very congested with mostly the mothers from the Montessori School

dropping off their children. The mothers would remove their children themselves from their vehicles and walk them to the school. The mothers would not leave the building until all of the children had entered the classroom. Even after that task is done, not all of the mothers would leave the building. They would stand outside and chat for a while. Eventually these mothers would move their vehicle so the next group could come in.

Mrs. Boettger said that those particular drop-off times for the Montessori School were scattered basically at 8:30 a.m., 8:45 a.m., and 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Knoll asked Mrs. Boettger why last year the Mothers Morning Out had put in place this pick-up and drop-off program.

Mrs. Boettger explained that Mothers Morning Out has two classrooms in operation. The first classroom runs from 9:15 a.m. until 12:15 p.m. Mrs. Boettger said her own classroom runs from 9:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. There was a serious problem with the mothers trying to park their vehicles and come in to retrieve their children before the mandatory pick-up system was implemented. The Mothers Morning Out Board met and decided they needed to take action. Mrs. Boettger stated that a traffic adviser was not consulted concerning this pick-up system. The Mothers Morning Out employees felt the safest method was to bring the children out under the bell tower so they were no where near traffic. The employees made it mandatory that the mothers must queue up in the bell tower driveway and the children would be delivered out to them. The employees would help buckle the children in their car seats.

Mr. Montague asked how well did this system work.

Mrs. Boettger answered that it worked very well.

Mr. Knoll asked how much more effective would a drop-off and pick-up system for Mothers Morning Out would be if the proposed plan was put into effect and the drop-off lane was moved closer to the red doors.

Mrs. Boettger answered that she was “sketchy” about the drop-off plan because the children in this program are two-years-old. Even at the end of the year there will be new children entering the Mothers Morning Out program. If a mother did the non-mandatory drop-off system, the children would still be crying.

Mr. Knoll asked if any drop-off system for the Mothers Morning Out Program is dependent upon the children’s acclimatization to the program.

Mrs. Boettger answered yes. Not all of the children acclimate.

Mr. Knoll asked what was the current situation with respect to the use of the property by the Montessori School at the same time as the Mothers Morning Out Program.

Mrs. Boettger answered that currently not many cars are seen parking in the Elmwood Ave. parking lot because the Montessori teachers park in the driveway from Elmwood Ave. leading down to the church's garage. This parking arrangement is against the Fire Code. One day there was a fire in the church building and the fire department could not bring the truck town because the teachers' cars were double-parked. The teachers were told not to double park any more. Extra new parking may alleviate this situation.

Mr. Montague confirmed with Mrs. Boettger that these cars were double-stacked on the driveway leading down to the garage. The cars were also six deep on the driveway. Mr. Pfeil and Mr. Gerridge believed the entire driveway is covered with cars all day.

Mrs. Boettger recalled that after the Montessori teachers were told not to do this stacked parking in the driveway any more, they would park parallel on one side and the rest would park on the lawn on the side.

Mr. Knoll asked Mrs. Boettger how much more effective would the over all traffic flow and the parking situation improve on the property if the plan was implemented.

Mrs. Boettger believed the traffic would definitely flow; however, she agreed that closing the one driveway, forcing the drivers to go out onto Main Street, will add to the congestion.

Mr. Montague asked if the public had questions for Mrs. Boettger.

Joe Marts, West Coleman Ave., noted that Mr. Knoll has remarked a number of times that Ogden Church has monetary constraints. He asked if the church was the owner of 186 Main Street, referred to as "Ogden Manse". Mr. Marts noted that the tax bills for 186 Main Street go over to Peapack-Gladstone.

Mr. Knoll indicated that Ogden church did not own that property.

Mr. Knoll asked if he could give his summation.

Mr. Hague suggested the summation be delayed until public comment is given.

Jan Boettger, 45 Elmwood Ave., explained the way the mothers of the Montessori School currently take their children to the church facilities. There is currently parking on the eastern side of Elmwood Ave. The mothers park their cars, remove their older children from their vehicles, stand the child up, reach in for the baby, and cross the two of them across busy Elmwood Ave. The reverse scenario happens when school is finished. Mrs. J. Boettger felt this was very unsafe. She felt the parking flow would improve if the proposed parking and a drop-off at the Elmwood Ave. doors were approved and implemented.

Mrs. J. Boettger stated that several of the older children on Elmwood Ave. have used the church lawn on the Elmwood side as their own personal athletic field. She felt the church

should hold back their proposed paving of that location so that this field can be maintained for these athletic pastimes. She stressed that the church seriously needs this proposed parking lot.

Mark Twentyman, 30 Elmwood Ave., felt that throughout the hearings on this application have been “heavily skewed” towards the church’s needs for parking, which is driven by a Borough ordinance. He believed more attention should be paid to the ordinance regarding setbacks on residential streets. He noted that there is a 30 ft. setback on the Elmwood Ave. side of the church property. He believed the reason for setbacks is to keep an aesthetic appeal for a street. Mr. Twentyman wanted assurance that the rationale behind the 30 ft. setback is factored into the discussions and deliberations made by the Board.

Loren Toolajian, 23 Elmwood Ave., was sworn in to testify. He distributed pages displaying photos to the Board:

Page 1 - photos taken by Peter Hoffman on 9/7/07, 6:30 a.m.

Page 2 - more photos taken by Peter Hoffman on 9/7/07, 6:30 a.m.

Mr. Toolajian described each of the photos:

**Photo 1a** – a view of an adjacent driveway & pedestrian sidewalk looking towards Main Street from 17 Elmwood Ave.

**Photo 1b** – a view from across the street looking at Ogden’s property to the left & 17 Elmwood Ave. on the right, and the church’s garage in the back.

**Photo 2a** – a view of the proposed parking lot from the front lawn of 17 Elmwood Ave., looking up towards Main St.

**Photo 2b** – a view of the proposed parking lot as seen from the driveway of 17 Elmwood Ave.

Mr. Knoll confirmed with Mr. Toolajian that these photos were taken last Friday. Mr. Knoll pointed out that the yellow caution tape shown in some of the photos was taken down a couple of months ago, probably in June. Mr. Knoll asked Mr. Toolajian if he knew whether the yellow caution tape was currently up. Mr. Toolajian answered that he didn’t know.

Mr. Toolajian noted that the church’s representatives have testified that the site plan presented on June 6, 2007 had been developed “with the advice and input and consent of the residents of Elmwood Ave.” Mr. Toolajian said that claim was not true. He testified that the residents of Elmwood Ave., with a few exceptions, are not in favor of a parking lot being constructed in their neighborhood. It is felt this parking lot will support a money-making enterprise, the Montessori School, which is operating in a residential district.

Mr. Toolajian testified that the residents’ petition presented to the Planning Board clearly demonstrates that the residents do not want the proposed parking lot. While Ogden held a few meetings to allegedly collect input from area residents that input was ignored or rejected as “not being what Ogden wanted”. In these meetings, residents asked again and

again that Ogden pursue various drop-off driveway solutions, not a parking lot for the traffic generated from Montessori School. Every plan from the church has proposed a bigger and bigger parking lot.

Mr. Toolajian noted that Bob Leverich and another Elmwood Ave. resident had met with Reverend Dealtrey in a good faith effort to find some common ground. He claimed that these gentlemen were politely dismissed.

Mr. Toolajian testified that he and his family live near Ogden Church and will be adversely impacted by the construction of the busy parking lot. He pointed out that the Borough's zoning ordinances look to protect the quality, safety, and the aesthetics of residential districts and to limit and control any development by non-residential uses, even if permitted. Mr. Toolajian felt that a non-permitted use, such as the Montessori School, should be held to an even higher standard.

Mr. Toolajian urged the Board to reject the church's site plans as they currently stand on the grounds that granting the variances required to develop a huge parking lot on a residential block lot, will be detrimental to the public good and will impair the clear intent of the Zoning ordinances. While the parking lot will be beneficial to Ogden's tenant, this plan introduces negative aspects for area residents and will impact their quality of life, their safety, and aesthetics.

Mr. Toolajian noted that Ogden Church claims that it will use only part of its parking lot for parking while the other part will be used for a drop-off driveway. He questioned how cars can be queuing to drop children off while other cars will be backing out of parking spaces just a few feet away from the drop-off process. He pointed out that there is no other drop-off/pick-up system like this existing in Chatham.

Mr. Toolajian stated that Ogden is proposing a tremendous amount of new parking while a few feet across on Elmwood Ave., the Borough plans on maintaining the majority of the existing head-in parking as part of its re-engineering of the street later this year. Mr. Toolajian predicted that with two parking lots soon to be opposite each other Elmwood Ave., a traffic nightmare will result. Mr. Toolajian pointed out that the entrance to the church's parking lot will be at most 3 feet from the driveway at 17 Elmwood Ave.

Mr. Toolajian predicted any queuing of cars that may result with the church's parking will be violating the new parking and standing regulations recently imposed by the Borough Council. Pedestrians going to and from Main Street, train commuters, students of the Montessori School, will have to deal with crossing the entrance and exits of the church's proposed parking lot.

Mr. Toolajian noted that Elmwood Ave. is a street that has a history of drainage problems. He believed that the additional impervious coverage the proposed parking lot will create is not a good move.

Mr. Toolajian said the photos that he has submitted to the Board tonight should prove how the proposed parking lot will be easily visible and will effectively change the aesthetics of the block.

Mr. Toolajian summed up his testimony by urging Board members to stand up for the Elmwood Ave. residents and their beliefs about this proposed plan.

Mark Conklin, 55 Clinton Ave., New Providence NJ, stated he is a long-time member of Ogden Church.

Mr. Conklin said he was surprised to hear that the statement that the proposed parking lot and drop-off location will create safety issues when there are still currently cars in the street. The children are still walking across the street and across driveways. The proposed plans will not be adding any more risk than what is there now. If anything, it is hoped that the plans will remove that risk.

Mr. Conklin noted that the church has come up with a plan, which may not meet everyone's expectations, but at least it gets the children closer to the doors and gets the traffic moving along. Like St. Patrick's School, the church can put cones up if it has to. Mr. Conklin pointed out that if the proposed parking lot is not approved, the problem will not go away. He felt that there would never be a proposal that everyone would approve of. Mr. Conklin believed that the church had listened to their neighbors' comments; however, they were very aware of what the options would be.

Bob Leverich, 43 Elmwood Ave., stated that the safety issue will be solved by having a "reasonable and workable drop-off solution". He felt that the number of parking spaces have nothing to do with this situation. He said the size of the proposed parking lot is the real issue with the neighbors. The neighbors fully agree with the drop-off plan. It's just a question of the magnitude of the parking lot.

Joe Marts, 14 West Coleman Ave., said he respected the recommendations given by the HPC; however, he urged the Board to respect the wishes of the residents. As a realtor, Mr. Marts said Elmwood Ave. has always been a special street. Many people have waited years to purchase a home on that street. He felt it would be a huge mistake to put a parking lot at the entrance to Elmwood Avenue. Mr. Marts strongly urged the Board to vote on having the parking on the front of the property. He believed such an arrangement could be tastefully done and adequately screened.

Peter Gillim, 34 Elmwood Ave., reported that for the last two years since Ogden Church improved their leaders from their roof gutters out to the streets, Elmwood Ave. has experienced severe flooding problems during any rain storm. He asked the Board to consider three items:

- 1) Certification that the sump drains will do what they should be doing and that the Borough system will be able to handle that run-off without creating another "Lake Lehman" in front of 37 Elmwood Ave.

2) Any construction by Ogden Church does not begin until the Borough's improvements are in place to handle the run-off.

3) Put the above two items in writing, so residents will know where to go to repair any damages.

Mr. Montague noted the lateness of the hour. He suggested Mr. Knoll give his summation at the next meeting, October 3, 2007. Mr. Knoll agreed. Permission was given to extend the deadline for approval of the application. The Board indicated that public comments will also be held over to the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Mr. Knoll offered to bring back Ogden Church's expert witnesses to that meeting to answer any more questions.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler  
Planning Board Recording Secretary

