

Present: Peterson, DeNofa, Stambaugh, Waterbury, Clark
Forrester (Attorney)
Cranmer (Engineer)
Absent: Canonico, Walsh, Betesh, Fisher

Vice Chairman, Mr. DeNofa, called the meeting to order at, 7:30 p.m.
All saluted the flag, and the presiding officer's statement was read.

Minutes:

A motion was made by, Ms. Clark, seconded by, Ms. Stambaugh to adopt the minutes of the April 1, 2009 meeting as submitted. All approved.

Planning Board Representative: no report

Correspondence: none

Unfinished Business: none

New Business:

Mr. James Whalen, Ms. Shelby Mills:

201 Patterson Ave
Bl: 2, Lot: 8

Bulk variances for 1 & 2 story
additions

Mr. Forrester announced that he reviewed service in this matter and finds it adequate and the board has jurisdiction in this matter.

James Whalen & Shelby Mills, 201 Patterson Ave, were both sworn.

Mr. Whalen testified that he is seeking permission to construct a 30" x 30' paved surface in the rear yard for a basketball court and for a place for kids to play other than the driveway. They are also seeking permission to construct a 2nd story addition over the existing garage, with a kitchen expansion in the rear yard.

Mrs. Peterson disclosed that her husband was the listing agent for Mr. Whalen's home. Mr. Forrester said that she would not have a personnel interest in the house since her husband did not sell the home to Mr. Whalen Mrs. Peterson said that is correct. Mrs. Peterson said that she could hear the application without any problems.

Mr. Forrester marked the following into evidence:

A-1: Survey prepared by Richard Stockton, dated 9/30/08 revised 10/16/08, with the existing structure, proposed construction and all of the zoning officers comments

A-2: Architectural plan prepared by Joseph C Feltz, dated 1/12/09 showing elevations and floor plans

A-3: 5 - Photos showing the front & garage of the their existing home, rear yard showing the area of the basketball court

Mr. DeNofa reviewed the variances that are being requested:

- 2 -Side yard set backs
- 1 - rear yard set back

Ms. Waterbury asked how far is the nearest home on the eastern property line?

Mr. Whalen said 12-15' which matches the western side. Ms. Waterbury described the addition would be for a master bedroom suite, and asked how many bedrooms exist today? Mr. Whalen said 3, making the home a 4 bedroom home.

Ms. Waterbury said that the addition will go over the entire garage area except for the overhang on the front and the overhang over the existing patio, and the highest point of the addition is equal the highest point of the existing home. Mr. Whalen said that is correct. Ms. Waterbury said that she has a concern with the "mass" of the home being so close (2'.99 exists, 15' required, 2'.99 proposed) she feels that the having the entire house the same height, and it is her opinion that the greater mass is not reflected as to what is currently in the neighborhood. She feels that a lower roof line than the existing house would not have a greater mass off the property line. Ms. Waterbury feels that lowering the roofline would also give them the same amount of usable space with less of an intrusion so close to the property line. Mrs. Peterson agrees with Ms. Waterbury's comments.

Mr. Whalen explained that he has to build over the foot print of the garage, he cannot come over. Ms. Waterbury explained that he can stay within the foot print of the house; it is more the height so close to the property line. She feels that they could work the height into a roof line to gain the same usable space, in order to make the height of the addition lower than what is being proposed. She also feels that this could add additional character to the house, meet their needs and not be so high next to the property line.

Ms. Clark feels that there are homes in Shrewsbury where garages are very close to the property line with 2nd story additions over the garage and it does create a "mass". However, we are in a town where homes are on property lines, and people need to expand their homes, and if we are doing it for one person we have to consider another. The garage exists and if they want to put a 2nd story. She feels that the homeowner is trying to create living space and privacy. She would have concerns if they were adding living space along the property line but they aren't.

Mrs. Peterson reminded the board that there have been applications before the board and the board took into consideration the mass of the new construction and requested the homeowner reduce the size of the construction.

Mr. Whalen testified that he has spoken to the neighbor and they did not have any concerns. He asked for suggestions on what the board wants to see. He doesn't have any problems with reducing the roof line, which would create a lower ceiling, which he doesn't have any problems with. The architect was instructed to design an 8' ceiling he may have designed 9', if so, he will eliminate that. He really wouldn't want to build it with a 7 or 8' ceiling, he needs some space in the attic for the heating system.

Ms. Waterbury suggested lowering the roofline and adding some dormers.
Ms. Waterbury reminded the board that all applications stand on their own, and if they feel that it is appropriate within a zone that this is what needs to happen every where then the Zoning Board should be making recommendations to the Planning Board that the zone should be changed, and the reasons are good planning.

Mrs. Peterson asked what is the reason for the stone pad in the back yard? Mr. Whalen said it will be basketball court.

Mr. Forrester asked Mr. Whalen to describe the surrounding area. Mr. Whalen stated that Circle Chevrolet is their rear yard, Sals is on the west, and Mr. Wilson is on his west.

Mr. DeNofa advised the applicant that hearing some of the comments, he should revisit the design of lowering the roof line, on the side yard variance.

Mr. DeNofa asked if any board members have any concerns with the stone pad in the rear yard. No one had any concerns, and it doesn't affect his impervious coverage and it far enough away from the neighbors.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Clark to open the meeting to the public. All approved

There were no comments/questions

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Stambaugh to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

Mr. Whalen stated that he will revisit the design since he does want to add on to his home, and judging what the comments made he would like to see what he can do to appease the board and not take way from the use of the addition and he is willing to come back on June 3, 2009 so he can review his application with his architect.

Mr. Forrester announced that this application will be carried to the **June 3, 2009 meeting** without further notice at the request of the application.

Mrs. Peterson disclosed that she does she runs blood drives but she has no concerns about hearing this application. Mr. Forrester did not see any conflict.

Ms. Waterbury asked if the Wall Co still owns the property, since she did work for them? Mr. Zager said no, the Blood Bank purchased the building 7/08.
Mr. Forrester said that he did not see any conflict.

Ms. Waterbury also disclosed that she is working with one of the attorneys, after a brief discussion Mr. Forrester stated that he feels that it would not be an issue. Mr. Zager stated that he did discuss the issue with his client and they also feel that it is not an issue. Ms. Waterbury stated that she would not have any difficulties hearing this matter.

Mr. Forrester advised Mr. Rick Brodsky on the issue of possibly not having a quorum when Ms. Waterbury steps down, leaving only 4 members to hear the Montessori application. After a brief discussion it was determined, and after referring to the MLUL 40:55D6, 4 members would constitute a quorum and Mr. Brodsky would proceed.

Central Jersey Blood Bank:

Sign Variance

494 Sycamore Ave
Bl: 3, Lot: 12

Mr. Forrester announced that he has reviewed the service and finds it to be satisfactory and the board has jurisdiction to hear this application.

Mr. Al Zager, Esq. Red Bank, NJ represented the applicant.

Mr. Zager explained that he is before the board seeking permission to change the existing Central Jersey Blood Bank's to be enlarged and modernized. He further explained that the Blood Center has been a tenant for 20 years and recently purchased the building from the Wall family in 2008. Photos of the existing sign and proposed signs will be submitted into evidence.

Mr. Forrester marked the following into evidence:

- A-1:** Site Plan, prepared by Nelson Kendarian, dated 12/04/86 revised: 2/10/87 showing the sign approved on the site
- A-2:** Foundation Details - including the sign detail dated 6/5/87
- A-3:** Computer generated detail of the existing sign
- A-4:** Computer generated detail of the proposed sign
- A-5:** Copy of the site plan showing the Block & Lot dated 6/20/08, showing existing sign

Mr. Zager stated that the original sign was approved 20+ years ago with the structure itself and the location, and when the applicant applied to enlarge the sign the Zoning Officer denied the enlargement since the building is located in the P1 zone which does not allow a freestanding sign, only on the façade. Mr. Zager pointed out that the existing also does not meet the general sign location of 20' from the street in any zone, which they are not proposing to change the location. The variances that are being requested are for 1 freestanding sign and a location of not being 20'.

Mr. Zager referred to the resolution of approval for a use variance issued in February 4, 1987 finding #22 and read the finding into the record "The Blood Bank is essential for the promotion of the health and general welfare of the people of Monmouth County". Board Engineer report dated 2/10/87 page 2 #3- Sign height & sign setback are not specified in the Borough's Ordinance.

Mr. Forrester pointed out that the resolution approving the site plan was dated April 4, 1987 and the sign detail (A-2) is dated 6/1987. Mr. Zager feels that the detail of the sign (A-2) is dated June which was for permitting purposing to build the sign, which was permitted by the board.

Mr. Forrester asked if there was a permit? Mr. Zager said that he did not have a sign permit and does not know if one was issued. Mr. DeNofa felt that it was a "moot" point if it did or did not have a permit.

Mr. Michael Clark, Chief Executive Central Jersey Blood Bank, for approximately 2 years, was sworn.

Mr. Clark testified that they are seeking permission to for a larger sign in order to bring visibility for special events & promotions, which are the "core" of the business. He explained that the requirements of the hospital community that they serve is approximately 50,000 units per year and only 28,000 units were being collected a year. With additional ways to increase the visibility they collected 40,000 units, and he feels that the new proposed sign would increase their visibility even more. They used the Police Departments sign when they had an event last summer and it helped to make the event very successful. During certain times of the year donor's drop off and it is important to make this known, and he feels that during these times they would not be able to supply the hospitals with the units that are needed.

Mr. Clark testified that the existing sign is not visible and the new sign will help him meet his goal to bring the Blood Center to the point where it will be able to meet the needs of the hospitals.

Mr. Zager asked Mr. Clark if this is the central headquarters for the Central Jersey Blood Center? Mr. Clark said yes, and he explained exactly what the Blood Center does at the Shrewsbury location.

Mr. Zager asked if the proposed changes & enlargement of the existing sign will help with the Blood Banks strategies in collecting more blood on the “voluntary basis” from the public? Mr. Clark said yes, and the sign will increase visibility. They have started by “reskinning” their vans with a very defined message, they have changed their logo, increased telephone recruitment, special events have been increased, local t.v. & radio stations have been used, high school participation. Collecting blood has been tightened up by the F.D.A. with very restrictive rules. Mr. Clark also testified that the new sign will carry the new logo, which is now being used on all of their stationery etc.

Mr. Forrester pointed out that on 9/11 the lines outside the center were 4 deep; he asked if this was a normal occurrence? Mr. Clark said no, they now have to have a disaster plan due that that disaster because the blood is only good for so long. They operate on a day to day operation not catastrophic operations; the need for blood never goes away.

Ms. Clark asked if this is another way to get the word out and to make them notice that the Blood Bank is there and to trigger people to give blood.

Mr. Clark explained that they have improved the outside of the building and the property which has helped, but now they have to use larger letters on the sign and have it visible for cars driving by.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Stambaugh to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

No comments/questions.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Clark to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

Mr. Randall Hertel, Facility Coordinator, was sworn. He testified that he has been in his position for 1 year and is very familiar with the new sign. Mr. Hertel described exhibit A-3 or the existing sign as a brick monument sign with concrete ball on the top, lit by 2 under ground spot lights one on each side which shines onto the letter box. Mr. Hertel described exhibit A-4 or the proposed sign, it will have a topper with the new color logo, the light box will be larger giving them 3 full lines for lettering, where the current sign only gives them 1 ½ lines of lettering. He feels the larger box will make it easier to read from the road. They will be replacing the 2 spot lights with l.e.d. lighting which will give a softer and safer lighting system. He explained that the will have stationery/changeable letters, and lit from behind.

Mr. Forrester marked the following photos which were taken by Mr. Hertel on 5/5/09 and measured

A-6: Bank of America sign to the west of the facility - which is approximately 15’ high and 20-25’ off the curb, located in the P1 zone.

A-7: Sun National Bank sign located across from the facility - which is approximately 16’ high and 20’ off the curb, located in the P1 zone.

- A-8:** Plastic Surgery Center - across the street from the facility - 5' high and 21' off the curb, back lit located in the P1 zone
- A-9:** Lawes sign, across the street from the facility, 18' from the roadway and located in the P1 Zone,
- A-10:** Borough of Shrewsbury Municipal sign, 7' ½ high, 10' off the curb and lit by spot lights

Mr. DeNofa referred to A-4 and asked if they are using the existing base? Mr. Hertel said yes, the only change is the light box and adding the topper with the new logo.

Mr. Forrester said they are adding approximately 30.7 sq ft to the existing 42 sq ft for a total square footage of 73 sq. ft., the current height is 51" high and they are proposing a 10' high sign or 109". Mr. Forrester asked if they will be using any hanging signs or tenant signs? Mr. Hertel said no hanging signs and they already have a tenant sign on the property, this sign is strictly for the Central Jersey Blood Central only.

Mr. Forrester advised the board that the P1 does not allow a free standing sign, the 2 surrounding zones LI south on Shrewsbury Ave allows 1 freestanding sign not to exceed 28 sq. ft. with a 25' set back and HCPO north on Shrewsbury Ave allows 1 freestanding sign of 10' and 50 sq ft. and the B1 zone along Rt. 35 allows for a free standing sign not to exceed 50 sq. ft. nor 10' in height.

Mr. Zager stated that a façade sign would be permitted, 1 sq. ft. for every 2 foot of width of the building, which would be 63 sq. ft. sign on the building.

Mr. Zager stated that the signs in the surrounding area are not measured exactly but measured to the best of Mr. Hertel's ability, and they would submit that the scale of what they are proposing is well within what has been established in the neighborhood, as to size and distance to the street.

Mr. Zager said that the testimony of Mr. Clark stated that the reasons for the sign to make sure that the Blood Center visibility would help in the collecting or maximize their ability to collect the necessary amount of blood needed in the region.

Mr. Zager stated that the reasons support that the general welfare is served by this relatively minor enlargement of the sign and it is keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Forrester marked the following:

A-11: Existing Blood Center sign

Mrs. Peterson asked Mr. Zager if the Blood Center is a non for profit organization?
Mr. Zager said yes it is.

Mr. Hertel said that the sign would only be lit during the evening hours, as well as the top of the new sign. Mr. Hertel also stated that the old spot lights will be taken out completely. He testified that the elimination of these lights will allow the sign to be easily read at night and would eliminate the “glare” that the spot lights give off.

A-11: photo of the existing Blood Bank sign

Mr. DeNofa asked Mr. Cranmer if he had any concerns with the sign? Mr. Cranmer said no, he suggested that the “blue portion” of the sign is a substantial part of the sign and could probably be reduced and the sign would have the same affect and impact, and would cut down on the square footage.

Ms. Waterbury feels that although there are other signs in the area are not as solid going up, the existing sign created a colonial look and this sign is more modern which does bother her just the blue area, which is a good portion of the 109”, and will change the look significantly. She understands the need and it does go toward the good of the community which is a reason to grant the variance.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Stambaugh to open the meeting to the public. All approved

No comments/questions

A motion was made by Ms. Clark, seconded by Mrs. Peterson to close the meeting to the public. All approved

Mr. Kanko Camprese, own Sign Factory & John Gagilio, were both sworn. He described what the proposed sign will be constructed from they will be redesigning & beatifying the existing sign. He explained the fabrication of the new sign. He stated that the portions of the sign that will be illuminated will be the blue area with the Central Jersey Blood Center logo & the letter box area.

Mr. Forrester stated that if the board does approve the sign the total illumination will be 33’.8 by 103’.5 Mr. DeNofa said it will be 31’’.9 x 108’’.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Clark to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

No comments/questions

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Clark to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

Mr. Zager summarized by stating that the reasons for the sign to support the variance the use promotes the health safety and general welfare of the community. The sign changes will help to identify the Blood Center for more visibility and help the strategy to collect voluntary blood donations, and he submit that there are benefits to granting the variance under the C2 requirements and there are no detriments other than what they are proposing is larger than what is permitted and the benefits of the proposal outweigh any detriments. Since the existing signs in the neighborhood all of which are freestanding and higher than what is permitted there are no substantial detriments to the Zone Plan or the surrounding area, and therefore the negative criteria for the granting the variance are met and he would request that the board grant the application.

Ms. Waterbury asked if the sign that is approved for this use could the board put a restriction that if this owner leaves than the sign goes as well? Mr. Forrester said no, the variance goes with the building and if the new owner makes any changes they would return to the board

Mr. Zager reminded the board that the Blood Center owns the building and they are now expanding into the 2nd story space, the likelihood of them leaving is very low.

Executive Session:

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Stambaugh to approve the application of the Central Jersey Blood Bank to expand the non conforming structure (sign) as submitted in regard to size, color, lighting & detail in the P1 zone where free standing signs are not permitted, with the following conditions:

- the existing ground lights to be removed
- lighting to be in conformance with the Lighting Ordinance 94-8.22

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, DeNofa, Stambaugh, Waterbury, Clark

Negative: None

Mr. DeNofa, Mrs. Peterson & Ms. Waterbury stated they voted yes even though the sign is 40% and they do have uncomfortably that if the Blood Bank moves the sign is permitted for this sign, but this use unique and does promote the general welfare and the public good and is needed to draw attention to this community service.

Resolution 6/3/09.....

Ms. Waterbury left 9:30 pm as she is stepping down from the Montessori application

Break: 9:31 pm to 9:40 All present at roll call

Mastro Montessori Academy:

35 & 45 White Rd

Bl: 34, Lots: 5,6,7

Site Plan Hearing

Mr. Forrester stated that he has reviewed the service and finds it to be adequate and the board has jurisdiction to hear this application.

Mr. Rick Brodsky, Esq represents the applicant.

Mr. Brodsky reminded the board that this is the second part of the application, the use variance and certain D3 variances granting a conditional use have been previously approved for the use of a Montessori School on this site and they are now seeking a site plan approval in the B1 zone, which was a condition of the use variance approval.

Mr. Brodsky reminded the board of the conditions that have been attached to the conditional use variance:

- limitation of the number of students to 90
- suggested were made amendments to the site plan which would have an increase in the capacity to stack cars on the site, which testimony will show that they have provided additional space

Mr. Forrester reviewed the bulk variances that are also being requested under the conditional use:

- lot area, 5 acres required 42,278 sq. ft. existing
- Lot coverage 30% permitted, 39.4% proposed
- Free standing sign set back 20' required, 10' proposed

Bulk variances:

- Perimeter buffer, 20' required, 5' proposed (western property line)
- Driveway aisle width 20' required, 18' proposed
- Off street loading zone, none proposed
- Front yard parking is prohibited where 7 spaces are proposed

Mr. Brodsky reminded the board that the previous approval for a medical building would vanish in the event that this application is approved by the board. The smaller buffer that is being proposed on the western property line is adjacent to a commercial parking lot, there is a substantial buffer on the eastern property line is adjacent to an existing residential homeowner. The owner was here earlier this evening, and they reviewed the plan and did not have any concerns with the proposal.

Mr. Cranmer recommended that this be **deemed complete** as per his letter dated April 29, 2009

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Mr. DeNofa to deem the application of Montessori Academy as recommended by the Board Engineer.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, DeNofa, Stambaugh, Clark

Negative: None

Mr. Forrester marked the following into evidence:

A-1: Preliminary/Major Site Plan, 8 pages, prepared by Kennedy Consulting Engineer. dated 3/5/09, revised for completeness 4/20/09

Mr. James Kennedy, Kennedy Consulting, 211 Maple Ave, Red Bank, was sworn and accepted as an expert witness, and he gave testimony on the conditional use variance that was previously heard by this board, and has prepared the site plan for this application.

Mr. Forrester marked the following into evidence:

A-2: Site Plan rendering, 5/6/09

Mr. Kennedy described the site in question, located in the B1 zone, which are currently 2 single family homes, garage with an apartment over the garage. The use variance which was approved by this board gives them a conditional use for a private school with 90 children. The building being proposed is 8,143 sq. ft which has been made smaller due to the construction of a covered porch for a drop off area, which will allow for better visibility for pedestrians and parents dropping off.

Mr. Kennedy also advised that they have revised the queuing area to hold more cars for stacking purposes up to 23 cars, and they have also increased the aisle width from 18 to 22' which allow for 2 - 11' lanes of traffic on the eastern property line.

Mr. Kennedy advised that the school has increased the drop off window from 20 minutes to 30 minutes this will space out the drops offs in order and will help to eliminate back ups, peak hour for queuing is in the morning when the entire school arrives, but ½ the school goes home at 11:30 am and the other half leaves at 3:30 pm.

Mr. Kennedy testified that this is a typical counter clock wise driveway through the site, entering off White Rd and circulate counter clock through the site, stop at the intersection with site access and exit the site. He explained that there will be 6 parking spaces for staff parking (6 full time and possibly 2 part time employees) there will be 6 parking spaces most removed from the school, 7 spaces along the southern property line, and 4 spaced in the front of the building for parents.

Mr. Kennedy explained that with special events there will be 24 spaces at the Valley National Bank that will be utilized by the school. A link has been a pedestrian link provided for walking from the bank to the school for safety at night time events.

Mr. Kennedy reviewed the Landscaping Plan. There will be 18 6-7' evergreens to supplement the buffer along the eastern property line and 11 deciduous trees, as well as the street trees in the center island, 91 perennial shrubs and ground covers throughout the site. The outdoor play area will have the existing tree line as exist today to provide a shaded area and it will be fenced in with a black chain link on the back and sides and a jerrith style fence along the front. They will provide two gates for access to the field for emergency egress. Mr. Kennedy stated that no play equipment will be included in the play area they field that they will eliminate the climber and slides which they currently have at the existing facility.

Mr. Kennedy addressed the storm water requirements and they are proposing 2 phases for their plan. A porous pavement parking area and driveway access, he explained that these pavers have been used in the Borough (Grove West) and it has worked well for over a year, this system does filter out the run off which contributes to the parking areas. The second storm water that they are proposing is a rain garden in the center island for the roof run off. They will construct a pedestrian bridge which connects the paver walkway to the front of the school. The bridge will provide a viewing station for the live rain garden which will be in the center of the island. The garden will hold the approximately 2-3' of water for approximately 12 hours from a 100 year storm and then infiltrate into the ground. The garden will be design within the State Standards for rain gardens, making this an attractive feature to the site. In addition they will have a reduction of approximately 1/2 after development for the 100 year store. Currently the two sites have concrete driveways and no drainage recharge. Mr. Kennedy did speak with the Environment Commission and did not receive any negative comments.

Mr. Kennedy described the proposed lighting as dark sky friendly fixture, with a decorative hat which holds the light source that shines downward toward the payment. The walking path will be lit with a small attractive bollard along the walkway to provide a low level of lighting without impacting White Road or the neighbors.

Mr. Kennedy described the proposed sign, which is 5' in height and 40 sq. ft. being used for identification for parents and emergency vehicles, which is the reason for the set back of 16' 10" from the curb where 20' is required, he described the surrounding signs in the neighborhood. All of the surrounding signs average 9' from the curb and he feels that having the sign at the 9' set back would impede the visibility of cars entering and exiting the site and giving visibility to the site as well. The lighting for the sign will be exterior ground mounted flood lights with glare shields.

Mr. Kennedy referred to Mr. Cranmer's review letter dated 4/3/09 and he testified that he can resolve every one of Mr. Cranmer's issues, which he has included on another exhibit which Mr. Kennedy presented to the board.

Mr. Forrester marked the following into evidence:
A-3: Alternate Site Plan rendering, dated 5/6/09

Mr. Kennedy described the changes that were made:

- Alternate configuration of the ingress/egress - shows a right turn out, left turn out dedicated lane, with a 1 way in 28' - but it is his opinion they will not need it. Mr. Kennedy feels that they should size the driveway width for 28' and put in a landscaped island in, if in a year that this driveway doesn't work, they can take out the small landscaped island and they will re-stripe it. The original driveway was designed at 25' (12' ½ per lane), making one driveway in 10' going in, and 2 9' aisles going out. Currently they are designed at 2 - 8' out and 1 - 10' aisle going in. He will defer to the board engineer as to what he wants

Mrs. Peterson said that she likes the wider aisle with the landscape island, rather than 2 exits and it will lessen the havoc at the exit. Mr. Cranmer said that this design will help the left turn going out. Designing the extra width is a type of banking that has been done in town. We can monitor the left turn out and see how it operates, and we can make a determination at within the next 18 months.

Mr. Kennedy said that they maximized the width of the aisle 20' in order to eliminate a double lane of cars to only 1 lane, and reducing the buffer to 20' allowed him to reduce the circulation area from 10' to 8', which would eliminate the rain garden or he could reduce the buffer next to the residential home from 20' to 18', which only eliminated a mulch border along the curb line. Mr. Kennedy said that he has spoken to the homeowner about the landscaping and they were happy with the possibility of an 18' landscaped buffer, which runs along the home owner's driveway.

Mr. Kennedy explained that they have added 2 blue painted lines to delineate the drop off area for parents, which will be included in the hand book that is handed out to parents every year.

Mr. Kennedy stated that a 2nd gate has been added to the play area for emergency purposes and fire drills which will teach the children where they go for any emergency.

Mr. Kennedy referred to the trash enclosure; he testified that currently the applicant uses 6 garbage cans per week. He is proposing to use 2 commercial size garbage cans/lids to be brought to the curb to be picked up by a private hauler once a week or they would increase the picks up to twice a week during peak utilization of the site when they are up to 90 children. Mr. Kennedy explained that the school does not have a cafeteria with cooking on site. The garbage that is generated can be handled on site.

Mr. Kennedy referred to the refuse enclosure, and testified that they use 2 garbage cans; they will be stored in the utility room or on a concrete pad in the rear of the school. The air conditioning units will also be out of view in the rear. Deliveries by UPS will most likely park along the curb in the front of the building, but they will be providing a parking space for them.

Mr. Kennedy explained that there is a 5 year moratorium on the utilities which are public from the street, and he will have to use a special patching technique, and they will be relocating the utility on the site and bring the utilities underground.

Mr. Kennedy again stated that he will comply with all of Mr. Cranmer's concerns, and the rendering does indicate the site changes that are a result of his letter.

Mr. Cranmer stated that there are 3 key elements that have been changed:

- 20' aisle in front in the school entrance
- 28' driveway aisle driveway
- 18' buffer from 20'

Mr. Cranmer feels that the board should give Mr. Kennedy some comments on those changes to see if the board agrees with the changes.

Ms. Stambaugh feels that reducing the buffer to 18' does not concern her and she agrees with the widening of the entrance/exit, and she feels that the changes are acceptable.

Mrs. Peterson agrees with the changes, she doesn't feel that there is a big difference between 20' to 18' landscaped buffer, the increase in the entrance/exit is importance and the widening of the driveway is important so cars cannot run over the curb.

Mr. Cranmer asked Mr. Kennedy to wait for Mr. Rea's testimony on the right turn and the curb aisle in the middle with a banking; for the widening if after 18 months if it is warranted the room is available to remove the aisle for a 3 way - 1 in and 2 out.

Ms. Clark likes the island to keep cars where they should be especially with cars trying to exit onto a busy road, 1 lane in and 1 lane out will help with the control, and she feels that 18' of buffer is a good size buffer.

Mrs. Peterson feels that the widening of the aisle in the front of the school is more important than the 20' for the landscaped buffer. Mr. Brodsky reminded the board that the adjacent property is a driveway and the homeowner was happy with the proposed buffer.

Mr. DeNofa stated that he is in favor of the alternate site plan, he feels that it is a safer plan.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Clark to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

There were no comments/questions

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Clark to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

Mr. Brodsky stated that he hopes to complete the application next month since they have some serious contractual issues. Mr. Forrester stated that he will prepare a draft resolution for next month if the board is so inclined to approve the application.

Mr. Forrester asked board members if they have any concerns that they would like addressed please advise Mr. Brodsky tonight so they can be addressed next month.

Mrs. Peterson asked Mr. Cranmer if there were any issues that he feels that he and Mr. Kennedy could not resolve? Mr. Cranmer said no. Mr. Cranmer asked Mr. Kennedy if he can have the final site plan ready for June 3rd? Mr. Kennedy said that he will have the plans ready within 2 weeks.

Mr. Forrester announced that this application will be carried to the **June 3, 2009 without further notice.**

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Mr. DeNofa to adjourn the meeting at 10:38 pm. All approved