

CHATHAM BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

October 10, 2007

7:30 p.m.

Chairman H.H. Montague called the Chatham Borough Planning Board meeting of October 10, 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: Chairman H.H. Montague, John Hague, David Gerridge, James Mitchell, Bill Jankowski, Councilman Bruce Harris.

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

Members Absent: Alison Pignatello, Thomas Sennett, Alan Pfeil, Mayor Richard Plambeck.

This meeting was televised live on Channel 21.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes of July 18, 2007 were approved as amended.

Ogden Memorial Presbyterian Church Application – 286 Main Street – a continuation
Vincent DeNave, Borough Engineer, was present.

The following representatives from Ogden Church were present:

Mark Knoll, Esq., attorney

Robert Moschello, engineer

The Reverend Dale Dealtrey, pastor

Mr. Knoll introduced Doug Polyniak, a traffic expert with Dolan & Dean, the traffic engineers hired by Ogden Church. Mr. Knoll submitted Exhibit A-14, a letter from Dolan & Dean dated 10/8/07.

Mr. Knoll recalled that at the last hearing, a request had been made to Mr. Polyniak that he put something in writing to support the proposed traffic flow and drop-off patterns discussed at that meeting. Mr. Polyniak will also present testimony regarding the proposed concept plan presented at the last meeting and the effectiveness of the proposed drop-off plan.

Douglas Polyniak was sworn in to testify. He submitted his professional credentials as a traffic expert to the Board. The Board accepted his credentials.

Mr. Polyniak testified that his firm, Dolan & Dean, has been working with the church and their engineer to come up with the best design for all of the aspects of the Montessori School, the Work Family Connection, and the Mothers Morning Out Program. He felt the proposed design has allowed for the segregation of the activities at the church facilities, either via timing or by distance. The time periods of these different programs will be staggered. There can be stacking along the building frontage of approximately 9 vehicles prior to impacting any of the operations on Elmwood Ave. The striping of on-site parking will alleviate the demand of parking within the Borough, specifically along Main Street and the surrounding roadways close to the church.

Mr. Polyniak felt that the proposed design is very good, and will alleviate the congestion and the parking demand that is currently imposed on the municipal streets.

At Mr. Knoll's request, Mr. Polyniak pointed out on the site plan the staging locations at the frontage. He testified that nine vehicles could use this frontage prior to interfering with the Elmwood Ave. traffic.

Mr. Knoll summarized the letter (Exhibit A-14) from Dolan & Dean. It is Dolan & Dean's conclusion, based upon review of the proposed site plan that this traffic design will greatly improve the traffic flows around the church property.

Mr. Knoll asked if there were any questions for Mr. Polyniak.

Mr. Montague asked Mr. Polyniak to explain the traffic flow and drop-off/pick-up method. He also asked for testimony on the specific locations of where vehicles would pick up and drop off children, and the reasons why these locations were designated.

Mr. Polyniak pointed out the 5 southern parking spaces along the building's frontage. Two of these spaces will be south of the drop-off area and three spaces will be to the north. The southern spaces will be reserved for the Mothers Morning Out Program. There will be a drop-off area for the Work Family Connection at the front of the building at the bell tower. Students will come by bus. The bus will park for 5 to 10 minutes for drop off and pick-up. During the tail end of this drop off, Montessori starts its drop-off process. Parents will enter from the northerly Elmwood Ave. driveway, progress south through the parking lot, and will drop off their child at the 30 ft. wide curbed area. There will be staff at that location to assist with drop-off to make the process move smoothly. After dropping their child off, parents have the option to either exit via the southern Elmwood Ave. driveway or onto Main Street.

Mr. Polyniak testified after the Montessori drop-off process is finished, the Mothers Morning Out Program starts its drop-off procedure. Since the children in this program are very young, the parents will want to park their vehicles and walk the children into the building. There will be 5 spaces reserved at the front for Mothers Morning Out parking.

Mr. Montague asked if there would be any signage or labeling for these 5 parking spaces to clarify what they are to be used for.

Mr. Polyniak suggested that either signage with specific language be installed, or the spaces could be coned off by the staff.

Mr. Gerridge asked why the spaces right in the middle of the drop-off section would be reserved. Why not reserved the angled spaces further up for the Mothers Morning Out?

Mr. Polyniak explained that the Mothers Morning Out drop-off procedure takes place at the Montessori drop-off location. The site should be a lot quieter at that time. There should be no issue with vehicles backing up and entering those spaces. There should be sufficient aisle width. Also, those particular spaces were picked because of the young age of the children, and those spaces should be located as close to the building as possible.

Mr. Montague noted that there is a 10 ft. wide space between the sanctuary church and the school building. What will that space be used for? Is parking being proposed there?

Mr. Knoll answered that currently that location is used for parking; however, it also leads to an emergency exit that's between the main sanctuary and the kitchen area next to the fellowship room. It serves as an egress from the emergency doors.

Mr. Montague asked if there was a reasonable understanding that this section may be used for parking during the time when parking is needed

Mr. Knoll answered yes.

Mr. Gerridge asked if the queuing of cars ever gets longer than 9 spaces. He asked how many cars arrive over what period of time. Based on that, how did Mr. Polyniak calculate the maximum length of the queue?

Mr. Polyniak answered that it wasn't so much as an actual calculation. It was based on the experience Dolan & Dean had with similar schools.

Councilman Harris asked Mr. Polyniak if his 9 space queue then is not based on looking at the arrival rates for drop-off or looking at the processing time for people to unload their children, and then drive off.

Mr. Polyniak answered yes; Dolan & Dean have familiarity with this type of drop off. This drop-off process can take anywhere from 45 seconds to one minute. It depends mainly on what staff is available to escort the children to and from the vehicles.

Mr. Knoll confirmed with Mr. Polyniak that the 9 space queue would provide adequate space.

Mr. Montague asked whether in order to make this queuing and drop-off plan work, would some sort of supervision be put in place to make sure vehicles keep moving? Or would the process work okay by itself?

Mr. Polyniak said he would first make sure every parent be notified of the proposed operation. Second, he would recommend that someone, like a monitor, be assigned to supervise and help with this drop-off process.

Mr. DeNave referred Mr. Polyniak to the traffic study which Dolan & Dean did a year ago. What were the counts for the peak hour or peak half-hour?

Mr. Polyniak answered that he couldn't recall the exact number; however, he estimated up to 60 vehicles.

Mr. Montague asked that if supervision was provided, would the pick-up/drop-off time be no greater than 45 seconds to 1 minute.

Mr. Polyniak answered yes.

Mr. Montague asked if Mr. Polyniak's study takes into consideration that more than one vehicle is unloading a child during this pick-up/drop-off process.

Mr. Polyniak answered no; however, including that scenario would be beneficial to the study. Significant safety factors are included to make the this process operate smoothly.

Mr. Montague asked Mr. Polyniak if his plan assumes that there may be a parent who, for some reason, may want to park their vehicle and escort their child into the building.

Mr. Polyniak said that parents will not be allowed to park in the queuing lane.

Mr. Montague confirmed with Mr. Polyniak that the staff will not arrive on the site the same time the queuing goes. Mr. Polyniak stated that the staff will already be on site.

Referring to the October 3rd plan presented last week by the applicant, Mr. Foster asked Mr. Polyniak to comment on the moving of the southerly Elmwood Ave. driveway further south. Also, could he comment on the no left turn requirements for exiting traffic at that driveway?

Mr. Polyniak felt that this was an appropriate location for the southerly driveway. He wasn't sure if the left hand turn prohibition on Elmwood Ave. was necessary.

Mr. Foster asked if he felt the left turn prohibition would reduce the traffic flow through the residential area north of the site.

Mr. Polyniak answered yes, probably in the immediate vicinity, further towards the north.

Mr. Hague brought up the staggering of the arrival times on the site. He understood families will be assigned slots of arrival times. Mr. Hague asked Mr. Polyniak if the school that he compared this to had a similar feature?

Mr. Polyniak answered yes. In addition to adding staff, the assigned arrival times are another way to deal with queuing and congestion on the site. He believed there was a certain amount of staggering occurring with the Montessori. The Mothers Morning Out program will have their drop-offs staggered.

Mr. Montague asked Mr. Polyniak what would be the total number of cars that can be parked on these parking areas. How is this total number calculated?

Mr. Polyniak answered that there are 28 striped parking spaces being proposed.

Mr. Montague asked if that number of spaces included the emergency lane.

Mr. Polyniak answered no.

Mr. Montague confirmed with Mr. Polyniak that one or two more spaces could be put in that lane.

Mr. Polyniak noted that he counted two parking spaces in front of the garage.

Councilman Harris believed that 3 parking spaces could fit in the emergency lane.

Mr. Montague calculated a total of 33 parking spaces.

Mr. Knoll agreed with this total. If Mr. Gerridge's idea about the handicap spaces not being counted during the day was used, there would be 31 parking spaces on the property.

Councilman Harris noted that there are 10 parking spaces on the other side of Elmwood Avenue.

Mr. Montague pointed out that at the present time those particular spaces are for straight-in parking for x-number. He believed when the Borough makes their improvements to Elmwood Ave., those spaces will be for head-in parking. The number of these head-in spaces is still not known.

Mr. Gerridge believed there would be at least 8 parking spaces at that location, if they were parallel spaces. Eleven spaces could be created if there was angled parking. For the Borough to create a 24-foot width, they would have to push the curb on the west side closer to the utility poles. Perhaps Mr. DeNave could clarify the number and type of parking spaces in that area.

Mr. DeNave stated that the angled parking that could be accommodated on the church property would consist of 11 spaces. The Borough's plans for Elmwood Ave. will shift the 24-foot pavement width over towards the church. Even though the back of vehicles will be sticking out into the Borough's right-of-way, they won't be within the 24-foot pavement way, the traveled way. The church will need an agreement from the Borough in order for them to occupy that area. If the church chooses to improve that area, they will need a further agreement with the church.

Mr. Knoll brought up that there had been a discussion about removing the 4 parking spaces on the Elmwood Ave. side of the parking area in the northeast corner. Would this removal have a positive or negative effect on the over-all traffic flows and patterns around the property?

Mr. Polyniak answered that any removal of parking on the site would have a negative traffic impact on the Borough in the vicinity of the site, because more of the demand would be put on the municipal roadways, not on the site itself. Providing a pick-up/drop-off area and striped parking spaces will help the burden currently on the Borough.

Mr. Montague asked if one space was removed, ten feet more of green space would result. Could the impact of such an action be measured?

Mr. Polyniak felt that such a removal would put an extra vehicle on the municipal roadways.

Mr. Montague asked the public if they had questions for Mr. Polyniak.

Bob Leveridge, 43 Elmwood Ave., asked what would be the final number of parking spaces.

Mr. Montague believed it would be 33 parking spaces.

Mr. Leveridge asked if that number did not include the existing parking area on Elmwood Ave. A lot depends on the configuration of that particular area.

Mr. Montague agreed.

Mr. Leveridge asked if there would then be a maximum of 44 parking spaces and a minimum of 38 parking spaces.

Mr. Hague believed it would be a minimum of 33 parking spaces, since there is no guarantee that parking will be allowed on the other side. The Elmwood Ave. parking lot is an isolated lot. A "D" variance is required to reconfigure it. The church may or may not obtain this variance. To reach the desired 11 parking spaces, the church needs an agreement with the municipality in order to use a portion of the municipality's lot or right-of-way. Mr. Hague said his own calculation is for 33 parking spaces. In his mind, that is the number being proposed.

Mr. Leveridge asked if it was fair for the Board to decide on this application when it's not even known how many parking spaces the church will end up with.

Mr. Montague clarified that the applicant has presented drawings and has requested 33 spaces. The Board is obligated to make a decision based on the application. Those parking spaces on the other side of Elmwood Ave. are not part of this application.

Mr. Leveridge brought up the 4 proposed parking spaces previously discussed. He felt that those 4 spaces could be moved. A net loss of 2 spaces would result. He believed that was what was agreed upon at last week's meeting with Mr. Gerridge's recommendations. He recalled Mr. Gerridge had suggested eliminating the tree on the southern corner of Elmwood Ave. to create one extra space. Also, one extra space could be created on the church's front lawn.

Mr. Montague said he understood that those there 4 parking spaces that could be given up if the Board decided or the applicant decided to add one space up front, one space towards the exit, which would buy back one of the 4 spaces. If a space was added towards the exit, it would buy back another of the 4 spaces. This arrangement was left as an open issue. Nobody formally agreed to it.

Mr. Leveridge felt the proposed plan would be made safer if these 4 parking spaces were eliminated. He asked Mr. Polyniak if those 4 parking spaces were eliminated, wouldn't that make the drive-through safer?

Mr. Polyniak answered no. He felt the proposed parking lot was property designed to make maneuvers. Those parking spaces will be used by the faculty and staff on the site, so there will be no conflict with the drive-through maneuvers. Also, if those parking spaces were eliminated, the faculty and staff would be required to park somewhere else in the municipality.

Ken Ryan, 51 Elmwood Ave., noted that testimony had been given that the parents will be given notification about the correct drop-off/pick-up procedure. He asked Mr. Polyniak if in his expert opinion this notification will actually work. Mr. Ryan said he has seen numerous violations made by these parents.

Mr. Polyniak agreed that parents, when they are driving, will do what they want to do. Making this notification is better than doing nothing.

Mr. Foster said testimony had been given that if the parents violate the regulations, it will be addressed. Mr. Knoll added that there are mechanisms in place to enforce the rules. The church, as the landlord, cannot guarantee that the rules won't be broken; however, the net positive effect of putting in the traffic flow improvements and the parking so far outweighs the negative impact of the current situation that it clearly weighs in favor of granting the application.

Mr. Ryan asked if anyone has been penalized yet for violating the procedure.

Mr. Knoll answered he wasn't aware of any penalizations.

Mr. Ryan asked with these extra spaces will the church allow members of the congregation, who live out of town, park in these extra spaces to commute by train to the city.

Mr. Knoll answered that he himself had parked at the church this morning to take the train, he sincerely hoped so. He had to park his car in the church this morning to take the train into town. There is no direct train from Chatham to his home in Peapack. He hoped the church will allow him to continue this arrangement.

Mr. Ryan asked how many people will be allowed to do this. Mr. Ryan reported that he has observed particular individuals, members of the church, who live out of town who use the church parking. He asked Mr. Knoll if these proposed new parking spaces will be used by other members of the congregation to take advantage of the Chatham train station without paying a fee or going somewhere else.

Mr. Knoll answered that the proposed spaces will not be an adjunct parking for the train station parking. He said he uses the church parking because of meetings he has to attend at night.

Mr. Montague pointed out that the church owns this particular property and they will administer the rules. One way or another, the church will resolve this issue.

Mr. Knoll assured Mr. Montague that the church will observe and respond to any future issues that may come up regarding the parking and drop off/pick up system.

In response to Mr. Ryan's claims, Reverend Dealtrey asked Mr. Knoll if he used the church parking on days when meetings are not held.

Mr. Knoll answered no.

Reverend Dealtrey asked Mr. Knoll if he used the church's parking lot as his own personal space when commuting by train.

Mr. Knoll answered no. He said he looked for a parking space at the train this morning, but when he arrived at the station at 7:05 p.m. there were no parking spaces available. It was raining, he tore his clothes, and he ended up parking in the church lot.

Reverend Dealtrey asked Mr. Knoll if he was aware of any Ogden members who are eyeing parking spaces on the church property to avoid paying parking fees at the station.

Mr. Knoll answered no.

Liz Landy, 39 Elmwood Ave., asked Mr. Polyniak if he typically spent a lot of time on the site observing the behavior of the people using the church facilities and the traffic in that vicinity.

Mr. Polyniak answered yes; he has to visit a site to see how it operates.

Mrs. Landy asked when was the last time he was at this particular site in the morning hours from 8:40 a.m. to 9:15 a.m.

Mr. Polyniak answered a few months ago. He offered to look up the exact month.

Mrs. Landy asked Mr. Polyniak if he had observed a queue she had seen going out onto Main Street and up Main Street at 8:40 a.m.

Mr. Polyniak answered that he wasn't on the site at that time.

Mrs. Landy believed the exit going onto Elmwood Ave. didn't make sense, because a motorist has to make a right turn back onto Main Street any way. She felt it would be better to direct all the traffic back to Main Street to take the right hand turn. She asked why that exit couldn't be blocked off. That may provide a better traffic flow.

Mr. Polyniak answered that what is being proposed will provide two ways to exit onto Main Street. DOT policy promotes alternative accesses and the restriction of movements on state highways. Mr. Polyniak felt this proposed plan would be more in favor with DOT than just allowing one egress onto the state highway.

Brenda Hynes, 29 Elmwood Ave., brought up the new parking arrangements being proposed for the existing parking lot on Elmwood Ave. Wouldn't there be a safety issue with vehicles coming out of the Elmwood Ave. exit and turning left? There will be vehicles coming onto Elmwood Ave. from Main Street and vehicles pulling out after dropping off and picking up. She felt those were dangerous conditions.

Mr. Polyniak answered that the whole purpose of the site design is to alleviate that particular action on Elmwood Ave. He felt that the restriction of left hand movements there will not be much of a conflicting movement at that location.

Ms. Hynes pointed out that vehicles will also be pulling in and out of the Elmwood Ave. parking lot.

Mr. Polyniak said that only right turns will be allowed for vehicles exiting the southern driveway. At that location there will be a stop sign and sufficient sight distance.

Jan Boettger, 45 Elmwood Ave., reported that she is an active member of Ogden Church. Her home is just a little ways up from the church. She pointed out that if she is not allowed to make a left turn when leaving the church property to get home, she would

have to take a large roundabout route via Main Street, Coleman Ave. and Weston Ave. drive home. She asked if she would be allowed to make a left turn.

Mr. Knoll answered that the left turn restriction was made as a concession to the other Elmwood Ave. residents during weekdays. He understood the inconvenience it would be for Mrs. Boettger.

Peter Hoffman, 17 Elmwood Ave., pointed out the space between the church sanctuary and the administration building. A maximum of 3 parking spaces could fit in that area. Would the Board consider utilizing that particular area for parking, mainly for the staff, in order to minimize the amount of paved surface closer to the sidewalk and lessen the severity of the variance being sought?

Mr. Foster stated that particular area is already included in the 33 parking spaces.

Mr. Hoffman asked if the church's parking needs during the school day could be reviewed for the audience. Currently there seems to be adequate parking on the church grounds. Is there a way to clarify what the needs are versus the 33 spaces so the Board can decide whether the request by the applicant is excessive?

Mr. Knoll said that the applicant has already presented abundant testimony on the use of the property and the number of spaces the church thinks they will need. Mr. Knoll pointed out that the church is asking for fewer spaces than it really needs. Mr. Knoll gave Mr. Hoffman a copy of the employee counts.

Mr. Hoffman asked if the 38 staff members on the church grounds all at the same time.

Mr. Knoll answered no. That information is on the employee counts.

Mr. Hoffman asked if the church would be willing to sit down with the residents and find a way to preserve some green space on Elmwood Ave. Could the church find somewhere else to put the 4 parking spaces?

Mr. Knoll answered that he conducted a half dozen meetings with both the Coleman Ave. neighbors and the Elmwood Ave. neighbors starting back in August. Mr. Knoll noted that considerable changes have been made to the original concept plans. The church has taken into consideration almost all of the concerns expressed by Coleman Ave. residents. Mr. Knoll said Ogden would like a definite decision made now. They have spent well over \$50,000 in engineering fees to come up with the concept plans. To put these plans in final form will cost even more. The church would like to move forward with the current plan.

Mr. Hoffman asked if Ogden Church is willing to implement any of the suggestions of the residents, aside from the left turn restriction.

Mr. Knoll pointed out that the church has also, on the concept plan, shifted parking 50 or 60 feet as originally proposed. Tonight's proposed plan will improve the traffic flow and provide parking that is definitely needed.

Mr. Hoffman asked Mr. Polyniak if he had been on the block since the new parking regulations were implemented.

Mr. Polyniak answered yes.

Mr. Hoffman asked Mr. Polyniak, if it was his professional opinion, that there was still a parking problem now that the Borough has implemented these new regulations.

Mr. Polyniak answered that the demand for the facility is 38 spaces. If those 38 spaces are not provided, those spaces will end up somewhere else.

Mr. Hoffman asked where are these people currently parking who need these 38 spaces.

Mr. Polyniak said he didn't know where these people are parking right now. He does, however, know a demand has been put on Borough parking and that this proposed parking could alleviate this demand.

Councilman Harris suggested the landscaping be discussed.

Mr. Knoll stated that the church will plant 4 foot shrubs, instead of the original 3 ½ ft. shrubs.

Mr. Montague asked what height these plants would eventually grow to.

Mr. Moschello answered that these plants can grow to an average of 4 to 5 feet, depending on what the landscaper wants to trim them to.

Councilman Harris noted that there had been a discussion about parking in the front yard. These plantings were to block the view of the parking at that location. He asked for more details regarding these plantings.

Mr. Moschello answered these plantings would be similar to the species types that will be planted along Elmwood Avenue. These shrubs will measure 3 ½ feet to 4 feet when planted.

Mr. Gerridge confirmed with Mr. Moschello that the plantings shown along the east side of the parking spaces would also be installed along the drop-off lane.

Mr. Moschello said that these latest developments concerning the plantings will be shown on the revised plans.

Mr. Montague asked the public if they had any questions concerning the plantings.

Liz Landy, 39 Elmwood Ave., asked if the shrubs proposed to go in along Elmwood Ave. would be evergreens, or a flowering plant?

Mr. Moschello answered that the plantings would be the type to provide adequate screening. They will not be the type to **lose** their greenery during certain seasons.

Mr. Montague invited the public to now give comments and testimony.

Jan Boettger, 45 Elmwood Ave., reiterated the church's needs for a parking lot. She felt the latest plan submitted by the church and Mr. Knoll made sense in terms of safety. The proposed parking will eliminate the current play area for the neighborhood children. She felt that could be a reason why the Elmwood Ave. parents are objecting to this proposed parking lot. As a choir member who attends rehearsals at night, she prefers to park on the church property itself. She felt the proposed parking lot will not change the values of the neighborhood houses.

Liz Landy, 39 Elmwood Ave., said the neighborhood children will find another place to play. Mrs. Landy said she has lived on Elmwood Ave. for 10 years. She believed there was only a parking and traffic issue since the Montessori School started operating in the church building. She said she could not remember any weddings or funerals that have overflowed the existing parking spaces on Elmwood Ave. Mrs. Landy also claimed she has never seen the existing spaces on Elmwood Ave. full on a Sunday during services. She noted that parking is not an issue when the Boy Scouts meet at the church on Monday nights. Mrs. Landy noted that since the Borough's latest parking regulations were enforced on Elmwood Ave. and Coleman Ave., the parking has improved. She asked the Board to take serious consideration on the types of shrubbery for landscaping this parking lot.

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

At 9:25 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Sue Keating, 28 Elmwood Ave., stated that she and her husband have lived on Elmwood Ave. for almost 10 years. She said that parking for the church has never been a problem. Church parking on Sunday has never spilled down Elmwood Ave. She said she had no problem with a parking lot on the church property. Mrs. Keating felt that the church needed parking spaces there; however, she was concerned about the scope and the number of spaces when it seems the church doesn't need it. So many questions have come up about the use of the parking lot for the school and the drop-off/pick-up procedure. She agreed that parking is needed, but not of this scope. Mrs. Keating described the process used by the pre-school program run by Stanley Congregational Church.

Ken Ryan, 51 Elmwood Ave., believed that without the Montessori School, Ogden Church would have a hard time surviving. It's still unclear how a Certificate of

Occupancy was issued for this for-profit organization. Some error was made in the government on this action. As a result of this error, a lease was granted to a franchise. Mr. Ryan said he hoped the Borough holds insurance for this type of error. He pointed out that the Board is now put in the difficult position of being asked to support a for-profit organization to keep a church alive. He urged the Board take everything into consideration, possibly putting in a parking lot, but not as massive as some of the ones that have been approved. Mr. Ryan reported on the number of empty parking spaces he counted at the existing Elmwood Ave. parking lot for the last four Sundays. The count also included the number of empty spaces in the near-by Borough parking lot. The number was between 22 spaces to 28 spaces.

Jeff Barrett, 27 Elmwood Ave., felt that the decision the Board makes will make an affect for the next 100 years. Once the grass is gone on that property, the pavement will stay. He felt the property values will drop for the homes close to this proposed parking lot. He pointed out that this proposed lot will be “a parking solution” for a school that wasn’t on the church property 2 ½ years ago. The due diligence for that school was not done. Mr. Barrett asked the Board to give the residents some measure of relief. He asked the Board to consider the scope of this proposed parking.

Bob Leveridge, 43 Elmwood Ave., asked the Board to consider the comments of the Elmwood Ave. residents as seriously as they took the comments from the Historic Preservation Commission. He noted that the residents are in favor of a drop-off and are not opposed to some parking spaces. However, this particular plan has far too much parking. The parking issue comes from the use of the Montessori School. Mr. Leveridge recalled at the last meeting, Board member Mr. Gerridge suggested a modification of this plan by eliminating 2 of the four spaces and moving two spaces to other locations. Mr. Gerridge felt this modification would create a significantly larger amount of green space than the present plan. Mr. Leveridge felt that compromise would not be asking too much. He asked the Board to consider it.

Eileen Dexheimer, 52 Elmwood Ave., said she wished Board members could stand and actually observe what goes on during the drop-off/pick-up process on the church property at 8:30 a.m. or 11:30 a.m. She reported that it is a nightmare. She felt this drop-off/pick-up system “doesn’t seem real on paper”. She pointed out that the church and the school uses that particular green side lawn every day for play time. Mrs. Dexheimer questioned where will the children play after that green space is gone. She described a recent bus incident unloading at the church building that she felt was unsafe. She asked if unsafe practices are already being conducted for the school, what assurance can the church give that their proposed plans will be safe.

Peter Gillim, 34 Elmwood Ave., stated that he has lived for 20 years on Elmwood Ave. He noted that Elmwood Ave. is “a kid street”. He hated to see the green space, where the children play, become a paved lot.

Brenda Hynes, 29 Elmwood Ave., stated an “interesting situation” which will result if this proposed plan is approved. She reviewed the number of parking lots that Elmwood

Ave. residents will have to deal with when driving towards Main Street. Mrs. Hynes felt that moving those 4 parking spaces, as suggested earlier, would be an aesthetically better idea. She suggested the parallel parking spots owned by the Borough be taken into consideration with this plan. She felt Stanley Congregational Church's school parking works well.

Reverend Dale Dealtrey brought up the issue of removing one or two of the parking spaces. She reminded the Board that the church's original application proposed some 20 parking spaces on Main Street. The present application now proposes only 4 spaces on Main Street. She pointed out that the church has considerably reduced the scope of their proposed parking. Every space that is taken away will impact not just the Borough, but the church itself. She has heard complaints from people attending funerals at the church, who have difficulty finding a place to park. Rev. Dealtrey said she has observed the drop-off procedure at Stanley Church. She has spoken with the director and the teachers of the school at Stanley Church. They informed her that they receive complaints from residents all the time about parents' parking. Rev. Dealtrey stated that the church is not happy to cover up green space. Her own office overlooks that green space and she enjoys seeing the children play on that lawn. If Ogden Church could afford underground parking to avoid taking this green space, they would do it.

There were no more public comments.

Mr. Montague noted that there is a motion on the table.

Mr. Foster recalled that at the last meeting Mr. Hague had tabled his motion. He now has the right to bring the motion up for consideration again.

Mr. Hague stated based on what he has heard, he is not willing to withdraw or modify his motion. He urged the Board to move forward with their discussion and then vote. Mr. Hague noted that the Board has a final resolution which articulates the conditions adequately. Following the Board's vote, a resolution could be adopted tonight or the next meeting after Board members study it.

Mr. Hague reiterated his motion to approve this proposed plan, based on the reasons he had stated at the last meeting. He recalled that in his earlier motion he had listed 18 conditions. Mr. Hague reviewed the 18th condition: "The applicant shall not be issued any permits or approvals for construction of any of the contemplated improvements until it has received final site plan approval from the Board evidenced by a resolution of approval specifically confirming satisfaction of all conditions of this resolution other than Condition #7."

Councilman Harris pointed out that one of Mr. Hague's conditions is one that the Borough is not in a position to implement. This condition requires that the Chatham Police Department approve the drop-off plan. That is not feasible. The Board shouldn't be delegating that responsibility to the Police Department. Councilman Harris suggested that the Board, instead of voting on Mr. Hague's motion, could negotiate the terms of a

resolution with conditions for approval. Councilman Harris stated he would like to get a sense of the Board before they negotiate these conditions.

Councilman Harris pointed out that the instances of when Ogden Church has been added on to over the years, the church had never taken any steps to address its parking needs. He felt that the church had assumed that street parking and Borough parking would always be available. He noted that the 43 spaces being proposed, including the handicap spaces, will be giving the church more spaces than their own data indicates the church actually needs. Councilman Harris stated that parking spaces are available on Sunday. He noted that he is willing to allow for some parking in the front lawn. Based on the data submitted by the church, Councilman Harris believed the church can give up those 4 spaces that have been under discussion or move them and they will still be meeting their parking needs. Councilman Harris stated he would not support the plans as they are presented right now.

Mr. Gerridge noted that the plans show that the driveway into the drop-off lane had been widened to go into the drip line of the large existing tree on the west side. He recalled Mr. Moschello explained the reason for this was because of the turning radius of the bus. Mr. Gerridge noted that the Shade Tree Commission had requested that tree be saved.

Mr. Moschello indicated he was willing to make an adjustment for this tree.

On other issues, Mr. Gerridge recalled that the original application proposed 31 parking spaces. The church had offered to block off 6 of those parking spaces during the drop-off time. This gave the impression that the church really needed only 25 spaces. Mr. Gerridge said, like Councilman Harris, he has trouble accepting the number of spaces being proposed. He felt it came down to balancing the historic façade of the church, the green spaces, and the church's needs for parking. Mr. Gerridge felt the drop-off can be made to work. He felt the 4 spaces that have been under discussion are not justified, at least not yet.

Mr. Montague stated that it would be beneficial to the Borough if this additional private parking could be provided. This would free up more parking spaces in the downtown area. He could accept the idea of moving two of the four parking spaces to the front and moving the green space forward.

Mr. Montague asked the Board if there was any missing information that would give them reason to delay their vote.

Councilman Harris asked if the applicant is willing to change their plans along the lines that have been discussed.

After further discussion, Councilman Harris stated that if the church is willing to give up the four parking spaces between the walkway and the northwest green space, and re-arrange their plans, he is willing to negotiate a resolution with conditions. He felt the conditions, as they stand now, are not feasible.

Mr. Gerridge reviewed his proposal for the 4 parking spaces. His proposal would shift the southern most driveway over 1 or 2 feet. An angled parking space could be installed in that section.

Mr. Moschello, Mr. Knoll, and Reverend Dealtrey consulted privately for a minute.

Mr. Knoll went up to site plan on the easel. He pointed out the 4 parking spaces will be eliminated. He pointed out the remaining spaces would now be shifted slightly to the north. The sidewalk may also have to be shifted northward. An angled crosswalk could be installed. Mr. Knoll noted that the Church's Session would have to approve of these proposed changes.

Mr. Moschello made these recommended adjustments to the plans:

- 1) Removal of the northernmost 4 parking spaces in the row of spaces closest to Elmwood Ave.
- 2) Add one parking space to the group of proposed 5 spaces located in the church's front lawn
- 3) Add one parking space to the row of parking spaces located closest to the east side of the buildings.

There will now a net loss of 2 onsite parking spaces, and the total number of parking spaces on the site would be reduced from 33 to 31.

Mr. Hague suggested the type of the plantings be decided on. He recommended an evergreen. He also recommended removing the condition requiring police approval. Councilman Harris said he would consult with the Borough Administrator on who should monitor the traffic situation.

Mr. Foster noted that a week ago the Board had asked him to prepare a resolution in accordance with Mr. Hague's motion. Mr. Foster said he will now need authorization from the Board to make a revised resolution to be considered at the next meeting.

Mr. Hague said he was willing to modify some of the conditions; however, he would like the application voted on tonight. The Board could negotiate the resolution at the next meeting.

Regarding the traffic monitoring condition, Mr. Montague noted that the correct entity for this detail will have to be decided. It probably will be the Planning Board. No changes were made to Condition 5. For Condition #9, the Board and Mr. Foster included the language: "The Board determined that Applicant may not commence the improvements described in its site plan until the Borough Engineer has concluded that drainage improvements on Elmwood Ave. have progressed to the point that Applicant may commence construction".

For Condition #17, the Board decided that the landscaping in front of the parking spaces in the front yard should be 3 ½ feet to 4 feet when initially planted, with an ultimate height of no less than 5 feet.

Councilman Harris brought up at what time of night the parking lights should be extinguished. He suggested inserting language that these lights will be turned off when the church facilities are not being used.

Mr. Foster will include this language recommended by Mr. Hague: “Applicant will not be issued any permits or approvals for any of the contemplated improvements until it has received final site plan approval from the Board.”

Mr. Foster said he will circulate a revised resolution with all the notations that have been made.

A roll call vote was taken on Mr. Hague’s motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan subject to the conditions just enumerated for the reasons articulated in his comments made at the October 3rd meeting:

Mr. Hague	-	yes
Mr. Gerridge	-	yes
Mr. Mitchell	-	yes
Mr. Jankowski	-	yes
Councilman Harris	-	yes
Chrmn. Montague	-	yes

Mr. Knoll stated that Ogden Church is looking forward to returning to the Board for Final Site Plan Approval.

Before adjourning, Councilman Harris reported that at the last Council Meeting there had been a discussion about the need to look at the B-4 District, the parking regulations, and the lot coverage in that district. The sense of the Borough Council is that a professional planner should be hired to look at these issues. The Borough Council will hire a planner; however, the Council would like the Planning Board to select this planner. Councilman Harris suggested the Board put together a job description at their next meeting. The candidates will be invited to give presentations to the Board. The Board could recommend the candidate it feels would be best.

Councilman Harris reported that 221 Main Street will be re-appearing before the Board. Proper notice must be given by 221 Main Street.

On other matters, Mr. Montague reported that a hearing was held concerning the Omnipoint case. Alan Siegel, Esq. represented the Planning Board. The judge is currently deliberating the case and will return with a decision.

At 11:10 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler
Recording Secretary