

**TOWNSHIP OF WEST ORANGE
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 4, 2014**

The Township of West Orange Planning Board held a regular meeting on June 4, 2014 at 7:30 P.M. in Council Chambers, 66 Main Street, West Orange, New Jersey.

Chairman Heller called the meeting to order at approximately 7:30 P.M. It was announced that notification of this meeting was given to the Township Clerk, and posted on the Township Bulletin Board on November 21, 2013 in accordance with the requirements of the "Open Public Meetings Act".

PRESENT: Chairman Ben Heller, Robert Bagoff, Joanne Carlucci, Jerome Eben, Gerald Gurland, Lee Klein, Council President Susan McCartney

ABSENT: Tekeste Ghebremicael, Jason Lester, Vice Chairman Ron Weston, William Wilkes II

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Grygiel, AICP, PP, Acting Township Planner, Frank Russo, PE, Omland Engineering, Patrick J. Dwyer, Esq., Board Attorney, Robin Miller, Board Secretary, Debbie Dillon, Audio-Digital Transcription Service

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Heller requested all attendees stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Board regular meeting will be held on July 2, 2014 in Council Chambers at 7:30 P.M.

SWEARING IN

Paul Grygiel, AICP, PP, Acting Township Planner
Frank Russo, PE, PP, Consulting Engineer

RESOLUTIONS

PB-13-19/Sirius XM Radio, Inc.

Block: 84.01; Lot: 22.01; Zone B-2

12-16 Marcella Avenue

Conditional Use Site Plan replace existing antenna, add new antennas and replace existing cabinet and equipment.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Eben stated he had visited the site the previous day; there was debris and equipment all over the property. He said he was concerned the property owner or Township officials would not address the issue. Mr. Dwyer said the Building Department would address the matter before issuing permits. Dr. Bagoff suggested an addendum be inserted to the Resolution instructing the Building Department not to issue permits until the property was sufficiently cleared of debris to the satisfaction of the conditions of the Resolution.

Mr. Dwyer advised the Board that upon review of the draft Resolutions (PB-13-19/Sirius XM Radio, Inc. and PB-14-02/World Class Wireless, LLC), both attorneys had reservations about their applicants' ability to make the recommended structural integrity improvements as per the Consolidated Engineering report (dated January 16, 2014). He said the Resolutions had been modified slightly to reflect the applicants would not begin their site improvements until the structure owner had completed the structural repairs.

The Board voted on the Resolution (with modifications as noted) as follows:

Motion: Dr. Bagoff
Second: Chairman Heller

Bagoff: Yes	Carlucci: Yes	Eben: Yes	Ghebremicael: Absent
Gurland: Yes	Klein: -	Lester: Absent	McCartney: Yes
Weston: Absent	Wilkes: Absent	Heller: Yes	

PB-14-02/World Class Wireless, LLC

Block: 84.01; Lot: 22.01; Zone: B-2
12 Marcella Avenue
Conditional Use Site plan to replace existing telecommunication antenna.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Dwyer advised the Board that the Resolution had been modified to reflect the Applicant would not begin site improvements until the structure owner had completed recommended structural repairs.

Dr. Bagoff requested the same addendum be included regarding the Building Department not to issue permits until the property was sufficiently cleared of debris to the satisfaction of the conditions of the Resolution.

The Board voted on the Resolution (with modifications as noted) as follows:

Motion: Dr. Bagoff
Second: Chairman Heller

Bagoff: Yes	Carlucci: Yes	Eben: Yes	Ghebremicael: Absent
Gurland: Yes	Klein: -	Lester: Absent	McCartney: Yes
Weston: Absent	Wilkes: Absent	Heller: Yes	

APPLICATIONS

PB-14-04/Essex County Country Club
Block: 156; Lot: 1; Zone: R-2
350 Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Preliminary and Final Site Plan with "C" variances.
Carried from the May 7, 2014 regular meeting.

EXHIBITS

- A-1:** Colorized aerial site photograph of current conditions, prepared by Matrix New World Engineering, Inc.
- A-2:** Colorized site rendering of existing building; proposed changes including landscaping and handicap parking area, prepared by Matrix New World Engineering, Inc.
- A-3:** Architectural Plans prepared by Wayne J. Jacques, JGA Architectural Design dated May 21, 2014 including Sheet A1.1/Main Level Floor Plan; Sheet A1.0/Lower Level Floor Plan; Sheet A1.2/Upper Level Floor Plan; Sheet A5.1/Proposed Exterior Elevations East & North; Sheet A5.2/Proposed Elevations West & South; Exterior Rendering dated June 4, 2014.
- A-4:** Colorized Photographs (three pages), prepared by Peter G. Steck, P.P., dated June 4, 2014.

DISCUSSION

Joseph A. Vena, Esq., Mandelbaum, Salsburg, Lazris & Discenza, P.C., attorney for the Applicant, addressed the Board; he stated the Application was for preliminary and final site plan approval with request for the granting of four variances, for improvements to the existing clubhouse and facilities. He noted the club had a rich history and was the oldest of its kind in the State of New Jersey; Thomas Edison had been a member.

Mr. Klein requested he be recused from hearing the Application; it was so noted by Chairman Heller; Mr. Klein left the Board dais.

Christopher James Field was sworn in, advised the Board he was a resident of West Orange, a member of the Essex County Country Club for seventeen years, and the current President of the Club. He said that currently there were 285 club members; the maximum number of desired golfing members was 300. He testified that there were approximately 320 people in attendance at the Club's largest social event; there were never parking problems at events; there was valet service for larger events and on Friday and Saturday night events. There were currently 206 parking spaces, and additional accessory parking of approximately 40 to 45 spaces behind the pool area usually used by staff during large events; and another 40 to 45 spaces near the maintenance facility. The main parking area would be reduced from 206 to 203 due to the planned restriping of the lot for handicapped parking. The existing clubhouse had been open since 1942; among the list of items in need of renovation were HVAC system, roof, an awkward two-tiered dining room layout; and plumbing and electrical issues. The improvements were not meant to increase membership numbers; the intention was to make necessary renovations to remain competitive; the clubhouse was inferior to area competition. The Club had struggled to maintain membership numbers of 250 over the last few years in part because of the current facilities. The golf use would remain the same; the interior changes would be for member enjoyment only; the club does not advertise its facilities for rental to outside entities. The renovation included relocating the pro-shop to the main building.

Council President McCartney asked for clarification regarding the existing 206 parking spaces; did that include the spaces near the pool and maintenance areas. Mr. Field said the existing 206 spaces were those in the vicinity of the main building; the pool area had approximately 40-45 spaces; the parking near the maintenance shed were approximately another 40-45 spaces; approximately 40% of the 60-65 employees drove to work; most were summer staff that used public transportation. Council President McCartney asked if the increase in interior gross square footage would be to make the space more handicap accessible. Mr. Field said the key problem was the existing dining room on two levels and the inadequate kitchen; the dining room would be one level area; the kitchen would be reconfigured.

The Public had no questions for Mr. Field.

Phillip Scott, PE, Matrix New World Engineering, Inc., was sworn in, stated his credentials, and was accepted by the Board to be an expert in engineering. Referring to Exhibit A-1, Mr. Scott said all improvements would be within the immediate area of the building; there would be few changes to the existing parking other than to relocate the handicap parking closer to the existing building. The closet adjacent property was approximately 1,000 feet, the closet road was approximately 1,500 feet; the improvements would not be visible from the nearest street or adjacent properties. Referring to Exhibit A-2, Mr. Scott said the improvements would include an addition to the main building; the relocation of the clubhouse main entrance; the relocation of the handicap parking spaces; and a new covered patio and outdoor dining area. The building would be "bumped out" to increase the kitchen and food preparation areas; and provide a new pro-shop to main building; also, the relocation of the loading area from the rear to the front to make it more functional – the Applicant was requesting a variance for the relocation of the loading area. As part of the expansion of the building, there would be a large elevation change creating the need for a new retaining wall that would be 9-feet with 4-foot fencing for a total height of 13-feet; the height of the wall exceeded ordinance – the Applicant was requesting a variance. The Applicant was also seeking a variance for relief from the parking lot shade tree ordinance; he stated the entire property was located on 176 acres of mostly open space with numerous trees; the parking lot improvement was only to relocate the handicap parking; there would be no change to the parking lot impervious coverage, only restriping for better functionality. Mr. Scott opined the requested variance relief would improve the overall functionality of the property.

Council President McCartney asked if there was any room to plant trees to camouflage the area of the proposed retaining wall; Mr. Scott said that there were some existing trees and landscaping that would not be disturbed and additional plantings would be added.

Dr. Bagoff asked if the requested variances were "c(1)" or "c(2)". Mr. Vena stated the Applicant's Planner would be able to answer questions regarding the variances. Dr. Bagoff inquired as to the current number of handicap spaces; Mr. Scott said he believed there were currently three spaces – they would be increased to seven spaces. Mr. Vena said the Applicant's architect would provide testimony regarding the number of handicap spaces.

Mr. Eben stated that the distance from loading area to fence was only about 28 feet; he asked if delivery trucks would be stacked up; would there be a delivery schedule; he opined there was no room for truck parking. Mr. Scott said deliveries would typically be scheduled for early morning hours before the Club was open. Mr. Eben asked the location of the dumpster area; Mr. Scott said the dumpster was located near the pool house, which was outside the area of the proposed renovations and would remain the same. There was no garbage stored in the loading area. Mr. Eben asked what material would be used for the retaining wall; Mr. Scott said the wall material would be a decorative segmental block.

Chairman Heller stated the plans appeared to show two different types of retaining walls; he asked what material would be used; Mr. Scott said the final design had not been determined but it would probably be some type of decorative façade.

Mr. Russo advised the Board that all comments regarding the Omland Engineering memo dated May 19, 2014 had been sufficiently addressed.

Makram Erian, 592 Prospect Avenue, stated the Public Notice he received said the Application included a house of worship would be built; he asked where it would be located. Mr. Vena said the original notice that went out had a typographical error, there was no house of worship included in the Application; the second notice that was sent out had the correct information.

Wayne J. Jacques, RA, Jefferson Group Architects/JGA Architectural Design, was sworn in, stated his credentials and accepted by the Board to be an expert in architecture. Referring to Exhibit A-3, Mr. Jacques described the proposed renovations to the main clubhouse proposed which included the relocation of the main entrance; relocation of the administrative office; bathroom renovations; additional kitchen and storage space. In the back of the building, the lower dining room area would be raised to become more efficient; the patio area would be renovated and a hard roof would be installed. On the lower level, there would be a pro-shop, new storage space, and a small expansion to existing ballroom. The upper level would include the addition of a small Boardroom and staircase. Improvements would include cosmetic upgrades to the main building. The loading dock would be moved to provide better access for deliveries.

Council President McCartney asked for clarification regarding the exterior stairs in the area of the outside pavilion; was the area handicap accessible and what was the purpose of the stairs. Mr. Jacques said the area would be handicap accessible; the existing stairs just provided additional access to the building.

Dr. Bagoff asked if the building included an attic; if light colored tiles would be used for the roof; and if the plan included an emergency stand-by generator. Mr. Jacques said there was a small attic area; a light colored roof could be considered; he said that a generator had not been discussed as part of the project. Mr. Vena said a generator was an operational issue; but a great recommendation that the Applicant would look at although it should not be included as a condition of approval.

Mr. Gurland asked if the building was sprinklered; Mr. Jacques said the building was currently sprinklered; the renovations would include bringing the existing system up to code. Mr. Gurland asked if all renovations would be ADA compliant; he noted there was no elevator indicated in the plans. Mr. Jacques said that all areas would be accessible, albeit some from the exterior graded areas; he admitted that issues related to better accessibility should be explored.

Mr. Eben said he did not see a janitorial service area on the plans; Mr. Jacques said the janitor area was located at the end of the hall near the main floor restrooms; an additional janitor facility was located in the kitchen area. Mr. Eben said he was confused regarding handicap accessibility for the second floor women's locker room; Mr. Jacques said there was no current access; it was something that should be investigated.

The Township professionals and Public had no questions for Mr. Jacques.

Peter G. Steck, P.P., was sworn in and accepted by the Board to be an expert in planning. Mr. Steck confirmed he had reviewed the Township ordinances regarding the request for the (four) variance(s); he

had reviewed the Township's Master Plan; and he confirmed he had visited the site. Referring to Exhibit A-4, he stated the Club was approximately 176 acres comprised of mostly open space located in the R-2 Zone. The clubhouse was surrounded by extensive open space separated from adjacent property owners. The proposal was focused on modernizing the clubhouse to serve its existing members. Mr. Steck said the Applicant was seeking variance relief for parking, loading space location, wall height, and trees in parking area. He opined variance relief could be granted for "c(1)" hardship reasons; the relief could also be granted under "c(2)" reasons, the benefits of the improvements were greater than the detriments, the plan offered a better option regarding the Master Plan and zoning ordinance.

Council President McCartney asked Mr. Steck to detail the need for landscaping in the area of the retaining wall. Mr. Steck said the information was on the engineering plan; it was his opinion there would be sufficient landscaping to soften the effects of the retaining wall.

Dr. Bagoff said he had issue that the previous witness had testified that not having an elevator was poor planning; Mr. Steck opined that the plan clearly reflected the Applicant had addressed upgrades regarding handicap accessibility, i.e. parking spaces, the leveling out of floor heights, bathroom access. He stated the zoning code was not the same as the building code; if the New Jersey International Building Code (NJIBC) required additional handicap accessibility by installing an elevator, then that would have been addressed outside of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Gurland stated that he felt strongly about the issue of the elevator and handicap accessibility; he requested that as a condition of approval the Resolution should include the Building Inspector provide a written statement whether an elevator is required. He opined that whether or not an elevator was required by code, it was a good practice that improved the quality of life for a handicapped person. Mr. Field said that the ladies locker room on the second floor was solely for the use of women golfers; approximately 35 female golfers used the room. Currently, the Club had no handicapped golfers. The first floor and lower level of the clubhouse would be handicap accessible. The renovations would meet all uniform code requirements.

Mr. Eben stated that he was a proponent of the zoning ordinance requiring one tree for every ten parking spaces; he was concerned about the request for relief; Mr. Steck opined that the parking lot was located on a golf course that had thousands of trees; the parking lot would not be visible to adjacent properties or streets. The parking lot was an existing condition; there was not a "sea of asphalt".

Mr. Grygiel opined that Mr. Steck accurately described the Master Plan objectives regarding golf courses and open spaces.

The Public had no questions for Mr. Steck.

The Board deliberated on the Application. Council President McCartney opined that Mr. Steck's rationale for the requested variances made sense; she recommended that all existing construction code standards be considered; she said it was her understanding that new construction standards did require elevator installation was required; she suggested that a light colored roof design be considered.

Mr. Russo requested there was a need for an Engineer's estimate for the site work. Mr. Vena said the issue had been discussed at the Technical Review meeting.

Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall comply with all applicable Township of West Orange, County, State and Federal laws, ordinances, regulations and directives, including without limitation, obtaining all applicable local, state and federal approvals and/or regulatory 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 and stipulations 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.
6. Applicant shall comply with the requirements for affordable housing compliance, if any, which apply, including any amendments or revisions thereto, as the same may require the creation of low and/or moderate income housing or contribution therefor as a result of this approval.
7. Applicant shall:
 - (i) give consideration to the Board's recommendation for a light colored roof;
 - (ii) abide by all ADA requirements with regard to handicapped accessibility;
 - (iii) give consideration to the Board's request for installation of a permanent generator; and
 - (iv) provide an engineer's estimate of the work for inspection purposes.
8. 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.

The Board voted on the Application as follows:

Motion: Chairman Heller

Second: Dr. Bagoff

Bagoff: Yes	Carlucci: Yes	Eben: Yes	Ghebremicael: Absent
Gurland: Yes	Klein: -	Lester: Absent	McCartney: Yes
Weston: Absent	Wilkes: Absent	Heller: Yes	

Chairman Heller announced a brief recess at approximately 9:17 P.M.; he reconvened the meeting at approximately 9:25 P.M. Chairman Heller indicated Mr. Klein had rejoined the Board dais.

Mr. Russo left the meeting at approximately 9:20 P.M.

PB-14-08C/County of Essex-South Mountain Recreation Complex

Block: 163; Lot: 13; Zone: R-1

560 Northfield Avenue

Courtesy Review Application to construct a 5-Level Parking Deck.

EXHIBITS

- A-1:** Topographic Mapping of 560 Northfield Avenue prepared by Michael Pronesti, P.L.S, Pronesti Surveying Inc., dated February 10, 2014;
- A-2:** Overall Site Plan including proposed south parking deck and site improvements, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated May 1, 2014, revised May 23, 2014;
- A-3:** Garage Floor Plan Level P1 through Level P5, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated May 1, 2014;
- A-4:** Colorized rendering of proposed garage and existing conditions, prepared by Comito Associates, PC, undated.
- A-5:** Traffic Signal Plan and Striping Plan (Sheet T-) and Existing Conditions Plan (Sheet C-1), prepared by Paul B. Going, P.E., Atlantic Traffic & Design Engineers, Inc., dated April 10, 2014.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Eben requested he be recused from hearing the Application; it was so noted by Chairman Heller; Mr. Eben left the Board dais.

Mark L. Fleder, Esq., Connell Foley, attorney for Applicant, addressed the Board. He said the County was proposing to build a second tiered parking garage behind the existing ice rink in the area of the Turtle Back Zoo parking area; there would also be traffic signal improvements.

Darrell F. Alvarez, R.A, P.E., P.P., Comito Associates, P.C., was sworn in, stated his credentials, and was accepted by the Board to be an expert in engineering and architecture. Mr. Alvarez said he had prepared the plans for the project. Referring to Exhibit A-1, he described the existing conditions; he told the Board the plan included building a new parking structure to the rear of the existing ice skating structure. Referring to Exhibit A-2, Mr. Alvarez identified the existing structure, its location relative to Northfield Avenue, and the existing asphalt surface parking area near Turtle Back Zoo. He said the new proposed structure would be approximately 60 feet from the ice skating arena; it would not be visible from Northfield Avenue. Referring to Exhibit A-3, Mr. Alvarez said the proposed structure would be five levels; Level P1 would have 52 spaces; Levels P2, P3 and P4 would each have 107 spaces, and Level P5 would have 106 spaces; for a total count of 479 spaces; the structure would be ADA compliant. The

structure was designed to accommodate a sixth level; however, the County currently had no plans to erect a sixth level. There were currently 296 ground level spaces; approximately 200 of the existing spaces would be incorporated into the ground level of the new parking structure for a net increase of 338 parking spaces. The current parking at the amusement was 860 spaces; the new structure would increase the capacity to 1,200 spaces. The new garage would be a pre-cast structure almost identical to the existing parking garage; a Security Office would be located at the entrance to the structure on the main level; there would be a utility room; janitor's closet and restroom for office personnel; but no public restrooms in the structure. The deck would have two elevators and two stairs; there would be a back-up generator for the structure. There would be interior lighting on each level; pole mounted lighting would be located on Level P5, identical to the lighting on the existing garage; the pole lighting would be shielded; no excessive overflow lighting would be visible to surrounding properties. Referring to Exhibit A-4, Mr. Alvarez said that landscaping would be installed in the traffic island areas and along the structure walkways and light poles. Mr. Alvarez described the existing traffic conditions; currently there was a signalized entrance at the center of the site, and a signalized exit to the left of the property. He said the new plan would change the current restricted driveway (located to the right of the property) to a signalized driveway exit for public use; it would be restricted to passenger cars only. Buses would exit from the existing driveway at the left of the property. Mr. Alvarez said the County was projecting a fall start date for the project so it would not interfere with peak zoo attendance.

Council President McCartney asked what the height of the structure and would the elevator shaft be constructed to extend to accommodate a sixth level; how the tree ordinance regarding one tree for every ten parking spaces related to the parking structure; and would emergency vehicles have access to the parking garage. Mr. Alvarez said the maximum height would be 51 feet; the elevator would be able to extend to a sixth level, but the shaft would not be extended until a sixth level was installed; ambulance vehicles would have access to interior main level of structure; fire trucks would have access to the building exterior. Mr. Fleder said the ordinance regarding trees did not apply to the parking structure located on County property; however, Mr. Alvarez testified to the landscaping consideration.

Mr. Gurland asked where would be the location of the new traffic signal; how would a passenger vehicle exit west from the site on to Northfield Avenue. Mr. Fleder said the existing left turn would remain the same; vehicles exiting the new driveway exit would turn right to next signal then make legal U-turn exit west on to Northfield Avenue.

Mr. Klein, (referring to Exhibit A-3-Parking Level P1), stated that the first three parking spaces looked too close to the entrance; was there enough space for cars backing out to not be hit by cars entering the garage; he asked for clarification regarding the current traffic circulation for school buses and if the pattern would change; and what was the projected construction time frame to finish the project if it was started in September. Mr. Alvarez said the garage entrance would have a ticket-type operation; there would be ample timing for cars to maneuver backing out of the spaces; he explained the traffic pattern for school buses and the student drop-off area; he said that buses were currently parked off-site during visits; the projected time frame would be approximately eight to ten months to finish the project.

Council President McCartney asked for clarification regarding the location of the proposed traffic light at the new exit; would it be located on site or on Northfield Avenue. Mr. Alvarez said it would be located on Northfield Avenue.

Robert Rashkes, 35 Oak Crest Road, asked how many surface parking spots would remain after the parking garage was constructed; would flatbed trucks have access to all levels of the garage in case a car needed to be towed; would the new garage be higher than the existing garage. Mr. Alvarez said there

were currently 296 surface parking spots; 200 would remain after the construction; a flat-bed truck would not have access, a smaller utility vehicle would be used to tow disabled vehicles from the structure; the height of the new garage would actually be lower than the existing garage.

Paul B. Going, P.E., Atlantic Traffic & Design Engineers, Inc., was sworn in, stated his credentials, and was accepted by the Board to be an expert in traffic engineering. Referring to Exhibit A-5, Mr. Going confirmed he had designed the traffic signal plan; he described the existing conditions and the proposed improvements, which included the new westerly driveway and new traffic signal. He said the plan essentially permitted one main traffic signaled driveway entrance in to the site and two traffic signaled driveways exits out of the site. He opined the overall traffic plan was an efficient and safe plan for site ingress and egress and pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Klein asked if a pedestrian crosswalk was needed along the new driveway (exit) on Northfield Avenue; were any traffic improvements planned in the vicinity of the gas station across Northfield Avenue; had a traffic study been done to address the increased volume of vehicles exiting the site resulting from a new second means of egress; how would the new exit affect the queuing of traffic on to Northfield Avenue; and would there be improved signage in the area of the "jug-handle" at Northfield and Cherry Lane. Mr. Going said there was an existing crosswalk in the area of the new driveway exit and a pedestrian signal would be installed. There was currently a pedestrian crosswalk across Northfield Avenue in the area of the ingress signal. There would be a stop sign, a right-turn-only sign and signal at the new driveway; vehicles would not be allowed to cross Northfield directly to the gas station; traffic volume had been looked at but the site change was for the number of parking spaces, not the expansion of the site facilities; he opined the queue length was adequate.

Chairman Heller asked if the proposed traffic signal would be on a timer; Mr. Going answered in the affirmative; it would be coordinated with the existing signals.

Council President McCartney asked if the new traffic light was to be located on Northfield Avenue or at the driveway exit on site; Mr. Going said the traffic signal would be located on Northfield Avenue; a pedestrian crossing signal will be located at the driveway exit. Council President McCartney opined there was excessive road signage on Northfield Avenue commercial properties, however, inadequate site access signage (information) for westbound vehicles traveling on Northfield Avenue. Vehicles needed to know they had to stay to the right to make the jug-handle turn for access to the site long before they traveled to the area of the jug-handle. She asked if it would be possible to synchronize the light at the intersection of Northfield and Pleasant Valley Way to permit left turn on to Cherry Lane. Mr. Fleder indicated that Mr. Varghese could discuss site access signage.

Mr. Grygiel asked if the County was aware of recently approved and proposed West Orange development in the area including a new mini-mall and pending Quick Check application currently before the Zoning Board; he asked if the plans had taken the new development into consideration regarding the traffic plan for Northfield Avenue, which was a County road. Mr. Fleder said that Mr. Varghese would be able to address the matter.

The Public had no questions for Mr. Going.

Sangeev Varghese, Director, Essex County Department of Public Works, was sworn in; he advised the Board he had participated in the design process of the project and was familiar with the plan. He said the project would take approximately ten months to complete. During the construction period, there would be approximately 140 lost surface parking spaces; less visitors were expected during the construction period, but if additional parking was needed, visitors would be directed to off-site parking

areas. He detailed how buses would enter, unload passengers, and exit the site to off-site parking area. The signage issues along Northfield Avenue was currently being reviewed; there would be consolidation of some signs and better informational signage (further east) near Prospect Avenue for vehicles traveling west to the site. Mr. Varghese opined that the current conditions at Northfield and Pleasant Valley Way were a safer movement than proposing a left turn on to Cherry Lane. Mr. Varghese opined that a vehicle making an illegal turn was an enforcement issue.

Robert Rashkes, 35 Oak Crest Road, asked if there would be a fee for garage parking. Mr. Fleder answered in the affirmative.

The Board deliberated on the Application; the Board determined the proposed project and capital improvements were consistent with the West Orange Master Plan.

The Board voted on the Application as follows:

Motion: Chairman Heller

Second: Ms. Carlucci

Bagoff: Yes	Carlucci: Yes	Eben: -	Ghebremicael: Absent
Gurland: Yes	Klein: Yes	Lester: Absent	McCartney: Yes
Weston: Absent	Wilkes: Absent	Heller: Yes	

DISCUSSION

Technical Review Subcommittee Ordinance and Application Process
Carried from the May 7, 2014 regular meeting.

Chairman Heller announced that due to the lateness of the hour, the Discussion would be carried to the July 2, 2014 regular meeting.

Council President McCartney advised the Board she had contacted Meghan Hunscher, P.P., who had recently testified before the Board; she wanted to schedule a meeting with Ms. Hunscher about her possible suggestions regarding updating the Technical Review Application process.

MEETING ADJOURNED at approximately 10:32 P.M.

Minutes adopted September 3, 2014



Robin Miller, Planning Board Secretary
 Township of West Orange

**THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD WILL BE
 WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 1, 2014 AT 7:30 P.M. IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS**