

CHATHAM BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD  
June 1, 2016 7:30 p.m.

Chairman Susan Favate called this Planning Board meeting of June 1, 2016 to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Chatham Municipal Building. Chrmn. Favate announced that all legal notices have been posted for this meeting.

Name	Present	Absent
Mayor Bruce Harris		X
Council Member Victoria Fife	X	
Janice Piccolo	X	
Chrmn. Susan Favate	X	
Vice Chrmn. Matthew Wagner	X	
H.H. Montague	X	
John Bitar		X
Tom Gilman	X	
Joseph Mikulewicz	X	
William Heap	X	
Wolfgang Robinson	X	
Vincent K. Loughlin, Esq.	X	
Dr. Susan Blickstein		X

Also present was Vincent DeNave, Borough Engineer and Zoning Officer.

Chrmn. Favate welcomed Tom Gilman, of 24 Willow Street, as a new member to the Board.

Public Comment

There was none at this time.

Resolution #PB 2016-17

The meeting minutes of the May 18, 2016 meeting were approved as amended.

Resolutions

Application PB #16-003

Passaic Avenue Partners, LLC

222 North Passaic Avenue

Waver of Site Plan

Block 42, Lots 5 & 6

A motion was made/seconded to approve the resolution confirming the Board's approve of Application PB #16-003 – Passaic Avenue Partners, LLC. A voice vote was taken. All Board members present voted aye, except for Messrs. Mikulewicz, Gilman, Wagner, Heap, and Robinson because they were absent from the hearing.

Application PB #15-04

Chatham River Road Partners, LLC  
16 River Road  
Preliminary Site Plan/Final Site Plan/Variance  
Block 135, Lot 11

Attorney Loughlin noted that this resolution concerns a very significant project, subject to a developer's agreement, with many conditions. He reported that Mayor Harris had questioned the condition for the loading zone in front of the building. Mayor Harris wanted to review this loading zone situation with the Planning Board. Attorney Loughlin respectfully requested that this resolution be tabled until this matter is discussed. The Board agreed with the request.

New and Returning Applications  
Application PB #16-004  
Michael Riccone  
150 Center Avenue  
Minor Subdivision

Chrmn. Favate announced that this application will carry to the June 15, 2016 Planning Board meeting.

Application PB #16-006  
School District of the Chathams  
102 Washington Avenue  
Capital Review  
Block 78, Lot 5

Attorney Loughlin explained the Planning Board's responsibilities regarding this application. He stressed that for this particular application, the Board does not have the authority to approve or deny the application. In this particular situation, the Planning Board is authorized to hold a hearing, review the School District's application and give advisory comments. Public questions and comments will be received.

Graeme Dewar, 95 Fairmount Ave., asked who has the authority to vote on these proposals.

Attorney Loughlin answered the Chatham Board of Education has that authority. Residents are welcome to attend the Board of Education meeting to ask questions and give comments.

Beth Kenderdine, Consulting engineer for the School District of the Chathams, was sworn in to testify.

Attorney Loughlin asked who was present tonight to present this application on behalf of the School District.

Peter Daquila, Business Administrator/Secretary of the School District of the Chathams, introduced himself.

Attorney Loughlin confirmed with Ms. Kenderdine and Mr. Daquila that no attorney will be presenting this application tonight.

Attorney Loughlin confirmed with Ms. Kenderdine that she, as an engineer, is personally familiar with this proposed project. Ms. Kenderdine has represented the School District on previous projects.

Chrmn. Favate and Mr. Mikulewicz asked that Ms. Kenderdine briefly summarize the history of other School District projects done on the Washington Ave. School grounds.

Peter Daquila, Business Administrator/Secretary of the School District of the Chathams, was sworn in to testify.

Mr. Daquila testified that the School District had discovered that there was a shortage of parking at the Washington Ave. School. The District's Plan #1 was to expand the parking lot. To alleviate some of the traffic congestion, a parking lot in front of the school was proposed; however, a new circular loop would have to be constructed through the parking lot into the existing parking lot. This Plan #1 had been presented to the Planning Board. Mr. Daquila noted that the Board approved of this plan. There was some opposition from the public. Also, the stormwater control involved proved cost prohibitive with the addition of 25 parking spaces.

Mr. Daquila described Plan #2 which proposed angle parking alongside the School's driveway. Unfortunately, it was discovered the angle parking could not be done along the driveway because that property belonged to the Borough.

Mr. Daquila reported that the School District came up with Plan #3 for a parking lot. This lot is 100% on School District Property, at the foot of the existing soccer goal. With the Borough vacating Oliver Street, and coming in to extend the driveway, the two width driveway will be maintained to prevent additional traffic congestion during drop-off and pick-up times.

Chrmn. Favate confirmed with Mr. Daquila that tonight a different project is being presented.

At the easel, Ms. Kenderdine described the School grounds. She pointed out on the drawings where the existing right-of-way will be divided into half. With the vacation of the Borough right-of-way, the School District will receive half of the right-of-way and the adjacent neighbor will get the other half. This action will cause the School District's driveway to be on someone else's property. To prevent this situation, Ms. Kenderdine showed how the School District will do some re-configuring.

Mr. Montague asked if another lane will be constructed on a cut-into Washington Avenue.

Ms. Kenderdine answered no. Those lines on the plans do not indicate another lane. The School District will not be adding any more pavement to Washington Avenue.

Ms. Kenderdine showed the proposed improvements on the easel. On the drawings, she pointed out the new limit of the property, once the right-of-way is vacated. The school's driveway will be shifted over in order to allow for a separate driveway for the adjacent neighbor. The new driveway will be 24 feet wide, as it is now. It will connect to the angle parking.

Ms. Kenderdine testified that the School District is proposing a 20-space parking lot off of the new driveway. The dumpster area will be re-configured to allow for head-on access to the dumpster.

Mr. Montague asked if the 24 foot driveway will be configured to create two lanes for cars.

Ms. Kenderdine answered that vehicle traffic will go all one way; however there will be room for two lanes of vehicles for peak hours. Mr. Daquila stated that the school buses will be using the lane, not the vehicles belonging to parents.

Chrmn. Favate asked if any additional handicap parking spaces would be added with this new parking arrangement.

Ms. Kenderdine answered no, the pitch is too steep in the proposed section.

Ms. Kenderdine showed the plans for the new storm sewer system which will collect run-off from the new driveway and the parking area. Included with this are the grading plan for the new parking area. Ms. Kenderdine showed the side of the driveway where pedestrian traffic will travel. There will be a crosswalk across the driveway to the new parking lot, which will connect with the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Mikulewicz asked who would be using this new parking lot.

Mr. Daquila answered that the parking lot will be used typically for school staff members. Typically the staff members arrive before the students. The lot should be full by 8:15 a.m. Teachers usually leave after the students. Any visitors' parking will remain in front of the school.

Ms. Kenderdine described the proposing landscaping plan. One existing tree must be removed for the grading and construction of the new parking lot. Four new shade trees will be planted. Alberta Spruce will be planted at the end of the parking lot, where it's closest to the residential lot. Ms. Kenderdine stated that the School District is asking for the planting of a rain garden with an overflow outlet.

Ms. Kenderdine testified that no new lighting is being proposed by the School District.

Mr. Mikulewicz asked what would be the distance between the back of the new parking lot to the fence line.

Ms. Kenderdine answered about 30 feet. She added that significant plantings will be put in that section.

Mr. Daquila testified that the School District has made arrangements with Patrick Carroll, Chairman of the Borough Shade Tree Commission, that once the project is done, he will have trees planted alongside the sidewalk by Washington Avenue.

Chrmn. Favate asked if the depressed curb would be wide enough to actually allow for sufficient flow from the rain garden.

Ms. Kenderdine answered yes.

Mr. Montague asked what will be the elevation of the new parking lot. Or, will it be flat?

Ms. Kenderdine answered no. The parking lot will have a significant pitch to it.

Mr. Robinson asked if the proposed sidewalk would be demarcated in any special way.

On the plans, Ms. Kenderdine pointed out where a stop sign will be installed. There will be crosswalk stripes across the driveway. There will be ADA curb ramps so there will be a detectable warning surfaces on either side.

Mr. DeNave, the Borough Engineer, noted that a while ago a parking space had been created with gravel. With the proposed parking lot, could this parking space be restored back to its original condition?

Mr. Daquila answered yes. The gravel will be removed and an effort will be made to grow grass in that space.

Chrmn. Favate asked if the public had any questions for Ms. Kenderdine.

Brian Becker, 40 Orchard Rd., noted that he lived within the 200-ft. radius of the proposed project. He asked what percentage of this site will be covered with macadam.

Ms. Kenderdine didn't have an answer; however, the proposed project will increase the macadam by slightly less than a quarter acre of new impervious coverage.

Mr. Becker asked if 50% of macadam sound reasonable to her.

Ms. Kenderdine answered that she didn't have enough information to answer that question.

Mr. Becker noted that some provision has been made for drainage; however, he informed Ms. Kenderdine that this particular section is in the floodplain.

Ms. Kenderdine indicated she wasn't aware that it was in a floodplain.

Mr. Becker stated that the neighboring yards are regularly flooded.

Ms. Kenderdine asked Mr. Becker if this floodplain had been dictated by FEMA?

Mr. DeNave clarified that section is not a recognized floodplain however, the residents' yards have experienced flooding.

On the plans, Ms. Kenderdine showed Mr. Becker which direction the runoff will travel. She testified that all of the run-off from the new parking will go through a depressed curb into the rain garden area. She pointed out an inlet that will be connected by a pipe to an existing storm source that will take the water into the public sewer system. Ms. Kenderdine testified that the stormwater situation might improve because of the diversion into the storm sewer system.

Mr. Becker asked that wouldn't 20 parking spaces with impermeable surfaces add to the flooding?

Ms. Kenderdine answered that it would add to the public storm sewer system, but it won't be directed towards the neighboring properties.

Mr. Becker believed that the School District would be paving property, thereby turning a park into a parking lot.

Mr. Daquila stated that section of land is not deemed a park. Yes, paving is being proposed; however, any run-off will go into the storm sewer.

Mr. Becker said that he had a document indicating that the enrollment of Washington Ave. School will dramatically decline. Mr. Becker stated that this was Mr. Daquila's document. He asked Mr. Daquila if he was aware of it.

Mr. Daquila answered that document was created by a demographer, not by himself. The demographer, hired by the School District, has been wrong. Mr. Daquila stated that the enrollment of the school has been increasing.

Attorney Loughlin explained that since Mr. Becker is now asking the applicant questions, based on his (Mr. Becker's knowledge) Mr. Becker must then be sworn in.

Brian Becker, 40 Orchard Rd., was sworn in to testify.

Mr. Becker asked Mr. Daquila whether he was aware of the empty parking spaces that currently exist on the school property.

Mr. Daquila answered that the number of open parking spaces would differ during different times of the day, based on the school staff. There are staff members who do not work full time. Mr. Daquila clarified that he himself does not count empty parking spaces at any time during the day. He listens to the school principal who claims that there is not enough parking on the school grounds. Staff members have to park on the residential street, and have to move them every few hours to avoid a ticket.

Mr. DeNave reported that the different safety committees in the Borough have held several meetings on the traffic congestion in the Washington Ave. School area. Mr. DeNave noted the many different uses are impacting the parking during the day on the section of Washington Avenue. Mr. DeNave pointed out that if all-day parking was allowed for this section of Washington Avenue, there's a good chance train commuters will find and use those particular spaces.

Mr. Becker stated that he and the other residents would welcome more parking along Washington Ave. if it would avoid more macadam paving.

Attorney Loughlin and Chrmn. Favate warned Mr. Becker not to give his personal opinions. Right now the focus should be on fact-finding.

Robert Steelman, 55 Chatham St., asked Ms. Kenderdine if she had an existing drain on her plans.

Ms. Kenderdine showed Mr. Steelman the location of the drain. It has a grate on top.

Mr. Steelman asked what was the elevation change from the corner to that drain.

Ms. Kenderdine answered 15 feet.

Mr. Steelman asked how large that area was.

Ms. Kenderdine didn't know.

Mr. Steelman asked what happens to that drain.

Ms. Kenderdine answered that this particular drain will be demolished. That entire area will be re-graded.

Mr. Steelman asked where the water will travel after this drain is removed.

Ms. Kenderdine answered that the majority of the run-off will travel to the parking lot and drain into the rain garden. It will then travel to the public storm sewer.

Mr. Steelman asked about the elevation change between the drain and the recreation field.

Ms. Kenderdine explained that the whole area will be graded upwards in order in order to construct the parking lot.

Mr. Steelman asked Ms. Kenderdine if she was aware of any of the drainage situations because of the catchment area with the neighboring lots along that line.

Ms. Kenderdine answered yes. She had a question for Mr. Steelman.

At this point, Attorney Loughlin said that Mr. Steelman would have to be sworn in.

Robert Steelman, 55 Chatham St., was sworn in to testify. He noted that he is “the neighbor in the middle” of the bordering residential lots. Mr. Steelman testified that he had installed a “many thousand dollar” drain system so his backyard wouldn’t be soggy. He testified that his neighbors to the east also installed drainage systems. These drainage systems were to carry the water from the lot to Chatham Street.

Mr. Steelman asked if a parking lot with a curb system is constructed, running 20 to 25 feet to the fence, won’t some of that drainage then be pushed to the north?

Ms. Kenderdine testified that half of the area in question will have its drainage re-directed to a public storm sewer. She and Mr. Steelman discussed this situation in more detail.

Mr. Steelman asked if any consideration was given to moving the proposed drainage to the east of the proposed parking lot to receive the water from the catchment area.

Ms. Kenderdine answered yes, that could be done. An inlet can be installed in that area which could connect into the public storm sewer.

Mr. DeNave stated that the construction of the parking lot will be done by the Department of Public Works. Mr. DeNave said he had walked the back property lines to determine what was happening from a drainage standpoint. One of Mr. DeNave’s recommendations is to re-locate the basin in the back. Regarding the existing basin capturing the water along the swale running behind the neighbors’ properties, there is an 8-inch line that comes out of there and heads down the property line. Mr. DeNave wasn’t sure if this line connected to the 8-inch drain that the applicant was proposing to remove. Mr. DeNave stated a camera will be sent down that line to see where that 8-inch line travels. Somewhere along the swale along the neighboring properties, a more sizeable basin could be installed to catch the water upstream before it has a chance to accumulate.

Mr. DeNave stated, from a drainage standpoint, that it’s possible to improve the drainage of the rear swale, behind the houses, by dropping in additional drainage, when the water reaches the 4 ½ ft. pipe, there will be no issues. The pipe may have to re-size the pipe from 8 inches to a larger pipe. Or, additional locations could be designated where inlets could be created. Mr. DeNave stated that there is plenty of capacity to carry this water. It just has to be carried down to that 4 ½ ft. pipe.

Mr. DeNave felt the rain garden was a good idea. Regarding the engineering plans, Mr. DeNave pointed out that all of the runoff, from the parking lot, will not go near the residents’ property. The flow will drop into a pipe and will stay away from the swale at the rear. Mr. DeNave believed some more tweaks needed to be done to the engineering plans to handle the run-off.

Mr. Steelman said he would feel better if there was an engineering plan that went into greater detail.



Mr. DeNave agreed. If the School District is agreeable, it can be shown on the plans that a new inlet could be installed. The location of this installation can be determined by walking out there and TVing that pipe. The end point should be found. One or two inlets could be created along that pipe to take in the water accumulating behind the neighbors' homes during heavy rains.

Mr. Steelman asked if, in the future, lighting for the parking lot would be considered.

Mr. Daquila answered that the lighting for the parking lot will be from the streetlights on Washington Avenue.

Mr. Steelman asked if the school had any existing parking that doesn't have lights.

Mr. Daquila answered that there are lights in front of the school. He didn't believe there were lights installed for the upper parking lot, closest to Watchung Avenue.

Mr. Steelman believed that there are two large halogen lights in the front of the school. He confirmed with Mr. Daquila that there are no plans for conduits to electrify anything in the proposed parking lot.

Spencer Hawk, 98 Washington Ave., noted that his property shares the exit driveway for the Washington Avenue. He expressed concerns about the proposed rain garden being a mosquito breeding ground, especially with the Zika virus in the news. Will any controls be put in place to control this breeding?

Ms. Enderdine answered that she wasn't familiar enough with the plants which will go into the rain garden. The rain garden will be planted and maintained by School District personnel.

Chrmm. Favate asked if there has even been an issue regarding standing water in rain garden.

Ms. Enderdine answered that it depends on the depth of the standing water, whether mosquitoes could breed in the rain garden. She was willing to research that situation and take any measures to prevent this hazard from forming in the rain garden.

Mr. Hawk asked Mr. D'Aquila if the School District had any budget set-asides for mosquito control or for maintenance control for the spaces that will be planted.

Mr. Daquila answered, that with the exception of the rain garden, the plants on the plans will not require a great deal of maintenance. The rain garden, like the one at Southern Boulevard School, gets planted and left alone.

Mr. Hawk referred Mr. Daquila to the exit side of the driveway, and confirmed with Mr. Daquila, that a number of plantings were put in to serve as an aesthetic screening for the neighbors.

Mr. Hawk asked Mr. Daquila if he was aware that the exit side of Washington Ave. School contains a number of dead trees, that have not been replaced.

Attorney Loughlin pointed out that Mr. Hawk has to be sworn in at this point.

Spencer Hawk, 98 Washington Ave., was sworn in to testify.

Mr. Daquila answered that he was not aware of this dead tree situation on the exit side.

Mr. Hawk asked if the School District had an existing set-aside budget for maintaining any of the boundary plantings around the Washington Ave. School.

Mr. Daquila answered that the budget is set aside, in general to maintain the District properties. Some school properties need more maintenance than others.

Mr. Hawk asked if the proposed planting layout on Washington Ave. School may or may not last beyond even one year.

Mr. Daquila did not want to confirm that statement. He stated that the School District likes to maintain the school grounds as best as possible.

Mr. Hawk noted that the original number of proposed parking spaces was 25. He asked if the water management was considered too expensive for the School District with the originally proposed 25 spaces.

Mr. Daquila answered yes, that the cost estimate for stormwater management for the original plans was nearing a half a million dollars. It was not cost effective.

Mr. Hawk asked what would be the cost saving with the existing plan as compared to the original plan. How much money was saved? Mr. Daquila answered that, due to the joint services agreement pointed out by Mr. DeNave, the School District's cost is \$110,000 to have the driveway extended, the sidewalk replaced, and the parking lot constructed.

Mr. Hawk asked Mr. Daquila if he individually verified the need for parking on either the upper lot or the lower lot.

Mr. Daquila answered yes. The principal of Washington Ave. School has submitted a list of staff members that are assigned parking spaces. She always has more staff members than available parking spaces on the school grounds.

Mr. Hawk asked if an effort was ever made to have part-time and full-time staff members share parking spaces.

Mr. Daquila answered yes. He would have to check with the principal to get further information on this matter.

Mr. Hawk asked if Washington Ave. School was receptive to implementing a sticker/permit parking plan to allow teachers to park an indefinite time period on Washington Avenue.

Mr. Daquila answered that the School District *was* receptive to that arrangement. For reasons mentioned earlier by Mr. DeNave, the sticker/permit method didn't seem an option that the Borough wanted to take.

Mr. DeNave brought up the rain garden. He pointed out that a rain garden had been created close to the Memorial Park Pool. The runoff/drainage from the pool's bathhouse is used for the rain garden. More bees than mosquitoes visit this rain garden. The garden has plenty of vegetation. Beyond weeding, the rain garden requires limited maintenance if proper vegetation is planted. The Washington Ave. School rain garden will have several layers of pervious material. The plantings will be soaking up the water to a great degree. The rain garden near the Municipal Pool has required a limited amount of maintenance.

John Leberfinger, 24 Orchard Rd., brought up the enrollment survey discussed by Mr. Becker earlier in the hearing. It's driven by demographics, but it is not correct. How do we get a better survey?

Mr. Daquila explained how the demographer tracks and evaluates the birth-rates. The demographer does not take into consideration the number of residents moving in and moving out, tear-downs of homes, and re-builds of homes. He explained how the School District estimated the school enrollment, which has been increasing.

Andrea Skarra, 26 Orchard Rd., asked Mr. Daquila if the proposed plans would have no impact on the current traffic congestion.

Mr. Daquila confirmed that there will be no impact on the congestion. If the School District choses to do nothing, the School District ends up with half of the size of its driveway. The queue of the six cars that are always waiting in the school driveway would begin formation in the street. By partnering with the Borough to expand the driveway to retain its current footprint, the congestion will be kept at the same level.

Ms. Skarra questioned how the School District came up with the number of 20 needed parking spaces without any feasibility study done. She felt that the principal didn't really give Mr. Daquila definite information as to how many parking spaces were needed at a certain time. Ms. Skarra felt that the School District really needed to look into this aspect before sinking so much money into this project.

Sarah Apgar, 104 Washington Ave., noted that her residence is to the right of the school exit.

Mrs. Apgar asked where the 20 cars, for this proposed parking lot is for, are parking currently? She began giving her observations from living close to the school.

Attorney Loughlin said Mrs. Apgar would have to be sworn in at this point.

Sarah Apgar, 104 Washington Ave., was sworn in.

Mrs. Apgar described the parking situation on her residential street. She felt that 20 parking spaces was a high number to propose. She questioned where these people were parking at the current time. Mrs. Apgar suggested the school principal present what her current triage plan is for staff parking.

David Hock, 103 Washington Ave. asked Mr. Daquila who selected him to represent the School District at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Daquila answered the School District.

At Mr. Hock's request, Mr. Daquila reviewed all the materials and meetings he had attended in order to be ready for tonight's hearing. Also, with Mr. Hock, Mr. Daquila reviewed the alternate proposals that the School District had considered for the Washington Ave. School parking situation.

Mr. Hock asked if the parking lot was used for dropping off and picking up students.

Mr. Daquila answered no. The proposed parking lot will not be used for drop-off and pick-up.

Mr. Hock asked if the School District had given any thought to allowing for drop-off and pick-up in the proposed parking lot.

Mr. Daquila answered no. There would be safety concerns if that activity was taking place in the parking lot. The school does not have the manpower to make drop-off and pick-up a safe procedure in that parking lot.

Mr. Hock and Mr. Daquila reviewed the current drop-off and pick-up process at the school.

Brian Becker, 40 Orchard Rd., felt that Mr. Daquila had no basis for what currently exists (for parking spaces) on the school grounds. Mr. Becker told Mr. Daquila that he only had the word of the principal, who is retiring and wants more parking. Mr. Becker asked Mr. Daquila if these were reasonable statements?

Mr. Daquila answered that the principal has gone on the record many times that she did not have enough parking on the school grounds for her staff. Mr. Daquila stated that he didn't have an official number to say that the **school** is short two spaces or 19 spaces. Mr. Daquila stated that at times he himself has seen staff members having to park on the playground.

Mr. Becker testified that he has repeatedly walked the school parking lot. Mr. Becker has found that between 8 a.m. and 12 noon, eighteen parking spaces are always vacant.

Mr. Becker asked Ms. Kenderdine how much new impervious coverage would be put down.

Ms. Kenderdine answered a little less than a quarter acre. This amount would include *all* of the proposed items of this project.

Moving on, Chrmn. Favate felt that all of the points raised by Dr. Blickstein, the Board's Planner, have been covered in tonight's hearing. Chrmn. Favate confirmed with Ms. Kenderdine that Dr. Blickstein's recommendation for parking lot circulation arrows/pavement markings will be added to the site plan.

Chrmn. Favate asked for comments from the public.

Lauren Divito, 53 Chatham St., noted that the proposed parking lot will be directly behind her backyard. She recalled seeing the trees on the school grounds being removed without any notification made to the residents or community. She believed more than half of these 11 trees were healthy, and didn't need to be taken down. Mrs. Divito described the work that she and her husband have done to re-seed her backyard. She questioned the proposed asphalt to be put down for this parking lot, so close to her backyard, and the removal of the grassy area frequented by the children. Mrs. Divito asked for honest answers and honest numbers for these proposals.

Janet Langborgh, 82 Washington Ave., recalled over 20 years ago the School District appeared before the Planning Board to create a parking lot on Watchung Ave. The School District had testified that they would maintain a fence on the parking lot. That fence is currently overgrown with poison ivy and is unable to function. Mrs. Langborgh reported that the landscaping on the school's Watchung Avenue parking was poorly maintained. She felt the School District did not keep up their end of the bargain for the Watchung Ave. parking lot. She asked that the school be a good neighbor, as the residents have tried to be to the school.

Robert Steelman, 55 Chatham St., asked that the Planning Board not recommend this project. He felt the drainage plan could have been better developed. Mr. Steelman stated that the parking will significantly impact the residential properties, like his. Mr. Steelman pointed out that no significant study has been done for the definite need for these parking spaces. He questioned the more pavement that will be needed for this project.

Wendy Pierson, 15 Oliver St., suggested some kind of study be done on the real need for these proposed parking spaces. She is willing to help with the study. Ms. Pierson had fond memories of spending some of her childhood on that grassy area where the parking lot is being proposed. Residents still enjoy visiting that grassy area.

David Hock, 103 Washington Ave., believed that this proposed plan has not been well thought through sufficiently. He felt other options could be done. Mr. Hock questioned who exactly needed these additional parking spaces. He also felt these proposed parking spaces will not help the current drop-off, pick-up problems that exist on the school grounds.

A motion was made/seconded to close the Public Comments section of the meeting. All Board members approved the motion.

Mr. Montague noted that he has seen no engineering calculations on the plans regarding water flow for this proposed plans. He questioned whether the School District had met with the residents to review these plans and discuss concerns.

Mr. Robinson asked that a study be done on the need for this parking lot.

Mr. Mikulewicz said he would've liked to have the principal of the school present tonight to explain the need for the proposed spaces, since the number has increased to 20 spaces. Mr. Mikulewicz hoped that Mr. DeNave could help deal with the stormwater situation between the proposed parking lot and Washington Ave. This situation needs to be better defined.

Mr. Mikulewicz asked if the Board could make a recommendation that the parking lot be adjusted to the actual need. Would that be within the Board's purview?

Attorney Loughlin explained that the Board's purview is to decide whether this project is a suitable project according to the goals of the Borough's Master Plan. The Board may make conditions and recommendations on the project.

Council Member Fife pointed out that these proposals are suitable for the school; however, are the proposals suitable for the neighbors? It's difficult to give up green space. She asked for more information on the definite need for these proposed parking spaces.

Mr. Gilman stated that the need should be clearly established. The applicant should review the other options that had been considered and explain why the final proposal made the best sense.

Chrmn. Favate noted that a parking need exists; however, she wasn't clear what the need was. She was disappointed that the proposed plan does not address the current circulation problem on the school grounds, especially with drop-off and pick-up, which impacts the neighboring streets. Chrmn. Favate wanted to see a better landscaping plan. She would like to see fewer parking spaces in the plans, unless the School District can prove that these 20 parking spaces are definitely needed.

Mr. Wagner made recommendations regarding the proposed shrubbery.

Mr. Heap asked Attorney Loughlin if, after all the testimony and discussions are held, the School District can proceed with their plans with or without the Planning Board's recommendations.

Attorney Loughlin answered yes, the School District can proceed; however, problems may arise when the School District needs funding in the future. He reiterated that the Planning Board's responsibilities for this application.

A motion was made/seconded that the Planning Board recommend this Capital Review Project, Application PB #16-006, submitted by the School District of the Chathams, for 102 Washington Avenue, with the following recommendations:

- 1) The School District consider proposing fewer parking spaces
- 2) The actual measurable need for these parking spaces must be correspond to off-set future use
- 3) The fencing around the dumpster area will be improved as per the Dr. Blickstein's recommendations in her memo dated 5/31/2016
- 4) The School District will restore the gravel parking space on southwest

corner of the parking lot, by the exit driveway, returning the space to grass.

- 5) The School District consider installing additional inlets on the property that will meet the approval of the Borough Engineer.
- 6) New trees and shrubbery will be planted to replace the trees that had been removed on the school grounds
- 7) The School District consider pre-construction outreach discussions with the neighbors living close to Washington Ave. School
- 8) Parking lot circulation arrows/pavement markings should be added to the site.

A roll call vote was taken on this Motion with the conditions listed:

Council Member Fife	-	yes
Mrs. Piccolo	-	yes
Vice Chairman Wagner	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Gilman	-	abstained
Mr. Mikulewicz	-	no
Mr. Heap	-	yes
Mr. Robinson	-	no
Chrmn. Favate	-	yes

Application PB #16-005

William T. Anastasio

338 Main Street

Change of Permitted Use

Block 79, Lot 3

Council Member Fife recused herself because she lived within the 200-ft. radius of the subject property.

William T. Anastasio, the applicant, was sworn in to testify.

Mr. Anastasio testified that he owns the property at 338 Main Street. In 2013, Mr. Anastasio submitted an application to the Borough Planning Board to use the second floor as a law office. The first floor was to be used as a speech therapy office operated by his wife. The Board had given their permission for this arrangement.

Mr. Anastasio testified that he and his wife are now divorced. He is proposing to move his law office down to the first floor, to make it more effective. Mr. Anastasio would like the second floor now to be used for himself and his family.

Mr. Anastasio stated that he has made improvements to the property, but nothing structural. All the permits for his improvements have been closed out. No addition was made to the kitchen. To help prove this point, Mr. Anastasio offered the Board a survey and a floor plan drawn in

April 1999 when Mr. Anastasio purchased the property. At that time, there was an existing kitchen.

Mr. DeNave explained that Mr. Anastasio was present tonight to seeking a Waiver of Site Plan/Change of Permitted Use. Mr. Anastasio's property is in the B-1 District, which allows for apartments on the upper floor. Mr. DeNave noted that some time ago, apartments had functioned on the second floor. Mr. Anastasio's law office would also be a permitted use in this B-1 District. Mr. DeNave confirmed that Mr. Anastasio has followed through with the requirements from his earlier application in 2013.

Mr. Anastasio testified that he is not proposing any interior changes. The house is functional as it is.

Mr. Montague asked, if the application was approved, would the law office bring in more people to the site.

Mr. Anastasio answered that the number of visitors will remain the same as it was from the earlier application. Mr. Anastasio said, at his age, he wasn't seeking additional clients.

Chrmn. Favate noted that plastic flowers have been planted on the grounds.

Mr. Anastasio said he would replace the plastic flowers with real flowers.

Mr. Anastasio testified that the existing signage will not change.

Attorney Loughlin confirmed with Mr. DeNave that a new C.C.O. would not be required for this situation. He also confirmed with Mr. DeNave that all permits on the applicant's property were closed out.

A motion was made/seconded to approve Application PB #16-005: William T. Anastasio -338 Main Street – Waiver of Site Plan/Change of Permitted Use, with the condition that the artificial flowers be replaced with real flowers. A voice vote was taken. All Board members present voted aye.

At 10:20 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

The next Planning Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 15, 2016, 7:30 p.m. Council Chambers, Chatham Municipal Building.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler  
Recording Secretary