

**TOWNSHIP OF WEST ORANGE
PLANNING BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
November 29, 2012**

The Township of West Orange Planning Board held a special meeting on November 29, 2012 at 7:30 P.M., in Council Chambers, 66 Main Street.

Chairman Bagoff called the meeting to order at approximately 7:39 P.M. It was announced that notification of this meeting was given to the Township Clerk, the West Orange Chronicle and posted on the Township Bulletin Board on November 13, 2012 in accordance with the requirements of the "Open Public Meetings Act".

Chairman Bagoff requested all persons in attendance stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Chairman Bagoff, Joanne Carlucci, Jerome Eben, Gerald Gurland, Lee Klein, Councilwoman Susan McCartney, Ron Weston

ABSENT: Tekeste Ghebremicael, Vice Chairman Ben Heller, Jason Lester, William Wilkes II

ALSO PRESENT: Eric Keller, P.E., P.P., Omland Engineering Associates, Inc.
Debbie Dillon, Audio Transcription Service, LLC
Patrick Dwyer, Esq., Board Attorney
Robin Miller, Board Secretary

ROLL CALL

Chairman Bagoff, Joanne Carlucci, Jerome Eben, Tekeste Ghebremicael, Gerald Gurland, Vice Chairman Ben Heller, Lee Klein, Jason Lester, Councilwoman Susan McCartney, Ron Weston, William Wilkes.

ADOPT MINUTES

Adopt the minutes of the October 24, 2012 Planning Board special meeting.

The Board voted on adopting the minutes of the October 24, 2012 special meeting as follows:

Motion: Chairman Bagoff

Second: Mr. Klein

Carlucci	Y	Eben	N	Ghebremicael	-
Gurland	N	Heller	-	Klein	Y
Lester	-	McCartney	Y	Weston	-
Wilkes	-	Bagoff	Y		

ADOPT MEETING DATES

Adopt 2013 Planning Board meeting dates.

Tabled to the December 5, 2012 meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next regular Planning Board meeting will be held on December 5, 2012 in Council Chambers at 8:00 P.M.

SWEARING IN

Eric L. Keller, PE, PP, Omland Engineering, Planning and Engineering consultant engaged by the Township.

RESOLUTION(S)

PB-12-22/Converge Towers, LLC

Block(s): 84.01; Lot(s): 22; Zone: B-2

10 Marcella Avenue

Conditional Use Site Plan to install two antennas on an existing telecommunications tower.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Bagoff gave a brief recapitulation of the Application approved at the October 24, 2012 meeting.

Mr. Dwyer advised the Board there were minor changes to the draft resolution; he read all changes to the Board.

Chairman Bagoff called for a vote with modifications to the Resolution.

The Board voted on the Resolution as follows:

Motion: Chairman Bagoff

Second: Ms. Carlucci

Carlucci	Y	Eben	Y	Ghebremicael	-
Gurland	Y	Heller	-	Klein	Y
Lester	-	McCartney	Y	Weston	-
Wilkes	-	Bagoff	Y		

PB-12-24/Metro Networks Services c/o Lemanowicz LLP

Block(s): 84.01; Lot(s): 22.01; Zone: B-2

12 Marcella Avenue

Conditional Use Site Plan to install two (2) antenna dishes on an existing tower.

DISCUSSION

Chairman Bagoff gave a brief recapitulation of the Application approved at the October 24, 2012 meeting.

Mr. Dwyer advised the Board there were minor changes to the draft resolution; he read all changes to the Board.

Chairman Bagoff called for a vote with modifications to the Resolution.

The Board voted on the Resolution as follows:

Motion: Chairman Bagoff

Second: Mr. Eben

Carlucci	Y	Eben	Y	Ghebremicael	-
Gurland	Y	Heller	-	Klein	Y
Lester	-	McCartney	Y	Weston	-
Wilkes	-	Bagoff	Y		

APPLICATION(S)

PB-12-12/Forsons Partners, LLC on behalf of 7-Eleven, Inc.

Block: 172.02; Lot: 8.01; Zone: B-2

955 Pleasant Valley Way

Preliminary and final site plan with bulk variances and soil removal permit for a retail convenience store.

Carried from the October 24, 2012 special meeting.

EXHIBITS

A-1 – Affidavit of Public Notice;

A-2 – Site Plans;

A-3 – Neglia Engineering Associates response letter dated August 24, 2012;

A-4 – Environmental Status from Envirotrac dated July 31, 2012;

A-5 – Title Commitment dated November 8, 2011;

A-6 – Neglia Engineering Associates Planning Report dated June 18, 2012;

A-7 – Neglia Engineering Associates Traffic Report dated June 19, 2012;

A-8 – Neglia Engineering Associates Drainage Report dated June 18, 2012;

A-9 – Neglia Engineering Associates Environmental Impact Statement dated June 18, 2012;

A-10 – Harrison French & Associates Exterior Elevations dated June 19, 2012;

A-11 – Harrison French & Associates Floor Plan dated June 19, 2012;

A-12 – Aerial Site Plan Exhibit;

A-13 – Colorized Site/Landscape Plan;

A-14 – Truck Template Plan

A-15 – Harrison French & Associates Site Rendering dated June 12, 2012;

A-16 – Neglia Engineering Associates Site Section dated October 24, 2012;

A-17 – Neglia Engineering Associates Six (6) Site Photos dated June 7, 2012.

A-18 - 11/12/12 – Revised plans from Neglia Engineering Associates;

A-19 – Harrison French & Associates – 11/14/12 – 3 sheets elevation, floor plan and rendering of project;

A-20 – Updated Drainage Neglia Engineering Associates 11/12/12

DISCUSSION

Antimo A. Del Vecchio, Esq. Beattie Padovano, LLC, attorney representing the Applicant, 7-Eleven appeared before the Board. Mr. Del Vecchio gave a brief recapitulation of the Application carried from the October 24, 2012 special meeting. Mr. Del Vecchio advised the Board that the Applicant had revised plans and was anxious to present the changes to the Board. Exhibits A-18, A-19, and A-

20 were submitted to the Board. Mr. Del Vecchio gave a brief description of the changes to the site plan.

Chairman Bagoff inquired if Mr. Del Vecchio and Mr. Dwyer had confirmed the architectural acceptability of the Applicant's architectural firm, Harrison French & Associates. Mr. Dwyer said it was matter of credibility; did the Board give weight to the plans. Mr. Del Vecchio said the testifying architect, Thomas Heigle, AIA, was licensed in New Jersey, and two of the three principals with the firm Harrison French & Associates were licensed in the State of New Jersey. Mr. Eben stated that there were certain procedures required from an architect licensed in the State of New Jersey; the Applicant's submitted plans did not have the proper title block required in the State of New Jersey; he advised Mr. Del Vecchio to have his client check with the New Jersey State Board of Architects. Chairman Bagoff stated that the Board would accept the Applicant's architect.

Mr. Del Vecchio said that Gregory J. Polyniak, P.E., P.P., Neglia Engineering Associates would be back on record to continue his testimony as professional engineer. Mr. Polyniak testified that the proposed building had been moved south and east to the property, it was not centered as originally planned. The loading area and dumpster area had also been flipped. Mr. Polyniak noted that the changes would now affect the visibility for drivers coming upon the site; however, the revised plan honors the 75 ft. setback. The new design made the small retaining wall much diminished; there would no longer be a need for a wing-wall design. Mr. Polyniak said the revised plan addressed many comments made by the Township professionals and the Board. The revised landscaping plan would exceed Township requirements; the maximum lot the number of parking spaces had been reduced to seventeen (17) from nineteen (19). Mr. Polyniak confirmed that the revised plans were accurate; he stated he had supervised all revisions. Referring to the Omland Engineering memorandum dated November 26, 2012; Mr. Polyniak said that all comments made by Omland had been addressed; either on the plans or during his testimony; including Omland Memo Item #3: Mr. Keller commented on the north driveway. Mr. Polyniak said he ran turning templates and there was not a problem. Omland Memo Item #4: Existing utility services - Mr. Polyniak said there was no problem with accommodating the recommendation. Item #5: Mr. Polyniak said the width of the parking spaces would be revised to 9 ft., there would be an increase to the buffering space and reduce the impervious coverage. Item #17: Omland Memo noted discrepancy between elevations on site plans and architectural plans; Mr. Polyniak said the architectural plans would be amended to reflect correct elevations.

Mr. Eben asked Mr. Polyniak from what direction would tractor trailers be making deliveries; Mr. Polyniak said the truck access would probably be from north off of Route 280, traveling south on Pleasant Valley Way. Mr. Eben inquired as to the height of the proposed retaining wall, would it have a railing; and if the proposed Juniper plantings at the base of the retaining wall would be destroyed by snow plowing. Mr. Polyniak said the wall height was 4 ½ ft., without a railing; additionally it was his opinion that the owner would not want to see a dead area at the base of the wall. If plantings were damaged, they would be replaced.

Councilwoman McCartney asked if the driveway would be directed one-way. Mr. Del Vecchio answered that the driveway would have two-way traffic.

Ms. Carlucci had no questions for Mr. Polyniak.

Mr. Weston inquired if the re-located trash area was code compliant; Mr. Polyniak confirmed it was compliant.

Mr. Gurland had no questions for Mr. Polyniak; but requested that a cross-section of Page 8.01 of the site plan be included in the final plans. Mr. Polyniak said that the vertical section from east to west would remain the same, and agreed to provide a cross-section in the final plans.

Mr. Klein said that due to the high turnover nature of a 7-Eleven, he wondered whether the proposed parking spaces width of 9 ft. would be adequate. Mr. Keller opined that the 9 ft. width would be sufficient; the new plan had a wider drive aisle. Mr. Klein commented that the Applicant should check with the Police Department regarding traffic crashes.

Mr. Keller said it appeared the plan showed keeping a portion of the retaining wall; he suggested eliminating the wall for better maintenance; Mr. Polyniak said they did not want to disturb the buffer area. With regard to the trench drain behind the building, Mr. Keller said he was still concerned it would become clogged; he suggested the Applicant look at ways of installing different inlets. Mr. Polyniak said the drain would be maintained on a regular basis; it would not clog.

Mr. Keller said that Vice Chairman Heller, who was not in attendance, had forwarded comments for the Applicant. Mr. Heller commented that he was concerned about the lack of street trees on the landscaping plan; Mr. Polyniak said that since the new plan shifted the building approximately 42 feet, the structure would be hard to see, so it was important to retain the site so as not to obstruct its visibility.

Mr. Keller said that Mr. Heller voiced concern there was no buffering through the rear area during the fall and winter months; he requested an upright variety of evergreen arborvitae shrub buffer; Mr. Keller stated that he would also advise something upright. Mr. Polyniak said he did not have an issue with that request.

Chairman Bagoff asked Mr. Polyniak to indicate the location of the front of the building in relation to the neighboring building; the location of the monument sign and the sight line to monument sign; and the sight line to driveway. Mr. Polyniak indicated the sight line was 450 feet, not in the vortex. Chairman Bagoff asked how many types of materials would be used in the building of the retaining wall. Mr. Polyniak said the same material would be used to the left and right of the building; it would be uniform.

There were no questions from Public Advocate.

Mr. Manuel Lin, 938 Pleasant Valley Way, indicated he had a question regarding traffic. Chairman Bagoff advised Mr. Lin to wait until the Applicant's traffic expert presented testimony.

Brian A. Intindola, P.E., Neglia Engineering Associates was sworn in, stated his credentials, and was accepted as an expert witness in traffic engineering. Mr. Intindola said he had visited the site on several occasions; he had performed all traffic counts; and had authored the Neglia Traffic report dated June 19, 2012. He testified the trip generation would be approximately one-hundred (100) additional trips during the morning peak and approximately eighty (80) additional trips during evening peak; sixty-percent (60%) would be pass-by traffic on Pleasant Valley Way. Mr. Intindola said that little traffic generated from Mount Pleasant Place on to Pleasant Valley Way. Currently the site had three driveways; the Applicant proposed to eliminate the third driveway that was located across from Mount Pleasant Place. Mr. Intinola indicated the Level of Service would remain

acceptable after the project was completed. Additionally, Mr. Intinola said he re-ran the Levels of Service based on Mr. Keller's memorandum dated November 26, 2012 and got similar results; it was now a left-hand site; the driveways would be able to accommodate deliveries; he stated the revised plan was one of the better site plans for deliveries.

Mr. Del Vecchio asked Mr. Intinola if there was any negative impact regarding the revised plan. Mr. Intinola said the prior site condition had three movements; the new plan eliminated one movement creating an overall improvement. The option of the two driveways would accommodate the oddity of visual sight coming off Route 280. Additionally there would be greater ease making the left turn from Route 10; the way the site was situated, two-way access was the best plan.

Mr. Del Vecchio and Mr. Intinola discussed Mr. Keller's memorandum dated November 26, 2012. Regarding Item #6, Mr. Intinola advised he had conducted Saturday traffic counts. Addressing Items #7 and #8, Mr. Intinola said that fewer motorists would attempt to make left turns into the site if the turn was inconvenient. Per Item #9, Mr. Intinola said a .8 peak hour factor (PHF) would not change his conclusion that the Level of Service would remain acceptable. Regarding Item #10, Mr. Intinola said he had examined Mr. Keller's concern about simultaneous left turns from the southern driveway and out of Mount Pleasant Place; he did not believe there would be any conflict.

Mr. Eben inquired about the intersection of Mt. Pleasant Avenue and Pleasant Valley Way; all signals had different timers, individual phasing, and that he had experienced being backed up to the site's driveway; he wondered if it would be a problem for the retailer's customers to get in to the traffic flow. Mr. Intinola said that the beauty of the new plan was that a motorist could make the decision to take either way in or out of the site.

Councilwoman McCartney voiced concern about pedestrian safety and inquired if there would be a sidewalk; additionally she inquired if there was restrictive signage on Mt. Pleasant Place. Mr. Intinola said that a sidewalk was planned for the site. The Board determined that there was signage on Mt. Pleasant Place regarding ambulance access.

Mc. Carlucci had no questions for Mr. Intinola.

Mr. Weston asked for confirmation that the Level of Service was B; Mr. Intinola indicated the Level of Service for Mount Pleasant Place was B; but the Level of Service for Pleasant Valley Way and Mount Pleasant Avenue was D or better. Mr. Weston voiced concern that drivers would make a quick left in to the site making the driver behind the turning vehicle stop short. He questioned if making a left turn would create a potential hazard. Mr. Intinola stated he did not believe there would be a problem making left turns.

Mr. Gurland said he was concerned with three views: north, south and from Mt. Pleasant Place.

Mr. Klein inquired if it would be possible to make the southern driveway flow right-in and right-out only. Mr. Intinola said he believed the proposed plan called for the most accessibility.

The Public Advocate had no questions for Mr. Intinola.

Manuel Lin, 938 Pleasant Valley Way. Referring to the traffic study, Mr. Lin asked if there was a plan to control traffic flow once the project was completed. He stated that there were at least two accidents a year when the site was previously occupied; accidents now occurred to the south side

where the Exxon station was located. He asked if it would be a good idea to install an additional traffic signal at the site. Mr. Intinola said that the traffic itself would control the flow because of the design plan. He opined that while it might be a good idea to have an additional traffic signal installed, he did not believe the County would consider a new light.

Chairman Bagoff announced a brief recess at approximately 9:32 P.M.; he re-convened the meeting at approximately 9:39 P.M.

Mr. Del Vecchio advised that Gregory J. Polyniak, P.E., P.P., Neglia Engineering Associates would be providing testimony as the Applicant's professional planner. Mr. Polyniak indicated he had prepared the Applicant's Planning Report dated June 18, 2012. He described the topographical features and reiterated the site was constrained by considerable slopes on the west and north sides, and a sixteen feet reservation for Essex County on Pleasant Valley Way. He testified that those factors constituted conditions resulting in difficulties in developing the property. After the site had been reconfigured per the comments of the Planning Board, he noted the Applicant was requesting the following variances:

1. Parking Location - permitted only in side or rear yard, none existing, proposed in front yard with 42.4 ft. setback;
2. Steep Slope Disturbance - no disturbance on slopes more than 25% and limited on lesser slopes, none existing, 15 – 19.99% slope 40% disturbance allowed, 75.35% disturbance proposed; 20-24.99% slope 20% disturbance allowed, 66.96% proposed; 25% and over slope no disturbance allowed, 6.12% proposed;
3. Vegetated Buffer to Residential Zone - 75 ft. required, 53.25 ft. to existing driveway/69.3 ft. to RR tie wall existing, 53.25 feet to northern driveway/69.3 ft. to retaining wall proposed;
4. Maximum Lot Coverage - 60% allowed, 77.36% allowed, 72.40% proposed;
5. Parking Stall Size - 10 ft. x 18 ft. or 9 ft. x 20 ft. required, none existing, 9 ft. x 18 ft. proposed;
6. Parking Setback – Building - 15 ft. required, none existing, 6 ft. proposed;
7. Off Street Loading – Size - 10 ft. x 40 ft. required, none existing, 20.3 ft. x 35 ft. proposed;
8. Off Street Loading – Location - allowed in side or rear only, none existing, loading space in front yard proposed;
9. Signage - monument and directional signs not permitted, none existing, one (1) monument and two (2) directional signs proposed.

Mr. Polyniak said he believed the project was a safe design plan and would promote a desirable visual impact to the community.

Chairman Bagoff asked Mr. Polyniak if he would like to provide testimony regarding the size of parking spaces. Mr. Polyniak opined that going from 10 ft parking spaces to 9 ft was consistent with the updated ordinances, the reduction of spaces advanced MLUL.

Mr. Eben had no questions for Mr. Polyniak.

Councilwoman McCartney had no questions for Mr. Polyniak.

Ms. Carlucci had no questions for Mr. Polyniak.

Mr. Weston asked Mr. Polyniak to explain the basis for "C1" hardship, should the Board make

interpretation based on "C2" hardship. Mr. Weston said the testimony provided indicated the hardship was self-imposed, and indicated a "C2" hardship. Mr. Polyniak agreed that the variances needed could be justified under "C2" because the benefits outweigh the detriments. The project promoted appropriate land use.

Mr. Gurland had no questions for Mr. Polyniak

Mr. Klein had no questions for Mr. Polyniak

Mr. Keller said he was concerned that the 30 ft deep loading area was a little slim to accommodate a truck of the same depth. Mr. Polyniak said he believed the 30 ft was sufficient but would agree to move it an additional five feet.

The Public Advocate had no questions for Mr. Polyniak.

Manuel Lin, 938 Pleasant Valley Way, asked if geological information would be gathered; should borings be done further up the slope of the property. Mr. Keller answered that he had not heard testimony that the slope would be disturbed. Mr. Polyniak did not comment.

Chairman Bagoff voiced concern about adolescent pedestrians congregating/loitering at the site; he inquired if the Applicant had a loitering policy. Mr. Del Vecchio said that there would be a sidewalk along the building frontage; however, the Corporation had a strict anti-loitering policy.

Mr. Del Vecchio advised the Board that the Applicant's testimony had concluded. He further advised the Board that two of the three principals of Harrison French & Associates, Ltd. were New Jersey licensed architects; the Board should be satisfied with their credentials.

Chairman Bagoff asked the Public for comments.

Manuel Lin, 938 Pleasant Valley Way, was sworn in. Mr. Lin testified that when the property was an Amoco station there were at least two vehicular accidents per year. He said he observed during peak hours that when school buses picked up students, cars zoom by. He recommended a one-way directional sign and a traffic signal be installed. He voiced concern that existing businesses in the area would close, and when businesses on one side of the street closed, he was concerned for the safety of pedestrians crossing the street. He said he was concerned about the stability of the slope. He concluded by stating he did not believe the Application was a good plan.

The Board deliberated on the Application.

Mr. Eben said the Applicant had listened to what the Board had asked them to consider. He believed the development would be 110% better for the area. He was impressed with other 7-Elevens; they were maintained impeccably. Mr. Eben said he was assured by Mr. Del Vecchio that the plan was a positive improvement to the site, and while he did not like 7-Eleven stores in general, the new business would be a tax-ratable.

Councilwoman McCartney said the area was zoned for this type of business. She said she appreciated Mr. Lin's concerns, the Application did conflict with other businesses but it was the nature of the business. She reminded the Applicant to abide to ordinance rules for 24-hour operation of a business. She said she appreciated all the revisions made by the Applicant.

Ms. Carlucci had no comments.

Mr. Weston said the Applicant had been responsive to the Board; the plan was consistent with land-use law. He said he did have reservations regarding the left turn in to the southern entrance to the site, but overall the plan was acceptable.

Mr. Gurland said the Applicant's team had been amenable. He commented he was not a fan of the architectural design; and voiced concern there was a discrepancy regarding elevations and was worried there would be a step; but otherwise he said he was very positive regarding the proposed plan.

Mr. Klein said he was concerned about the left turn; he said that if there was a problem perhaps it could be monitored and re-addressed at a later date.

Mr. Keller voiced concern regarding the legality of requiring a post-construction traffic study; he noted that Pleasant Valley Way was a County road and the County might impose additional restrictions.

Mr. Weston questioned if would be safer to have the south driveway be a right-turn in, right-turn out only. Mr. Keller said it was not a simple question; should a restriction be imposed for a condition that occurred only occasionally. The signage should help with enforcement; and installing an island would not deter a motorist from making the left-hand turn. Mr. Keller advised the Board to remember it was a County road and the County might make restrictions.

Chairman Bagoff polled the Board regarding restricting left-hand turn. The Board voted not to restrict the left-hand turn.

Mr. Dwyer advised the Board that they could make a condition for a traffic study in a year.

Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall comply with all applicable Township, County, State and Federal laws, ordinances, regulations and directives, including without limitation, obtaining all applicable local, state and federal approvals and/or permits. Without limitation of the foregoing, prior to the signing of the approved site plans, and prior to the commencement of any land disturbance or construction, the Applicant shall submit to this Board, with a copy to the Board Engineer, proof that it has obtained all required governmental approvals.
2. If another governmental entity or agency grants a waiver or variance affecting the plans and/or exhibits submitted by the Applicant, this approval or the conditions attached to it, then the Applicant shall re-apply to this Board respecting the same and this Board shall have the right to view that issue as it relates to this approval and these conditions and modify and amend same, if appropriate.
3. In the event that any other required regulatory approval conflicts with the terms and conditions hereof, or materially alters the same, or the terms and conditions hereof are materially altered by any change in applicable law or regulation other than those municipal regulations for which change is prohibited by the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), or in

the event Applicant or its successors or assigns construct or attempt to construct any improvement in conflict with or in violation of the terms of this approval, the Board hereby reserves the right to withdraw, amend or supplant the instant approval.

4. All construction, use and development of the property shall be in conformance with the plans approved herein, all representations of the Applicant and its witnesses during the public hearing, all exhibits introduced by the Applicant, and all terms and conditions of this resolution.
5. The Applicant shall pay all outstanding taxes, tax liens, application fees and technical review fees, as well as any inspection fees that may be required hereunder. The Applicant shall pay any additional fees or escrow deposits which may be due and owing within thirty (30) days of notification or this approval shall be deemed withdrawn.
6. An engineer's estimate is to be provided for all site improvements for the purpose of establishing an engineering inspection escrow during construction in accordance with the MLUL. The engineer's estimate is to be submitted to the Board Engineer for review and approval. A pre-construction meeting is to be scheduled prior to the start of construction with the Township Engineer and Board Engineer.
7. All notes included in the approved plans, including notes required by this Resolution, shall be deemed conditions of approval having the same force and effect as conditions expressly set forth in this Resolution.
8. Applicant to revise the site plans in accordance with Omland Engineering's completeness review letter dated July 11, 2012, and comply with Items 4, 5 and 17 in Omland Engineering's review letter dated November 26, 2012 except that no street trees need be provided.
9. Applicant to comply with Items 4, 5 and 17 in Omland Engineering's review letter dated November 26, 2012.
10. One year after issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Applicant shall submit for review by the Board a traffic study detailing the traffic patterns, levels of service, number of accidents and all other pertinent information regarding parking and circulation for the improved site. In the event the Board determines that traffic and/or parking changes need to be made at that time the Applicant shall comply.
11. The roof shall be made of reflective materials so as to reduce light and heat absorption with a roofing material having a "solar reflective index" equal to or greater than 78.
12. Applicant shall limit deliveries by trucks having a wheelbase of 50 ft. or longer to between the hours of 7 p.m. and 5 a.m. Applicant to provide truck turning templates to Omland Engineering.
13. Applicant to maintain all plantings. Applicant to add evergreen shrubs in the rear of the lot and to provide more columnar shrubs in front of the retaining wall both subject to the review and approval of the Board Engineer.

14. Applicant to revise the architectural plans to accurately reflect the same first floor elevation as shown on the site plans.
15. Applicant to add east-west cross-sections to the site plan.
16. All retaining walls shall be of the same material and color.
17. Applicant to extend the loading area by five (5) feet so that it will be 35 feet in length by moving the dumpster enclosure to the west.
18. The parking space width is to be changed to 9 feet with the adjacent islands increased in width with additional landscaping provided.

The Board voted on the Application as follows:

Motion: Chairman Bagoff

Second: Mr. Eben

Carlucci	Y	Eben	Y	Ghebremicael	-
Gurland	Y	Heller	-	Klein	Y
Lester	-	McCartney	Y	Weston	-
Wilkes	-	Bagoff	Y		

MEETING ADJOURNED at approximately 10:44 P.M.

Minutes adopted January 2, 2013



Robin Miller, Planning Board Secretary

****THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD WILL BE
FEBRUARY 6, 2013 AT 7:30 P.M. IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS ****