

Discussion at the last meeting focused on drainage at the right rear corner with some downhill neighbors expressing concerns with runoff. They met with the neighbor immediately to the west along with his counsel, engineer and the Borough engineer. Their points were considered and the plans, soil moving permit and drainage calculations were revised accordingly and submitted to Mr. Vander Veer 6-16-2016. Mr. Vander Veer prepared a review letter dated 6-22-2016. They will present testimony from Applicant's Engineer Michael Hubschman and Landscape Architect Brad Meumann.

Mr. Phillips reminded Mr. Hubschman he remains under oath and marked the revised plan on exhibit as [A-2] Site Plan /Septic System Plan Sheet 1 of 3 prepared by Hubschman Engineering dated 9-15-15 last revised 6-15-16.

Mr. Hubschman recounted the meeting held with neighbor's counsel, engineer and the Borough Engineer to discuss the concerns with runoff. Stormwater flows generally from east to west. They've revised the plans to move the pool six feet to the south, add more drainage structures, provide for a 10 inch pipe along the westerly property line and add a trench drain to pick up any additional runoff and alleviate any water running towards the westerly corner. Where currently water flows down the Lot 12 property line into a drainage ditch towards Dogwood Lane everything will be piped and the problem eliminated. The wall has been moved to ten feet off the property line and the fence relocated to eliminate one of the waiver/variances. Additional chambers will pick up flow from all of the pool and patio. The overflow has been straightened and a manhole will be installed in Birch Road providing a solid pipe that will be protected from the septic system by a pond liner and allow them to get deeper into the stormwater system.

Mr. Phillips recalled they were going to add 6 Cultech chambers for a total of 18 where the proposed only shows 15. Mr. Hubschman explained the rear only picks up half the house and the driveway thus adding more in that area would not have accomplished anything. They added more in the middle. Mr. Vander Veer concurred the proposed should suffice noting the volume is acceptable. However, he has other issues with the design as noted in his review letter. Mr. Hubschman stated he would address.

Overall soil movement is revised as follows:

Cut	1,694 cubic yards
Fill	1,882 cubic yards
Import	188 cubic yards

The steep slope is located in the corner which forces them to push everything more to the west.

Ms. Parilla asked Mr. Vander Veer if he had any questions which he replied were outlined in his letter dated 6-22-2016 that reviewed the presented plans. He stated the revised plans do not address the comments in this letter. Mr. Capizzi and Mr. Hubschman stipulated to make the required revisions. Ms. Parilla referred to the section on General Zoning Item 2a regarding a required variance for disturbance to the steep slope area (15% - 24.99%) for the retaining walls where only disturbance for driveway and grading is permitted. Mr. Hubschman noted they could use transitional grading but the wall will lessen the grade. It was clarified that the Planning Board does have jurisdiction for this variance. Regarding General Zoning Item 3 Mr. Hubschman stipulated to make the minor required revisions. Questions regarding trees were deferred to the landscape architect. Mr. Vander Veer emphasized that drainage was his primary issue. The proposed design does not allow the full volume to be taken advantage of and the structures, particularly both Cultech systems will require some modifications. Mr. Hubschman agreed.

Bradley Meumann of Meumann Associates NJ LLA was sworn and provided his credentials: He graduated Rutgers University in 1983 with a degree in Landscape Architecture subsequently obtaining his Certification and License and has been working in the field since 1986, predominantly in Bergen County. He has appeared before Alpine Boards in the past.

Mr. Meumann referenced a rendered copy of his Landscape Architect Plan last revised 6-16-2016 which Mr. Phillips marked [A-3]. In preparation he reviewed the site, Mr. Hubschman's plan and Mr. Vander Veer's letters.

Mr. Meumann described the existing woodland, rock and steep slopes at the corner of Allison Road and Birch Road. His design proposes screening views for neighbors and providing a street view that considers the character of the neighborhood. They analyzed tree removal and replacement / reforestation. Replacements will consist of evergreen and deciduous varieties along with other understory trees and shrubs for aesthetics and improved infiltration. They moved the

wall in, proposed drainage and provide shrubs to soften the wall and reduce any impact. The proposed provides screening from onsite and buffering from offsite.

Mr. Meumann reviewed comments in Mr. Vander Veer's 6-22-2016 letter pertaining to his plan [A-3] noting they had revised the plans subsequent to his prior letter 6-13-2016 to address the following:

Section III.4. Tree removal / replacement. They upgraded calipers of replacement trees to 4" for the cherry, hornbeam, redbud and a red maple trees which is more of a clerical change and doesn't alter the overall design. Subject to final review by Mr. Vander Veer's the plan provides for 46 replacements meeting the town's requirement of 44 four inch caliper trees in combination with 8-10 foot evergreen trees, an excess of two. The plan also provides for a number of undersized trees so they are planting more than required.

Section III.5. Number of replacement trees. Mr. Meumann advised this was a clerical error that they've revised.

Section III.6. Placement of trees. Mr. Meumann agrees with Mr. Vander Veer's comments. They do not want to place trees on top of the westerly retaining wall or drains and address this on the newly revised plans. They also show the perimeter drain which was a clerical correction.

Mr. Meumann displayed a newly revised exhibit and plan which Mr. Phillips marked:

[A-4] Landscape Exhibit Revisions Along Northwest Border which is from their newly revised plan marked

[A-5] Landscape Plan revised 6/27/2016.

Referring to the above plans, Mr. Meumann indicated a blue line represents the retaining wall. Pink lines delineate drain lines. The pink line nearest the wall is a shallow set gravel and perforated pipe drain designed to capture water running toward the wall and direct it downhill to a deeper set solid pipe running from the back to the front. This directs any excess water from the Cultech storage tanks to the front. The plan also shows they shifted plantings away from the pipes. A plan note precludes excavating within three feet of the pipe. This design includes the upgraded caliper changes to meet minimum tree replacement requirements.

Ms. Parilla asked Mr. Meumann to identify existing trees to remain. Mr. Meumann pointed these out adding anything within the line of disturbance may be damaged during construction and should come out. While possible to save a few trees now, the changes in drainage would likely kill them in a few years creating a liability. Mr. Vander Veer noted seven existing trees, some sizeable, within the tree buffer on Mr. Hubschman's plan. Removal of those would substantially up the mitigation needed. Mr. Meumann affirmed his plan would not supersede Mr. Hubschman's plan regarding trees to remain.

Ms. Mattes questioned a drain location five feet into the buffer zone. Mr. Meumann stated the wall is five foot in and the drain is further in than that. Ms. Mattes questioned the composition of the wall. Mr. Meumann offered ideally it will be constructed from rocks native to the site. Mr. Capizzi concurred it will be a boulder wall. Ms. Mattes questioned the distance between the drain and trees to be planted. Mr. Meumann noted distances from the drain to the tree centers range from 7'1" to 7'9". Ms. Mattes asked how long before tree growth results in the roots impacting the drains. Mr. Meumann responded there should be no effect on the solid drain and the perforated drain is fairly high. Perforated drains typically need maintenance about every ten years to remove silt and roots. Healthy tree growth will contribute to increased water absorption further reducing runoff. Ms. Mattes asked if the wall could be located outside of the tree buffer. Mr. Meumann explained they are constrained by location of the as-built septic systems. He offered you won't even see it in a few years as they also propose shrubbery at the base. Ms. Mattes noted while the plan shows 832 plantings most are shrubs, grasses and groundcover. Mr. Meumann stated 52 are trees. He does not know how they could add more trees to the already heavily designed plan. Ms. Gerstein asked if landscaping will be completed at the same time as the house. Mr. Phillips noted they would not get a Certificate of Occupancy unless the landscaping is in or post a bond if delay is seasonally related. Mr. Vander Veer had no further questions. Mr. Meumann will copy Mr. Vander Veer on this latest plan version.

Ms. Parilla highlighted Mr. Vander Veer's letter where it points out the need for immediate installation of proper soil erosion control measures. Mr. Capizzi acknowledged they would comply.

Ms. Parilla opened the hearing to the public for questions and being none closed for questions.

Ms. Parilla opened the hearing to the public for comments.

Joyce Sonpal stated she still believes the Allison Road driveway is dangerous. The intersection has a stop sign that nobody yields to, there are children and that will be a blind driveway. The Board reviewed the configuration as shown on the plan [A-2]. There is currently a stop sign on Allison approaching Birch and the other side is a yield. There is an offset between the Allison Road driveway and the intersection of Allison Road with Overlook Road. The natural terrain and rock create a blind spot when you're coming down Birch Road and make the right turn onto Allison Road. Mr. Hubschman stated the Allison Road driveway is 150 feet from Birch Road. Although the intersection geometry is unusual there is plenty of sight distance. Ms. Sonpal asked if the Traffic Safety Officer should review. Mr. Phillips stated that would require carrying the matter to obtain additional testimony which may be an issue for Mr. Capizzi. Ms. Parilla asked the Board for input. Ms. Herries thought the distance from the corner, while not ideal, was not unsafe. Mr. Capizzi offered piers may highlight the curb cut. Ms. Gerstein questioned replacing the yield sign with a stop sign. Mr. Phillips questioned branch height of the sweet gum trees located on the corner and whether trimming any low lying branches would help. The Board noted they do not want the trees removed. Mr. Hubschman will re-check the sight distances.

Being no further comments Ms. Parilla closed the meeting for public comments and called for a motion.

Upon a motion by Ms Gerstein, seconded by Ms. McGuire to approve the application with variances and waivers as requested subject to conditions outlined by Attorney Phillips including but not limited to:

- Compliance with Mr. Vander Veer's requirements to certify the number of bedrooms.
- Subject to compliance with Mr. Vander Veer's other requirements as noted in the 6-22-2016 letter.
- Confirmation that the Site Plan and Landscape Plan be in total conformity in terms of trees to remain with the Site Plan to govern.
- If found necessary trim the trees on the corner of Birch Road and Allison Road to provide adequate sight distance.

Vote: Ayes: Gayle Gerstein, Elizabeth Herries, Catherine McGuire, Lorraine Mattes, Catherine Parilla

NEW APPLICATIONS:

Soil Moving Permit Application: Liza Shabetayev Block 74 Lot 6; 36 Dogwood Lane

The applicants were represented by their attorney, Matthew Capizzi, 11 Hillside Ave., Tenafly, NJ. This is an application for a major soil moving permit to construct a new single-family dwelling at the site requiring some waivers from the soil moving and tree ordinances. Relief is essentially triggered by repurposing the existing driveway which already encroached into the tree buffer. Waivers are also needed relative to the fill and grades between the septic systems and dwelling. They will present testimony from Applicant's Engineer Douglas Doolittle.

Douglas Doolittle, P.E., L.S., P.P. McNally Engineering, LLC 169 Ramapo Valley Road, Oakland, NJ 07436 was sworn and approved to provide expert testimony in his fields. Mr. Doolittle referenced his Site Plan dated 3/28/2016 last revised 4/29/2016.

Mr. Doolittle described existing conditions. The property is located on the north side of Dogwood Lane near the intersection with Birch Road. The property is approximately 1½ acres or 59,322 square feet with a number of environmental issues. DEP permits were obtained by the prior owner/engineer regarding substantial wetlands on the property. The permits were quite restrictive regarding the area that could be filled and limit re-development generally to the footprint of disturbance of the prior construction. The water table is only a few feet below existing grade which required substantial elevation of the septic systems. While the house sits at grade in the rear substantial fill is required between the front wall of the house and the septic systems necessitating a waiver for the 7.2 foot change in grade from existing. The first six feet of the house was designed with a crawl space to reduce the distance to the septic field to 19 feet.

They propose to maintain the driveway in the same location to create the least amount of disturbance. The prior driveway, an existing nonconformity, was removed. Construction of the new driveway in the same place requires a waiver. No additional tree removal is required and the utilities will run beneath the driveway.

The onsite detention system consists of a 36" HDPE pipe across the front with a little bit across the street. As much as possible they direct flow via gravity into a detention system with an outlet control structure to the street drain. Rear roof

drains drain to a 500 gallon sump pit to be pumped to the front detention system. The prior structures did not have any retention/detention system.

The lot is in the R-1 zone having 59,322 s.f. where 40,000 s.f. is required. The plan contains a typo regarding lot width which is actually in excess of 200 feet. This will be corrected. Mr. Doolittle reviewed they comply with the bulk requirements. Building coverage is 6.92% where 9% is the maximum allowed. Improved lot coverage is 11.55% where 25% is the maximum. They propose 27 feet of garage doors where 40 feet is permitted. They are well within the allowances.

Soil moving calculations are as follows:

Volume of cut	236 cubic yards
Volume of fill	2,038 cubic yards
Volume to be imported	1,802 cubic yards
Volume to be exported	0 cubic yards
Total volume of soil to be moved	2,038 cubic yards

Part of the fill is for the driveway between the home and the septic and for coverage of the septic systems.

Mr. Doolittle discussed soil erosion control measures. They are bound by their limit of disturbance because of the wetlands which is defined by a silt fence. The construction access pad and stockpile are within these limits. They submitted their application to Bergen County Soil Conservation and await feedback.

Mr. Doolittle reviewed Mr. Vander Veer's letter dated 4-29-2016 and will address all of the comments. He acknowledged the existing interceptor trench (curtain drain) had to be installed prior to constructing the septic fields. As work progresses this drain may need minor revisions. They stipulate to maintain, repair and re-test the drain upon completion of the project to ensure it works. They propose to direct the footing drain into that drain as well.

Attorney Phillips asked if Mr. Capizzi had received a copy of Mr. Vander Veer's 6-27-2016 letter. He had not. A copy was provided to him. Mr. Vander Veer pointed out the 6-27-2016 letter reviews the plan revised 4-29-2016 which is the same date of his prior letter reviewing a plan dated 3-28-2016. Although the plan revised 4-29-2016 is annotated "revised per Borough comments" he doesn't see how this could be possible and could find no revisions. Mr. Doolittle responded he had clarified with his office, confirmed the plans are identical and no further revisions had been made at this point.

Ms. Parilla asked Mr. Doolittle to review compliance with Mr. Vander Veer's letter of 4-29-2016.

- II. General Zoning 3. Wetlands. Mr. Doolittle denoted 60% of the lot is wetlands or part of the buffer averaging. A fence will mark the edge of the wetlands. The prior DEP permits are not transferrable between owners and they will have to obtain accepting that as a condition of any approval. This process can take two to three months.
- II. General Zoning 4. Interceptor Drain. Mr. Vander Veer clarified other names include curtain or trench drain being a feature installed around the entire perimeter of the property to lower the water table. The proposed plan shows part of the drain going under the foundation. Mr. Doolittle stated their intent is to connect the footing drain to the interceptor drain. They understand they may have to re-design or re-locate. Mr. Vander Veer noted the interceptor drain was staked out and roughly constructed to permit progress of the septic system. They spent a lot of time and effort monitoring it over a few weeks to ensure it would lower the water table. He is concerned that it may be damaged by running it through the building foundation and along the same line as the detention pipe. Mr. Capizzi pointed out the fields will not be compromised as they will not be in use during construction. They will ensure they are functioning before the house is occupied. The Board questioned how they will be able to remediate the drain if it's under the house. Mr. Doolittle stated it will act as a footing drain which is now standard for new construction. Albeit in a slightly different location the fitting drain consists of a four to six inch porous pile installed around the entire perimeter of the foundation. They plan to connect the overflow into the interceptor drain which will also collect clean groundwater. If the drain has to be relocated or is compromised they will repair it. They reviewed grades today and can adjust the drainage for retention in the front a little bit higher to get it above the drain, too. Dealing with the as-built conditions puts them in a difficult situation.

- II. General Zoning 8. Mr. Doolittle affirmed the septic system design is not to exceed four bedrooms.
- III. Soil Moving Permit Application 3. Tree removal. Mr. Doolittle offered they may need to remove two additional trees in front near the drainage system, one to the west and one to the street side of the drain by the driveway. They will apply for additional permits if needed.

Ms. Parilla asked Mr. Vander Veer if he is comfortable monitoring the site for problems and their mitigation throughout construction. Mr. Vander Veer stated he was while cautioning Mr. Doolittle that if he gets to the site and finds the water table and the septic systems two feet higher then they'll have a problem, especially if nothing is connected to it.

Ms. Parilla opened to the public for questions of Mr. Doolittle.

Linda Disher Hobeika lives next door. She knows the driveway is proposed in the same location but asked if there is any way to move it out of the buffer zone. Mr. Doolittle stated he did not know if they could get it totally out but they could probably move it over a little bit if need be. They will certainly work on that and do what they can. Ms. Hobeika asked about planting in that area. Mr. Doolittle stated none is proposed there at this time but some planting will be proposed for the wetlands mitigation. He does not yet know what the client will want to do.

Being no further questions the matter was closed to the public for questions.

Ms. Parilla asked the Board if they had any questions. Mayor Tomasko liked that the coverage is well within limits rather than to the max while recognizing this is likely due to the wetlands. He is concerned with raising the original topography by seven feet and asked if they could lessen that. Mr. Doolittle reminded they were limited by the need to raise the septic system above the water table even after installing the interceptor drain to lower the ground water. The fill would be placed between the front of the house and the septic field to avoid a "mound" look which would not be desirable. The effect would not be as noticeable looking in from the street appearing more like three and half feet; a little below eye level. For perspective for the audience, Mayor Tomasko asked how many dump trucks it takes to import 1,802 cubic yards. Mr. Doolittle estimated about 120 loads but noted a large portion of that is already there now where they excavated for the drain and septic fields and will dig the foundation.

Ms. Mattes questioned measurement of building height. Mr. Doolittle advised measure from the grades around the footprint of the home. Ms. Mattes questioned if the new home will be higher than most of the neighboring homes. Mr. Doolittle stated the other homes are not that close, the Hobeika's house sits up higher on the right hand side and the house to left is probably a bit lower but the property mounded a bit higher than theirs. You want them to be sequential and he does not believe they're going to stand out like an eyesore.

Ms. Mattes asked how they would protect the trees with all the soil moving. Mr. Doolittle replied they installed silt fencing to delineate the limit of disturbance and will stress to the owners and builders that the burden is on them to protect the wetlands. If they go into the wetlands they are in violation.

Being no further questions or comments Ms. Parilla asked for a motion.

Upon a motion by Ms Gerstein, seconded by Ms. McGuire to approve the application subject to conditions outlined by Attorney Phillips including but not limited to:

- Compliance with Mr. Vander Veer's requirements including but not limited to
 - Obtain DEP approval for transfer of freshwater wetlands permits
 - Corrections to the zoning schedule
- Monitoring of the interceptor drain during construction
- Obtaining tree permits for any additional tree removal
- Limitation of the dwelling design to four bedrooms as per the septic design
- Restrictions on soil moving which shall not occur on Saturdays or Sundays or during hours when children would be traveling to and from school.

Vote: Ayes: Gayle Gerstein, Elizabeth Herries, Catherine McGuire, Lorraine Mattes, Catherine Parilla, Joyce Sonpal, Mayor Tomasko

Soil Moving Permit Application: Leon Garabet Block 47 Lot 1 987 Closter Dock Road

The applicants were represented by their attorney, Scott R. Lippert from the firm PashmanSteinWalderHaydn located at Court Plaza South, 21 Main Street, Suite 200, Hackensack, NJ 07601-7054. This is an application for a soil moving permit with one waiver. They will present testimony from Applicant's Engineer Douglas Doolittle.

Douglas Doolittle, P.E., L.S., P.P. McNally Engineering, LLC 169 Ramapo Valley Road, Oakland, NJ 07436 was sworn and approved to provide expert testimony in his fields. Mr. Doolittle referenced his Plot Plan dated 2-28-2016 last revised 5-31-2016 as submitted with the application.

Mr. Doolittle described existing conditions. The property is located on the north side of Closter Dock Road between Old Dock Road and Main Street. The church is to the east of the property. The property is located in the R-2B residential district having 53,641 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required. Topography slopes relatively high from front to bank. There is an existing two and a half story dwelling in about the middle front of the lot along with some other ancillary structures such as a storage shed, frame garage, and an old barn all of which will be removed. The plan is to construct a new single family residence.

The existing dwelling had a new septic system installed to the east of it about eight years ago which they will use for the graywater system. They will add a 1,250 gallon tank. They recently constructed a new blackwater field in the extreme north end of the lot. That will have a 1,500 gallon septic tank and a 1,500 gallon pump chamber up to a surge tank. The field is almost complete and the surge tank is installed. Water will be provided through the municipal system with no wells. For drainage they propose a strip drain out at Closter Dock Road to run into a proposed 970 gallon seepage pit. They will pick up a large portion of the driveway water with a couple of catch basins and two more seepage pits down in the front yard. They will pickup most of the runoff from the roof, patios, etc. with a series of seepage pits, four of them right behind the garage. The drainage design calculations were reviewed and approved by Mr. Vander Veer.

Soil moving calculations are as follows:

Volume of cut	1,929 cubic yards
Volume of fill	2,194 cubic yards
Volume to be imported	265 cubic yards
Volume to be exported	0 cubic yards
Total volume of soil to be moved	2,194 cubic yards

One waiver is required for a rockery wall proposed behind and to the east of the dwelling starting behind the garages and traversing down closer to the building. It would then come around and run along the east side. A vertical retaining wall would not need a waiver but this is more aesthetic. There is substantial rock on the property and they will use what they are hammering out rather than export it from the site.

Tree removal and replacement. They propose removal of twenty-seven trees. They obtained permits from DEP to fill an isolated wetlands pocket in the back which included a condition to replace some trees. They have already removed eight to ten trees for the septic field construction. The plan demonstrates they're plan to meet both DEP and Borough requirements for tree replacement by planting a series of 10 four inch caliper red maples and 12 eight inch caliper Norway spruces along each sideline.

Mr. Doolittle reviewed the List of Required Revisions / Supplements for Mr. Vander Veer's Letter dated June 13, 2016.

1. They have applied for approval from the Bergen County Soil Conservation District which is pending.
2. They will provide additional detail relating to the condition of the existing drain in Main Street/East Main Street drain for suitability for a connection from the onsite relief drain.
3. Protection of on-site drain from rear yard septic system. Mr. Doolittle will ensure a watertight system.
4. Details for any proposed enhancement Main Street/East Main Street at point of proposed driveway connection. Mr. Lippert stated their intent is to comply with what Mr. Vander Veer would require in that regard.
5. Revise proposed landscaping plans to satisfy mitigation requirement as depicted in referenced plans. Mr. Doolittle responded that this has been done. Mr. Phillips noted the letter dated 6-13-2016 reviewed the 5-31-2016 revision. Mr. Doolittle stands corrected and will update the plan to show the mitigation requirement.

6. Revise plan to show tree removal issues and modify plans to protect existing trees to remain. They will comply.

Mr. Vander Veer requested more detail regarding their intention to use an existing drain in Main Street/East Main Street. He recalled several past instances where the drain has required remedial work and they propose to tie into a six inch discharge pipe that may be 100% clogged. Mr. Doolittle acknowledged they will have to do more investigation. He suspects it's probably a two by two inlet up at the intersection by where that pipe starts and they may need to run a 12 inch HDPE all the way down to the curb from the inlet on East Main Street but until they analyze it he doesn't want to make any commitments. Mr. Vander Veer notes it is a problem line that goes way back and he has a real concern if it can handle all that runoff.

Mr. Vander Veer is also concerned with the driveway connection to East Main Street. Mr. Doolittle stated they would like the access for safety as Closter Dock Road has a horrible line of sight; it's dangerous and offered they could construct a driveway 12-15 feet wide from the property line to where the pavement begins at Main Street. During the lengthy discussion that followed it was noted East Main Street is a thirty foot unimproved Borough Right of Way that runs between Main Street and Forest Street on paper. It currently consists of dirt, pea gravel, and grass with areas of exposed rock. As is, the right-of-way does not actually go all the way to Forest Street but instead residents of Block 46 Lots 5 and 6 use the other unimproved side of East Main Street to exit onto Forest Street and around to West Main Street to Main Street. The proposed driveway would exit the side of the Garabet property onto East Main Street accessing Main Street by passing by two driveways used by Block 46 Lot 2 and the rear of Block 47 Lot 10. It was noted people from Lot 10 park vehicles on the right-of-way next to their property and there is a question whether or not this is legal. This section of Main Street to East Main Street would essentially dead end at the proposed driveway. No one else uses it.

Mayor Tomasko noted **Tadros Michael** owner of Block 46 Lot 6 was in the audience. Mr. Michael described the unique nature and history of East Main Street affirming the description and limited uses being an unimproved paper street. He recalled neighbors requested the road be paved but then turned down the Borough's proposal due to the costs. Mr. Lippert asked Mr. Michael be sworn which Mr. Phillips did affirming his oath applied to prior as well as future testimony. Mr. Michael noted the neighbors don't want the road paved. Too much traffic would go through and it would cost too much; the neighbors don't want it.

Mr. Lippert stated his client wished to speak and **Luiza Garabet**, daughter of the applicants was sworn. Her parents have lived in another home on Closter Dock Road for over twenty years. Her parents will likely use the Closter Dock Road driveway, a road they are used to, but they would like to have the other access because it is there. She discussed property maintenance issues on Lot 10 and the history of people from that property parking on East Main Street. The area is not well maintained but they have already cleared some debris and would do more but they do not want to be responsible for paving it. They would prefer to put gravel or whatever is minimal.

Mr. Phillips noted the applicant does not need a variance for a lot unconnected to a public street; they have the Closter Dock Road entrance. The question is whether or not they have a right to access an unimproved road without road improvements as a secondary non-emergency access. What is going to be safe and adequate access from this driveway to the nearest portion of the Borough road and not create a liability on the part of the Borough. If it were an emergency access Mr. Vander Veer would probably be fine with gravel because you don't have to do anything with it. If it's going to be an access that's going to be used it's got to be satisfactory to the public works department who will have to maintain it. He suggested they carry the application to the next month and in the meantime get a report from Public Works. Mr. Lippert asked if the Borough would work with them regarding the cost of paving. Ms. Parilla stated they need to discuss with DPW and review next month.

Mr. Phillips stated the application will be carried to the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, July 26, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. with no further notice required.

BILLS:	John C. Phillips, Esq.	\$ 740.00	Montammy Bl. 11 L. 2 (escrow)
		\$ 360.00	Alpine Three
		\$ 200.00	Attendance May Meeting
	Clarke Caton	\$ 90.30	COAH

Motion to approve the above referenced bills made by Ms. Gerstein, seconded by Ms. McGuire. All were in favor.

COMMUNICATIONS: Reviewed without comment.

Ms. Parilla questioned a start date for work on the Alpine Three property and Mr. Vander Veer advised tree removal will start tomorrow and be limited to the proposed septic locations. Work in preparation for water testing should take several weeks and likely require rock removal. There are no plans to demolish the house but they may file a demo permit application for the detached garage. They should keep disturbance to a minimum until they know if the fields will succeed. Ms. Parilla asked if they will require a curtain drain. Mr. Vander Veer noted issues will be rock as well as the high water table.

DISCUSSION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION: Ms. Parilla received a suggestion for the Planning Board to consider historic preservation for the Stone Tower in Rio Vista. If they agree they would send a letter to the Mayor and Council asking them to consider a historic preservation ordinance. Ms. Sonpal noted they are losing their historic properties. Mayor Tomasko noted Alpine is fortunate to have historic properties still standing which although listed on the National and State Historic Registers these properties are not protected by restrictive covenants and could also be investigated for designation and inclusion. This would be an effort to preserve and protect such properties that would be designated to be worthy of that protection. Ms. McGuire offered Borough owned property is one thing but did not feel residents would agree because they could never alter their properties. Several members offered the historic church should be reviewed for inclusion. Current structures as listed in the Historic Register are listed in the Master Plan.

Mr. Phillips offered there is no issue with something the town owns. Ms. Parilla noted a future governing body might not preserve the tower. Mr. Phillips advised having a population under 2,500 people, the governing body may adopt a Historic Preservation ordinance administered by the Planning Board as opposed to an Historic Preservation Committee and then they have more control over structures which are already listed or designated under state and federal. The municipality also has the ability to designate a Historic District. With designation also may come the right to apply for funds for preservation and / or renovation which can be a benefit to the property owner. The issue becomes if somebody wants to tear something down completely as opposed to modifying it. If they're modifying it you have control. If they want to tear it down completely you have a whole different set of issues.

All were in favor of asking the Mayor and Council to move forward on a historic preservation ordinance for structures like the tower and, if they have any other suggestions, to please let the Board know.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Northern Valley Mayors & Planners Assoc.: Mayor Tomasko advised there was a meeting last Thursday.

Board of Health: No meeting.

Environmental Commission: Ms. Mattes highlighted the lobby display on Pedestrian Pathways. Copies are available from the Borough Clerk's office. A recent inspection for request for return of a tree bond revealed the owner had removed eight trees located close to his home without permission. They ultimately decided to return the bond with a stern warning that any future violation will result in strict enforcement of applicable fines and penalties.

Building Department: Report on file. Mayor Tomasko pointed out the photo attached to the second item on the last page of the Property Maintenance Report depicts issues on Lot 10 that the East Main Street neighbors discussed.

NJ Transit Update: No update.

COAH: Mayor Tomasko reported legislation was introduced to address the gap issue (1996-2015). Efforts are to keep attention focused on present and future need rather than going backwards.

ADJOURNMENT: A motion to adjourn the regular Planning Board meeting was made by Ms. Gerstein and seconded by Ms. McGuire. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Hayward
Recording Secretary