

**MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
REGULAR MEETING
BOROUGH OF ORADELL
HELD IN THE TOWN HALL
JANUARY 23, 2019**

Chairman Michelman called the Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Notice of this meeting was published in the official newspapers, prominently posted in the Borough Hall, and filed with the clerk in accordance with the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mr. Michelman, Mrs. McGrinder, Mr. McHale, Mr. Beslow, Mrs. Cobb, Mr. Degheri, Mr. Barrows, Mr. Santaniello

Also Present: Mr. Regan, Esq.
Mr. Atkinson, Board Engineer
Mr. Lydon, Board Planner
Mr. Depken, Zoning Administrator

Reorganization

Mr. Michelman stated that two reappointed board members needed to be sworn in. Mr. Regan administered the oath of office to Mrs. McGrinder and Mr. McHale for the position of regular members of the Zoning Board. Mr. Michelman introduced the board's council liaison, Councilman Kelly and asked if he would like to say a few words to the board. Mr. Kelly stated that he would like to express his thanks to the board members for their volunteering; for their service to the community and their professionalism. He explained that the council is honored for their service to the community and he thanks them again. Mr. Michelman stated that the Mayor had contacted him in the beginning of the year to thank him and express her appreciation on the efforts for all the Zoning Board members have done.

Nomination for Mr. Michelman as Chairman was made by Mr. McHale, seconded by Mr. Degheri. Mr. Michelman asked if there were any other nominations or if any opposed.

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Nomination for Mrs. Cobb as Vice Chairman was made by Mr. McHale, seconded by Mrs. McGrinder. Mr. Michelman asked if there were any other nominations or if any opposed.

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Nomination for Mrs. McGrinder as Secretary was made by Mrs. Cobb, seconded by Mr. McHale. Mr. Michelman asked if there were any other nominations or if any opposed

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Appointment for Mr. Regan as Board Attorney was made by Mr. Michelman, seconded by Mrs. Cobb. Mr. Michelman asked if there were any other nominations or if any opposed.

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Appointment for Mr. Atkinson from Neglia Engineering as Board Engineer was made by Mr. Michelman, seconded by Mrs. McGrinder. Mr. Michelman asked if there were any other nominations or if any opposed.

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Appointment for Rosalia Bob as Recording Secretary was made by Mr. Michelman, seconded by Mrs. McGrinder. Mr. Michelman asked if there were any other nominations or if any opposed.

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Correspondence

The New Jersey Planner November/December 2018 Vol. 79, No. 6
1-3-2019 Letter to Stephen A. Depken, Construction Official from Robert T. Regan, Esq. re 2018
Annual Report of Action.

Approval of Minutes – April 16, 2018; May 21, 2018; November 19, 2018; December 19, 2018

Mr. Michelman stated that the minutes before the board have been reviewed by him and proofread. He explained that when he reviewed the meeting from December, the board had discussed the minutes that were up for approval that evening but he had not called for a vote. He stated that the minutes the board would be voting on are April, November, May and December of 2018.

Mrs. Cobb made a motion to approve the minutes, and Mr. McHale seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Mr. Michelman stated that the approval votes for the record by the members are to reflect meetings they were present for.

Approval of 2018 Annual Report

Mr. Michelman asked if any of the members had any additional comments or edits to the annual report. Mr. Michelman called for a motion from the board.

Mrs. Cobb made a motion to approve, and Mr. Beslow seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL:
All in Favor

Mr. Michelman stated that the annual report had now been adopted and he would submit a copy to Mr. Depken.

Mr. Depken, Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Lydon were all sworn in by Mr. Regan.

Applications

CAL. #837-18 TEMPLE BETH EL OF NORTHERN VALLEY NEW APPLICATION
Block 807, Lot 3 660 Kinderkamack Rd.

Mr. Michelman stated that the case before the board this evening is an inherently beneficial use application. He explained that the board members do not need to look for the positives or have the applicant explain the positives. He stated that the board needs to look at any negatives in order to see if there is a substantial detriment, then if so, they must work with the applicant to see if they could overcome any detriment. Mr. Regan explained that in the MLUL a house of worship has been deemed an inherently beneficial use. He stated that since it is a house of worship being proposed, they also have the federal statute known as the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 which is a very important statute to consider when looking at an application such as this in their testimony. He detailed the law statute for the board members. Mr. Michelman stated that this application is also a D variance which requires five affirmative votes in order to be approved. Mr. Reagan stated that he had reviewed the notice submitted by the applicant and the board has jurisdiction. The attorney for the application, Holly Schepisi stated that she would be presenting the application on behalf of Temple Beth El which is the contract purchaser for the property 660 Kinderkamack Road. Mrs. Cobb explained that she needed to recuse herself from the application because she has a conflict with the applicant's attorney. She stated that they are working on another project together and this application would be a conflict. Ms. Schepisi explained that the applicant, Temple Beth El is an inherently beneficial use and their intent is to be good neighbors. She stated that the applicant wants to be a part of the community. She explained that the property is located in the B2 zone and detailed the property's location. She stated that the applicant is the result of a merger between Temple Beth EL of Closter and Temple Beth Or of Washington Township. She explained that the two temples had come together in discussions to join in order to ensure a vision of a new stronger progressive Jewish reform community within the area along with a preschool for approximately 66 children, before & after care for the school program and a religious studies program. She stated that houses of worship are a conditional use in the Borough of Oradell and she cites the section in the code. She explained that this a D3 conditional use variance for the application

along with associated bulk variances and a soil movement permit. She stated that they submitted for the record a parking license agreement between Temple Beth El and 700 Kinderkamack Road. She detailed the existing conditions of the current building along with the existing office space tenants. She detailed each variance being sought by the application. She stated that they would need to clarify the building height restriction. She explained that within the B2 zone, the building height requirement is 35 feet which they comply with but that under the conditional use ordinance there is a height requirement of 32 feet. She stated that the only relief the applicant is seeking under the conditional use ordinance is that of parking. She explained that the applicant would give testimony on a parking agreement they have established with a neighboring building along with a shuttle service in that location to bring people to and from the temple site. The president for Temple Beth El and parishioner, Stephen Verp was sworn in by Mr. Regan. Mr. Verp stated that he initiated the discussions on the merger of the two temples. He explained that he is currently a member of the integration committee and is the lead on the real estate project. He stated that in the fall of 2016 the two temples had begun conversations regarding the potential merger and they agreed to find a new building in Bergen County. He explained that they looked at many different locations for their size needs. He stated that when they found the property at 660 Kinderkamack Road, it was the perfect fit and the right size. He explained that they signed a contract for the property in June 2018 and then went to both congregations to seek approvals for the location in order to move forward on the project. He stated that currently Temple Beth Or has 300 members and Temple Beth El has approximately 210 families. He explained that typically Friday night service is held between 7:30-9:00 PM and they would anticipate 40 to 50 attendance. He stated that Saturday morning between 9:00-11:00 AM is their temple's Torah studies with typically between 20 to 30 attendees. He explained that they had done a planning scenario to look at what the possible attendees would be between the two congregations. He stated that a committee was appointed and they came up with the name, Kol Dorot which means voice of the generations. He explained that this name signifies a connection to their past both as Jewish people and the two congregations merging together to come as one for the future. Mrs. Schepisi stated that some of the submissions mention the name of the new temple. Mr. Regan confirmed that this would be the name of the new temple once it is established. Mr. Verp stated yes. He explained that their current facility does have a preschool on site and in discussions for the merger they made a lifecycle commitment which is from birth to death and is part of their commitment to the Jewish community. He stated that they currently have six classrooms and they are proposing six classrooms, a gym space and an outdoor space for the new building. He explained that they had a meeting with the State and they would have the possibility of a 66 student maximum at the new facility. He stated that this is based upon firm square footage guidelines with the State of New Jersey. He explained that they have already engaged with New Jersey Division of Family Services and they have given them guidelines to follow. He stated that they have been in close consultation with them for design and layout of the preschool. He explained that they also adhere to more rigorous standards of the NAEYC which is the National Association of the Education of Young Children for the curriculum of their young students in order to provide them with great service. He stated that the preschool would be for any children that would want to attend. He explained that there would be approximately 16 teachers and the hours of operation would be between 9:00 AM to 2:00 PM Monday through Friday. He stated that there would be extended hours to accommodate working parents which would be 7:00 AM to 6:30 PM. He explained that they estimate between 10-15% of the children to utilize the before and after care program in the nursery school. He detailed the approximate arrival and departure

times for the teachers within the main program and the before and after care program. He stated that there would be an additional religious study program. He explained that the religious school is conducted on Sunday between 9:00 AM to 11:00 AM and Monday, Tuesday and Thursday between 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. He stated that they are expecting approximately 80 to 90 students on Sundays with generally 10 to 12 teachers, on Tuesday they are expecting 60 to 70 students with generally 8 teachers and on the Monday and Thursday program they generally have approximately 30 students with 4 teachers. He explained that each year they hold high holiday services which are Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. He stated that as part of the application they had presented to the board a spreadsheet listing all the high holidays for the next few years. He explained that during the high holidays there is an increase in the numbers of the congregation and the maximum number they would never exceed is 350 to 400 participants as they have two sessions of services each day. He stated that there are approximately 10 days during the course of the year where they would have a larger number of congregants. He explained that they set their calendar in July going forward for the year so they would know these dates well in advance. He stated that they entered into a 10 year parking agreement with Kmack Realty Corp. at 700 Kinderkamack Road for up to 20 days per year and to also include for any type of future special events. He explained that their intention is to hire Borough Police Officers on overflow days to help with any traffic related issues. He stated that they currently do this in Closter and they are very supportive of the Closter Police Department. He explained that the temple would be willing to enter into a service agreement with the Borough of Oradell to offset anything it incurred. He stated that for the overflow parking, they would hire a shuttle in order to transport congregants to and from the temple. He explained that in their discussions with 700 Kinderkamack Road they had also agreed to rent a tenant space within their building along with the parking agreement so that the parking would be part in parcel with the tenancy. Ms. Schepisi presented into evidence a copy of the parking agreement. Mr. Michelman stated that this is part of their application but they would mark this as A1. Mr. Verp explained that the preschool would not be occupied during any high holidays or high-volume days. He stated that the temple's intention is to be a good shepherd within any community they reside in and if there was ever a need for another resource for the Borough including interfaith services or gatherings that they would be happy to host them. Mr. Michelman asked the board's planner if he had any questions for this particular witness. Mr. Lydon stated that he would like to apologize to the board and the applicant for the delay on their review memo for the application. He asked if the child care center would be licensed through the Department of Human Services. Mr. Verp stated that the licensing is through the Division of Family and Children Services. Mr. Michelman asked the Board Engineer if he had any questions. Mr. Atkinson stated not at this moment. Mr. Depken asked what the ages are for the preschool students. Mr. Verp stated that the ages are two years old till kindergarten. Mr. Depken explained that the conditional use code would include preschool does not mention anything about religious studies. He asked if that would denote needing another variance. Mr. Regan stated that he did not believe so because presumably the religious education program would encompass nursery to secondary. Ms. Schepisi explained that the religious education is akin to a CCD program and is part and parcel of the temple. Mr. Depken stated that he had wanted to clarify that everything would be covered under the variances being sought. Mr. Verp explained that the ages of the students receiving religious education are from the third grade to the seventh grade so it is only children receiving the education program and not adults. Mr. Regan stated that the primary principal conditional use would be the synagogue and the educational component would be an accessory to it. He asked to

confirm the number of students for the religious education portion and discusses this with the applicant. Mr. Atkinson asked if there would be separate staff during that time. Mr. Verp stated that the teachers are the staff and there would be nothing additional. Mr. Michelman asked if any of the board members had any questions. Mr. McHale asked about the number of congregants during the high holidays. He stated that they had given a number of 350 to 400 congregants and asked if this would be at each service or was this a combined total. Mr. Verp explained that this would be at each service. Mr. McHale asked how many high holidays are there. Mr. Verp stated that there are two high holidays: Rosh Hashanah which would have services the evening before, the day of Rosh Hashanah and the following day which tails off the holiday and Yom Kippur which has services the evening before and the day of Yom Kippur. Mr. Barrows asked how many people overall would be the combined congregation numbers. Mr. Verp stated that some members are families, some are empty-nesters and some are single people. He explained that there would be approximately 500 people or so. He stated that there is always a separation from that number because some families go to other temples for holiday services or do not attend services. Mr. Barrows asked of the 210 family's number, what would that scale too for congregants. Mr. Verp stated approximately 375 congregants. He explained that they believe their combined family target number range would be 425 to 450. Mr. Barrows stated that one of his concerns is the parking and asked questions regarding any possible type of termination policy. Ms. Schepisi stated that in the event of an approval, as a condition, there would always need to be something comparable in place in order to be able to have the high holiday services. She explained that in the event there was a termination or something occurred with the parking agreement then the applicant would need to come back before the board with an alternate type of parking arrangement and there would be a halt on the high holidays until such time that the board deems there is an acceptable option solution. Mr. Verp stated that they also went into discussions with the other building next door at 680 Kinderkamack Road as well in the event that something was to happen. Mr. Michelman clarified that if the parking agreement terminates, the temple would cease to have services that would require this parking until they came back before the board with whatever contingency plan they have made. He stated that the applicant would not have their congregants park off street. Mr. Verp explained that this would not happen for safety concerns and to be good neighbors. Mr. Michelman confirmed that this would be a condition offered by the applicant. Ms. Schepisi stated yes but that the normal operations would continue and only the high-volume services would be put on hold until a proper solution could be identified and brought before the board again. Mr. Michelman asked about other services such as naming services. Mr. Verp stated that those types of services would be during a regular Saturday morning service or through a private arrangement. He explained that services such as Bar and Bat Mitzvahs would be able to be handled within the existing parking on the site. Mr. Michelman asked about any catering after an event. Mr. Verp stated that currently have a warming kitchen and there would be no cooking on site. Mr. Barrows asked about vehicles turning out of the site and if they would be a right turn only or if vehicles would be attempting to make a left turn onto Kinderkamack Road. Ms. Schepisi stated that since this is a County road they need to gain County approval for their site plan. She explained that they would go by the guidelines the County indicates for that roadway. Mr. McHale discussed the sidewalk conditions in that area of Kinderkamack Road and their installations. He asked if the applicant would be willing to add a sidewalk in the front of their property to continue this access for pedestrian safety. Mr. Verp stated that they would consider adding the sidewalk in the front of the property.

Mr. Beslow asked if there would be testimony regarding traffic flow. Ms. Schepisi stated yes that there would be testimony regarding a traffic study.

Mr. Michelman opened the hearing to the public for questions, not seeing a show of hands, closed to the public.

The architect for the project, Joe Ives was sworn in by Mr. Regan. Mr. Michelman accepted his qualifications as an expert witness. Ms. Schepisi presented into evidence a colored rendition of the architectural site plan of the lower level and marked this as A2. Mr. Ives stated that this is the same site plan which were submitted with the application but they are colorized. He explained that the current building is approximately 17,000 ft.² with about 8500 ft.² on each level. He stated that the concept is to build the sanctuary on the second level in order to not take any of the site away and have parking beneath it. He explained that you would be able to exit the site from the upper level or lower level, right onto grade. He stated that since the addition is on the rear of the building it would hardly be noticeable even from Kinderkamack Road. He explained that this design allows them to build a sanctuary and to not worry about columns. He stated that the addition in the rear of the building faces east and traditionally synagogues face east. He explained that on the lower level there would be the childcare center for the younger kids. He stated that the classrooms need to open directly to grade. He explained that there would be a lobby on the lower level to enter the synagogue and they provided an elevator for handicap accessibility. He stated that on the lower level they are maintaining the entire existing structure and only adding the vestibule, elevator and one exit stairwell. He detailed on the plans the six classrooms and the gymnasium location. He stated that this plan needs to be approved by the State and the calculation for the number of students is based upon the square footage space. He explained that the nursery school opens up to a large outdoor area where they would be adding fencing for a play area. He stated that this would be a safe and enclosed outside area for the children. Ms. Schepisi presented into evidence a colorized rendition of the architectural site plan upper level and marked this as A3. Mr. Ives detailed the rooms of the upper level. He stated that the lobby area connects to the new sanctuary room. He explained that there would be some multipurpose rooms with operable walls which could be opened up to accommodate an additional 200 people for the high holiday services. He stated that they are proposing to add fire sprinklers throughout the entirety of the building. He explained that both levels of the building would be ADA compliant. Ms. Schepisi presented into evidence a colorized rendering of sheet AO3 in the architectural plans and marked this as A4. Mr. Ives detailed the site's elevations. He stated that there was some question to the building height due to the varying information within the Borough's ordinances. He detailed the calculations contained in the ordinances for the height requirement but explained that there are two ways to interpret the heights within two code sections of the ordinances. Ms. Schepisi presented into evidence a colorized rendering of sheet A5 in the architectural plans and marked this as A5. Mr. Ives stated that this sheet was designed for the line of sight in order to see a person's view from Kinderkamack Road. He detailed the signage drawing for the temple and explained that they would comply with the Borough's signage ordinance. He stated that the addition would not cause any lighting issues for any of the neighboring properties. He explained that they would be using the existing stone feature in the front of the site for the area for the signage. Mr. Depken detailed the process for their sign submission to the Planning Board sign committee. Ms. Schepisi presented into evidence a colorized rendering of the proposed building and marked this as A6. Mr. Ives stated that this

picture is an inspirational image of the building from the view of the addition. He explained that they have provided a lot of light on the rear of the building. Ms. Schepisi stated that there would be additional testimony on the lighting for the site. Mr. Ives explained that there would be additional signage on the rear of the building. Mr. Depken stated that they would need a variance for this additional signage. He discussed the front signage height in relation to it being added onto the existing brick structure. He explained that the signage would exceed the height requirements. Mr. Michelman stated that if they wanted to keep this height then they would require an additional variance. Ms. Schepisi explained that their notice included a statement for any additional variances required by the board. Mr. Degheri asked for clarification on the ordinance. Mr. Depken detailed the code for the board. Mr. Regan discussed another section of the Borough ordinance, 11.2 section C which discussed a single faced sign for a church, school or library and asked if this ordinance section would cover the signage for the synagogue. Ms. Schepisi stated that they were actually working with this section of the ordinance for the signage of the site. Mr. Regan explained that he believed section C would apply to this particular application rather than section J. Mr. Depken stated that his concern was that of the bulletin board. Mr. Regan explained that the ordinance indicates a single faced sign or a bulletin board. Ms. Schepisi confirmed that they would have to gain additional relief for the signage on the back of the building. Mr. Lydon stated that they would need a more detailed description of what type of signage they would be installing on the back of the building. Mr. Ives explained that he would submit additional information on the rear building signage. Ms. Schepisi stated that they would need relief for the additional signage for the nursery school as well and would provide that signage information. Mr. Ives explained that they are proposing a vinyl plank type enclosure for the garbage area. He stated that this would be visibly pleasing to the congregants coming into the rear of the building. Mr. Lydon asked what the life expectancy is for a vinyl plank garbage area enclosure. Mr. Ives stated that they could add a bollard in order to protect the enclosure from not being hit by a vehicle. Mr. Lydon explained that a masonry block wall would last longer than the proposed enclosure. Mr. Ives stated that this would be a good suggestion. He explained that as for the soil moving, there would be approximately 14 to 15 yd.³ of soil being moved on the site. He stated that whatever soil is being removed, would be filled with concrete for the footings. He explained that the original metal shed which was proposed on the plans is now being removed in order to give additional room to the outside playground for the nursery school. Mr. Michelman asked the Board Engineer if he had any questions for the architect. Mr. Atkinson asked if there were any proposed lighting for the signage on the back of the building. Mr. Ives stated that they would be able to mount a spotlight somewhere on the building which could be aimed at the signage by the entrance doors. Mr. Atkinson asked about the two access points on the rear of the building. Mr. Ives stated that there is one existing access to the rear of the building which would be for the nursery school area and would require a lot of security. He explained that they are building a new two-story glass enclosure which would be the entrance into the place of worship. Mr. Atkinson asked if all the entrances were ADA accessible. Mr. Ives stated yes. Mr. Atkinson asked about the egress on the site. Mr. Ives discussed the stairwells and stated that they had over designed this site in order to give it extra capacity. Mr. Lydon asked about the side door on the Kinderkamack Road side of the building. He asked if this door would be an entrance and exit. Mr. Ives stated that the main purpose of this door would be utilized for during the week. He explained that anyone utilizing the upper parking could use this door to go into the administration areas. Mr. Lydon asked if the applicant would be proposing a generator for the building. Mr. Ives stated that as of now, they are not proposing a

generator for the building. He explained that the building would not need to be kept operational during an emergency time. Mr. Lydon discussed the concept of needing a generator for the nursery school aspect of the building. Mr. Ives stated that this matter would have to be discussed with the administration of the building. Mr. Lydon asked if all the HVAC units would be located on the roof. Mr. Ives stated that there is existing equipment on the roof and any new units would be added onto the roof as well. He explained that the mechanicals would not be visible from the street. Mr. Lydon stated that they could possibly be visible from the east side of Kinderkamack Road where East Drive goes up. He asked if they could use some of the PVC fencing to go around the mechanicals on the roof. Mr. Depken stated that there is a requirement to screen the mechanicals from the view of the street. Mr. Ives explained that they could look at the line of sight for this area in order to make sure the mechanicals would be screened. Mr. Lydon asked questions regarding the lighting fixture locations on the rear side of the building itself. He asked for their fixture location to not have any light spillage into the sky. Mr. Ives stated that they would redesign the lighting so that the light spillage would be downward onto the building. Mr. Lydon discussed the door swing on the rear door of the building. Mr. Ives stated that there is no requirement for the door swing and they could swing the door either way so they would comply with any requirement. Mr. Lydon asked for them to discuss the specific lighting and signage they are looking to install before they come back to the board next meeting. Mr. Depken asked about the seating on the second level and if they are all fixed seating. Mr. Ives stated that what they had shown on the plans was a suggested layout and the seating are not pews screwed into the ground. He explained that they would be chairs put in an arrangement. Mr. Depken asked what the measurements are for the chairs in those arrangements and asked if the temporary areas would have the same type of seating. Mr. Ives stated that there would be temporary seating set up in the overflow area and asked if the board would like the actual measurements for the seating. Mr. Depken stated that he would like a detail submitted with the measurements of the seating along with the maximum number of seats. Ms. Schepisi explained that they would submit this information. Mr. Regan stated that he had no questions for the architect. Ms. McGrinder asked how someone would access the parking in the underground area. Mr. Ives stated that the engineer would testify to the access of the parking stalls in the underground area. Mr. Michelman discussed personal experiences and emergency situations in regards to underground parking areas. He stated that from those experiences, he questioned the fact of putting parking underneath the sanctuary room in regards to an emergency situation. He asked if they had consulted a security expert in regards to the underground parking being under a sanctuary room area. Mr. Ives stated that he had done a considerable amount of work for the Port Authority so he has experience in sensitive emergency matters such as this. He explained that there are ways to harden the building and over design the flooring. Ms. Schepisi stated that there are ways to provide information in regards to this type of matter without having to discuss any of the security means for the building. Mr. Ives explained that they are in communication with Homeland Security and in communication with the Anti-Defamation League in order to take the lead on protecting religious buildings. Mr. Michelman stated that his concern is the parking underneath the sanctuary room and not being able to harden the flooring enough to sustain any type of attack. Ms. Schepisi explained that the Bergen County Risk Security Assessment within the Prosecutor's Office had been contacted in order to discuss security assessment. She stated that they would review a copy of the site plan before the building would be completed in order to address any sort of risk concerns so that the building would be protected.

Mr. Michelman opened the hearing to the public for questions, not seeing a show of hands, closed to the public.

Mr. Michelman called for a short break at 9:30 PM. Mr. Michelman asked the hearing to reconvene.

Ms. Schepisi stated that during the break she had a discussion with her client and their next witness would only give his engineering and traffic testimony for the rest of this hearing in order to provide additional information and planning testimony for the next hearing. The engineer for the project, Matthew Seckler was sworn in by Mr. Regan as the engineer, planner and traffic expert. Mr. Michelman accepted all three of his qualifications as an expert witness. Mr. Seckler presented into evidence two exhibits which are an aerial exhibit and a colorized site plan marked as A7 and A8. He detailed the location of the existing building within the B2 zone and all the surrounding zones / features to the site. He detailed the 10 foot grade change between the front of the site to the rear. He stated that this reflects the existing flow pattern of water on the site. He explained that there are existing traffic patterns. He stated that there is very little landscaping to the rear of the property. He explained that they are expecting feedback from the County on the goals of the driveway and they will comply with any type of turn restrictions that are recommend for the site. He stated that on the high holidays there would be a traffic director which would move the flow of traffic in and out of the site. He explained that they are proposing a new synagogue which is the center of the Jewish community. He stated that under the Borough's codes, a house of worship may have accessory uses within the main structures or outside of the main structure for religious education, food preparation and assembly. He explained that this is a house of worship that will have all of these items. He stated that they are before the board seeking a conditional use variance. He explained that on the site there are 57 parking spaces which include three ADA spaces. He stated that there are a number of spaces which may be closer to the building but they are in locations that are not able to have an ADA accessible path. He explained that if they were to shift the columns then they may be able to move the location of an ADA parking space closer to the building. He detailed the flow of the site in the parking lot and agreed that they would work with the board professional's suggestions for the parking lot. Mr. Lydon discussed an option for the flow of the parking aisles. Mr. Seckler stated that they would work with the board's suggestions with the parking aisles. He explained that they provided some additional areas of landscaping and there is one area with a painted island in order to provide circulation for any garbage or emergency vehicles. Mr. Depken stated that he sent information to the police and fire department but had not received anything back from them as of yet. Mr. Seckler explained that they would be keeping any healthy existing landscaping on the site especially what is on the Kinderkamack side. He stated that they provided a lighting design which also included a higher level of lighting in the underground parking area for security reasons. He explained that they would provide more shielding so there would be less light spillage off the site. He stated that in regards to garbage pick up they would have a masonry structure around the refuge area which they would provide more detail for the board. He explained that the garbage pick up would be provided by a private hauler and it would not be done during the time when the preschool is in session. He stated that he would be happy to work with the board engineer in order to satisfy any comments they have on the site. He explained that they are slightly reducing the impervious coverage on the site. He

stated that there are a number of bulk variances required for the building location but they are not changing. Mr. Michelman asked if the board professionals had any questions regarding the engineering testimony. Mr. Atkinson stated that they had given testimony regarding truck movement within the parking lot on the site and asked if they had any drawings to this. Mr. Seckler explained that he would submit additional drawings to the board engineer. Mr. Atkinson asked questions regarding the access aisle to the underside of the building. He stated that the Borough's Code calls for a 15 foot aisle. Mr. Seckler explained that they are providing a 13.5 foot access aisle. He stated that they felt this aisle would be very lightly used. He explained that the nursery school is not a drop off / pick up location and everybody will park their vehicles to walk their children inside to the nursery school. He stated that he does not believe this aisle would be utilized. Mr. Atkinson asked if they would confirm that this area would not be a drop off / pick up location. Mr. Seckler stated that it could be used for some drop off / pick ups but in terms of the nursery school which is more of the higher generator this use would not be a drop off / pick up process. Mr. Seckler and Mr. Atkinson discussed the stacking of the parking lot area on the site plan. They additionally discussed the bump out area on the upper location which would be utilized for more of the Administration offices. Mr. Atkinson asked if they could give more information in regards to the Stormwater management on the site and where they would be discharging into. Mr. Seckler stated that they may need to increase the 10 inch drainage pipe which exist on the eastern side of the property. He explained that they are investigating what rights they have to discharge onto the railroad property. He stated that they would clean out the existing drainage pipes on the property. Mr. Depken asked if they have a PDF file of the architect's and engineer's plans. He stated that the fire department had asked for a set of plans email to them for their review. Mr. Seckler asked if the fire department could supply them the sizes of their emergency vehicles so when they do their templates, they can detail it with the exact dimensions of the vehicles the Borough has. Mr. Depken stated that he would send Mr. Seckler the contact information for the fire department. He asked if there would be personnel inside the parking lot in order to monitor when the lot is full in order to start sending vehicles over to the overflow site. Mr. Seckler stated yes that they would have a traffic detail individual monitoring the traffic into the site and then volunteers inside the parking lot in order to monitor vehicle parking to send vehicles to the overflow site. Mr. Lydon asked about adding the sidewalk along the Kinderkamack Road frontage. Mr. Seckler stated that they would add the sidewalk as long as they can make it accessible. Mr. Lydon asked questions regarding the painted crosswalks within the parking lot and questions regarding the lighting on the site, the lighting plan and the fixture count. Mr. Seckler detailed the lighting on their plan and stated that they would work with the board professional's regarding the lighting. Mr. Michelman discussed the board's proposed changes within their Annual Report to the Mayor and Council in regards to the LED lighting requirements. Mr. Seckler discussed the benefits of using LED lighting on the building and they would work with the board professionals on the focus of the lighting. Mr. Lydon asked if they could clarify the building height they are proposing. Mr. Seckler stated that they would revise their zoning table on the site plan in order to reflect the height of the building. Mr. Lydon and Mr. Seckler discussed the flow of the parking aisles and the line of sight from the parking lot towards Kinderkamack Road. Mr. Seckler stated that they would have more information regarding the playground for the next meeting. Ms. Schepisi explained that the playground would be compliant with any State regulations required for the nursery school. Mr. Michelman asked if any of the members of the board had any questions. Mr. McHale asked for the clarification on how many parking spaces are in the front of the building. Mr. Seckler stated

that there are six spaces. He explained that there is a parking variance requested for the site and they tried to install as many appropriate spaces as they could on the existing site. He stated that the upper spaces can be used to access the Administrative areas of the building. Mr. Seckler explained that as part of the application they had prepared a parking study analysis. He stated that the building is located on Kinderkamack Road which is a County road, utilizing a speed limit of 40 miles an hour. He explained that they had performed turning movement counts which are also known as volume counts on Friday September 7th in front of the site on East Drive. He detailed these count numbers for the board members. He stated that the Friday night services would be outside of the peak turn count volumes. He explained that they added the amount of traffic they expect a synagogue would generate in order to get a traffic estimation and they utilized the Institute of Transportation Trip Generation Manual. He detailed the calculations and trip numbers that were generated using these guidelines for the synagogue. He stated that they calculated the level of delay for the existing driveway on how it exists today. He explained that they would comply with any restrictions that the County would place on their application since this is a County road. He stated that they performed additional traffic counts during the times that the nursery school would be in operation. He explained that they used the same guidelines for a 66 child daycare facility. He detailed the calculations and the count for the board members. He stated that in regards to the Borough's parking ordinance for this type of building it over estimates the number of parking because in this particular house of worship, not all areas of the building would be utilized during the same time. He explained that other municipalities use a parking variance calculation of one space for every three seats of worship. He stated that the ITE parking generation manual does not have a synagogue land use code but it has a church land use code which they estimate one parking space for every four seats of worship. He explained that as for the nursery school each teacher would typically need a parking space and in terms of the 66 students, typically around 15% of the students are siblings so there would not be 66 cars showing up on the site. He stated that additionally in terms of the before and after care, you have a staggering pick up and drop off vehicles on the site so not all of the vehicles would be parked on the site for the 9:00 AM start time of the school. He explained that the proposed 57 parking spaces would be able to accommodate the nursery school. He stated that another item which is crucial is the applicant has put a condition upon themselves to have the hundred parking spaces offsite and be willing to hold off on high-volume service if anything were to happen to that offsite parking. He explained that the parking on site and the parking agreement can sufficiently support the synagogue and the accessory uses within it. Mr. Michelman asked if anyone had any essential questions or items that need to be brought up before the applicant's next meeting. Mr. Atkinson stated that they discussed the parking for the school but they need to discuss the parking for the sanctuary. Mr. Seckler explained that he would provide further testimony at the next meeting. Mr. Depken asked if they had performed a traffic study at the time of 2:00 PM when the nursery school would have their pick ups. Mr. Seckler stated that they did not do the counts at that time but if the board wishes, he could do an additional count study. He explained that at the 2:00 PM dismissal, there would only be a fraction of the students leaving at that time since some children may leave during an earlier time as the younger classes are dismissed. Mr. Atkinson asked if they could provide more information regarding the overflow parking at the 700 Kinderkamack site in order to show that there is sufficient parking. Mr. Michelman stated that this hearing would be carried to the February Zoning Board meeting without need for further notice.

Resolutions

None

Old Business

None

New Business

Mr. Michelman stated that he would like to pay tribute to a former resident of Oradell, Mr. Ray Eckel, who was a member of the Zoning Board; member of the Planning Board, Borough Councilman; Police Commissioner; Council President and for a short time Acting Mayor. He explained that what he remembered the most about Mr. Eckel was he was a liaison to the Zoning Board and he would come to every meeting and report back to the Council. He stated that Mr. Eckel really cared about the board and the Borough's business. He explained that the Borough was blessed on having a member of the community with such dedication. Mr. Depken stated that he had known Mr. Eckel for years and he was a true gentleman. Mr. Michelman explained that Mr. Santaniello still needs to take the board member certification class and has 18 months from the date of his appointment to have this done. He stated that Mr. Santaniello has 6 more months in order to schedule this class and have it done. He explained that Mr. Degheri still needs to do the board's Jiff training. Mr. Degheri asked if Mr. Regan was hosting any more dates. Mr. Regan stated that he would work out a date with Mr. Degheri. Mr. Depken explained that the Mayor had inquired if any other towns had done this training yet. Mr. Regan stated that Oradell is the only town that he has done this class for so far. Mr. Degheri asked when the board members are responsible to do their financial disclosure statements. Mr. Michelman stated that this matter is not until April. He explained that this is a good thing to keep in mind because there is a penalty for not doing your financial disclosure statement.

Mr. Michelman opened the meeting to the public for any matters, not seeing a show of hands, closed the meeting to the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Secretary