

**New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment
Special Meeting
September 19, 2012**

Vice Chairman Stokes called the Public Session of the New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:02 pm and read the Open Public Meeting Act.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Appice	Present
Mr. Binetti	Present
Ms. DeBari	Present
Mr. Denis	Present
Father Hadodo	recused
Mr. Loonam	Absent
Mr. Rebsch	Present
Mr. Stokes Vice Chairman	Present
Mr. Schaffenberger-Chairman	recused
Ms. Batistic- Engineer	Present
Mr. Grygiel Planner	Present
Mr. Sproviero – Board Attorney	Present

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OLD BUSINESS

12- 01 - New Milford Redevelopment Associates – Block 1309 Lot 1.02- Mixed Use Development

Chairman Schaffenberger and Father Hadodo have already recused themselves from this application.

Mr. Del Vecchio member of the firm of Beattie Padovano on behalf of the applicant requested two special hearings for October. The Board Members discussed tentative dates for October and would confirm on September 27 at the next special meeting. Mr. Del Vecchio requested the Board place some control on duplicative questions from the witnesses. Mr. Stokes responded the Board did discuss this a few months ago and had concerns on the continuity of the witnesses but agreed they would try to curtail the duplicate questions.

Ms. Elizabeth Dolan, the traffic engineer, was recalled and remained under oath.

Mr. Alonso 45 Clover Court addressed the issue on the inconsistencies with Exhibit A-2 and A-4. Mr. Sproviero explained correspondence had been received from Mr. Alonso relating to testimony offered by Mr. Dipple where he was unsure of which subdivision plan was in the record. Ms. Batistic explained the set of plans submitted to the Board did not have the correct

subdivision map. It was the map originally submitted for the subdivision but not the approved map because it showed the County widening Cecchino Drive. Cecchino Drive is no longer a County Road therefore there was a 5' strip added to the property. The Board Engineer stated the subdivision was perfected and was a slightly larger parcel. Ms. Batistic stated all the lot coverage percentages were slightly smaller because they have more land. Mr. Alonso responded that Mr. Dipple would have to submit a new set of plans showing the correct size of the lot and revise the zoning analysis table. The Board Attorney stated the applicant was aware of it and they would do what they need to do to address the issue. Mr. Del Vecchio stated Mr. Dipple concurred with the Board Engineer and they would address it.

Mr. Rebsch felt the traffic engineer report was very complicated and asked if the Board could have their expert review it. The Board Attorney said the Board Engineer had the capability of having the testimony reviewed by their traffic engineer.

Mr. Del Vecchio stated the original traffic report and trip generation was originally marked as Exhibits A-5 and A-7. Mr. Del Vecchio asked the Traffic Engineer if her testimony was the levels of service at the identified intersections that might be impacted would remain the same or improve. Ms. Dolan agreed and added also the site driveway locations would operate at acceptable levels. She stated they studied all four peak hours. Mr. Del Vecchio stated she made a recommendation on creating a left turn lane along River Road into one of the site driveways. Ms. Dolan agreed and said it was at the southern driveway on River Road.

Mr. Del Vecchio marked as Exhibit A-31 L2A River Road Turn Lane Exhibit SK-01
Exhibit A-32 Update of Traffic Impact Analysis

Ms. Dolan explained that A-31 showed a snapshot of the portion of the site plan with the southern driveway on River Road that would align opposite Demarest Avenue. It showed north and south bound left turn slots approximately 75' in length. Mr. Del Vecchio asked how much stacking room would there be for the left turn movement into the site. Ms. Dolan answered at least 3 cars. Mr. Del Vecchio asked if that would be sufficient to provide for a safe level of service. Ms. Dolan answered they looked at the queue calculations and it would be appropriate. Ms. Dolan stated there would be a full movement driveway on River Road to the site opposite Demarest Avenue, to the north would be a right in right out driveway, a full movement driveway on Main Street aligning opposite Washington Avenue and a full movement driveway on Madison Avenue. All those driveways would be stop sign controlled. Ms. Dolan stated the docks behind the supermarket would indicate that the truck traffic deliveries would come on Madison and turn into the Madison Avenue driveway and exit out to Main. The traffic engineer stated the site had been designed following recognized design criteria to allow for the appropriate maneuvering through the property for the passenger cars and delivery trucks. Ms. Dolan stated a good design feature was keeping the appropriate circulation behind the supermarket for the trucks separate from the regular pedestrian and customer parking. The parking for the residential component was developed within the building and parking and circulation for the bank accommodated the anticipated parking demands and also the drive thru configuration with two lanes, a bypass and queuing up to three cars per lane. She said each of the three sections had been appropriately designed for the needs of each use and also integrated with a shared access and main circulation system.

Ms. Dolan explained the parking requirement for the residential was obtained from the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) and was based on separate rates for each bedroom. She stated a one bedroom was- 1.8 spaces, 2 bedrooms -2 spaces, 3 bedrooms 2.1 spaces totaling 426 parking spaces required for the residential component and there would be 428 in the garage with a surplus of two spaces. She noted this figure included guest parking spaces. The bank parking standard was generated by the ordinance which was one parking space for every 150 sq ft which would be a requirement of 29 parking spaces for the bank and they had proposed 44 parking spaces surrounding the bank. Ms. Dolan explained that the Parking Generation by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) provided parking demand ratios for various land use types. The ITE requirement for banks was 4 spaces for every 1000 sq ft which would be approximately 17 spaces. The traffic engineer felt a practical requirement for this bank would be about 20 – 30 parking spaces. The supermarket would require one space for every 150 sq ft building area for a total of 470. The ITE indicated the average demand was 4 per 1000 for weekdays and Saturday. The Traffic Engineer visited the existing supermarket and determined the highest parking demand ratio was 2.72 spaces per 1000 sq ft. Ms. Dolan stated they were not meeting the local code for the proposed supermarket and they were proposing 354 parking spaces and 470 required by ordinance. Mr. Del Vecchio asked if there would be sufficient parking provided to serve the supermarket site. Ms. Dolan answered yes and said they had data from the existing store to help substantiate the adequacy of parking. Mr. Del Vecchio commented that the existing supermarket received approval to expand and the approval included additional parking. He asked what the approved parking ratio was for the site. Ms. Dolan answered 4 spaces per 1000 sq ft and the applicant was proposing at the new location 5 per 1000, the ordinance required 6 per 1000 and the ITE was 4 per 1000.

Mr. Stokes asked how wide the turning lanes would have to be if this was a County Road. Ms. Dolan did not know the County requirements but they proposed 10' lanes in some locations. Mr. Stokes asked how wide the roadway was for the left hand turn provided at Madison Avenue and River Road. Ms. Dolan believed they might be 11' or 12' but not sure. Mr. Stokes questioned that she referred to the supplemental analysis. Ms. Dolan stated based on the February 13, 2012 letter there was a request to include the River Road and Madison Avenue intersection which was not originally included and because the driveway on Main Street was aligning opposite Washington Avenue they needed a count for Washington Avenue.

Ms. DeBari questioned if they went to the existing Shop Rite to do a count for their comparison. Ms. Dolan said they counted the traffic entering and exiting and the parking accumulation. Ms. DeBari asked when this was done. Ms. Dolan said the traffic counts were done Wednesday February 15 7-9am, 3-6pm and Saturday February 25 11-2pm. Ms. DeBari was not sure how accurate the figures were because the volume of the business had diminished. Ms. Dolan said the numbers used in the Impact Analysis were the ITE data base which was higher except for the morning peak hour. Ms. DeBari asked if they took into account the proposed building was larger. Ms. Dolan stated they used the building area and the ITE rates.

Mr. Binetti asked if they took into consideration the amount of overflow traffic that would pour into the side streets like Demarest Avenue. Ms. Dolan answered the overall trip generation was summarized in the report and the figures 6, 7, 8, 9 showed the distribution of the site traffic. She

discussed the counts for Demarest Avenue. Mr. Binetti stated that would increase with the supermarket and Demarest Avenue would be used to cut thru to Boulevard Avenue. Mr. Binetti felt her figure at Demarest Avenue having 0 residential distributions was inaccurate. Ms. Dolan stated they did not assign cut thru traffic for Demarest Avenue to the Boulevard. He asked how they calculated the traffic flow on the existing supermarket vs. the proposed site. The Traffic Engineer stated they counted the existing supermarket in/outbound volumes. Mr. Binetti was concerned about the overflow of speeding cars on Demarest where there were kids playing. Ms. Dolan felt cars would turn right instead of crossing. Mr. Binetti disagreed and said people would use cut thru streets. He stated Demarest Avenue was close to the driveway. Ms. Dolan stated they did not distribute traffic as a cut thru but along the major travel paths. She stated it was not an exact science but an estimation of the type of activity. Mr. Binetti felt it was very important because it was evident that Demarest Avenue was a small residential street by a major driveway to the site. Ms. Dolan understood and appreciated his comments. Mr. Stokes added that River Road was also a residential street in that area. Mr. Binetti asked her to calculate the car stacking on Demarest Avenue heading to the Boulevard and going to the supermarket. He also questioned why there was not a traffic light at Demarest. The traffic engineer stated the traffic volume projections did not warrant a traffic signal.

Ms. DeBari asked if they were going to do a study to see if they would use Demarest Avenue as a pass thru street and how could that be resolved. Ms. Dolan stated if the Board wanted additional studies they would provide them. Mr. Binetti did not understand how they could overlook something so evident as a two lane residential street as Demarest Avenue and Washington Avenue. He felt there were a lot of residential streets overlooked in this proposal. Mr. Stokes felt they should research the impact on Demarest Avenue. Ms. Batistic asked what the speed limit was on River Road. Ms. Dolan answered 25 mph.

Mr. Rebsch asked who performed the actual traffic counts. Ms. Dolan answered their staff. Mr. Rebsch asked if she ever went back to measure the outcome of the evaluations to see if they were correct. Ms. Dolan answered sometimes it was typically done to check trip generations and usually they find them lower than the projections. Mr. Rebsch was concerned with the safety of the students at the school.

Mr. Appice asked if the study was performed during school hours. Ms. Dolan answered counts were done from 7-9 am, 4-6 and an additional count for the school from 2-4 pm. Mr. Appice asked if they counted the amount of children walking in the area because it would affect the turning time of a car waiting for children to cross the street. Ms. Dolan stated the vehicles would yield to pedestrians. Mr. Appice asked if she did an analysis for Friday night when they closed the back road. Ms. Dolan said no counts were done after 6 pm. Mr. Appice asked since the proposed supermarket was almost double in size from the existing supermarket were the findings almost doubled. Ms. Dolan explained they did account for the larger building based on the actual New Milford counts and compared them with the estimates derived from the ITE data. Mr. Appice asked if she ever did an analysis of a supermarket next to a school. Ms. Dolan could not think of one.

Mr. Grygiel questioned the reason for extra parking spaces provided for the bank. Ms. Dolan thought the 11 spaces provided closest to the residential building could also be used for accessing the residential component for visitors and emergency access.

Mr. Binetti stated the driveway by Demarest Avenue not only would be having the traffic from the supermarket but also the residential units had access to that driveway. Ms. Dolan answered that was one of the four driveways. Mr. Binetti clarified there was no proposed light at any entrance. Ms. Dolan agreed and added the numbers did not warrant a traffic signal.

Mr. Stokes asked what numbers would warrant a traffic signal. Ms. Dolan stated on Demarest/River Road it would be a combination of the two-way traffic flow on River Road with the higher volume approaching River Road and there was a peak hour, 4 and 8 hour warrants. The combination of volumes would have to be sustained for 4 or 8 hours to warrant the signal or for the one peak hour. The analysis was for the residential, bank and supermarket.

Mr. Sproviero asked what the width of River Road was at the intersection at River Road and Demarest Avenue. Ms. Dolan answered 30'. Mr. Sproviero clarified they were proposing three lanes. Ms. Dolan agreed. Mr. Sproviero asked for the width of the parking spaces in the supermarket. Ms. Dolan believed they were 9'. Mr. Sproviero questioned the 10' width proposed for the three lanes. Ms. Dolan answered they were the minimum design standard.

Mr. Denis stated that part of town was a sleepy area and there were not a lot of people going up and down looking for a supermarket or a bank. He stated the Shop Rite would impact the area because of the increase of traffic. Ms. Dolan stated the roadways have the capacity but agreed there would be an increase in traffic. Mr. Denis asked for the different widths on River Road for county and town.. Ms. Dolan did not know.

Mr. Stokes requested that the Board Engineer get the answers for the width of roadway with the turning radius and the impact on residential streets. Ms. Batistic agreed and stated she had never designed less than 11' wide lanes but they would look at it with their engineer. Ms. Batistic stated 10' was the minimum allowed.

Mr. Rebsch did not know how pedestrians would be able to cross the streets with all the trucks, buses and cars going up River Road. Mr. Binetti would also like a pedestrian study on crossing the street at River Road and Demarest Avenue because of the lack of a traffic signal.

Motion to open to the public was made by Ms. DeBari, seconded by Mr. Binetti and carried by all.

Nick D'Amelio 349 Trench Drive asked if she was aware of the bus stop that was 25' from the entrance and by Cecchino Drive. Ms. Dolan was aware of bus stops going north and south of the site. The resident asked if she was aware that Public Service, buses and Verizon use Madison Avenue and River Road to access their garage in River Edge. Ms. Dolan stated they did include a heavy vehicular traffic factor in their calculations. Mr. D'Amelio asked if she took into consideration the flooding. Ms. Dolan had not studied flooding that was Mr. Dipple's area.

John DeSantis 190 Powell Drive questioned the count for pedestrians. Ms. Dolan did not have the numbers available. Mr. DeSantis asked if she accounted for jaywalkers behind the high school. She did not have the data available. Mr. DeSantis questioned where the trucks would go when the streets were flooded. Ms. Dolan had not done any flood related traffic studies. The resident asked her to explain distribution of traffic. Ms. Dolan studied traffic flows on each of the roadways, where roadways connect to on a regional basis and the access distribution for the subject site. The resident clarified that the study did not include side streets. Ms. Dolan answered they counted them but did not make a distribution of cut thru activity but looked at the turning and thru movements, easy access and movement where there was capacity for turns. The resident questioned increase of traffic for the site from the supermarket, bank and residential area. Ms. Dolan answered because the capacity existed by the intersections the volume of traffic generated by the uses would be accommodated because the roads were underutilized. The resident questioned her testimony on being underutilized. Ms. Dolan answered it was based on the counts of the traffic volumes, generated the volumes for the proposed uses and added the traffic to the existing flows and then evaluated the capacity. The resident asked if they were taking their roadway to their maximum capacity. Ms Dolan answered not to their maximum capacity. The resident asked if the Board would utilize their traffic engineer. Ms. Batistic answered yes.

Michael Gadaleta 270 Demarest Avenue asked the traffic engineer to describe other shopping centers she worked on. Ms. Dolan had handled shopping centers of various sizes including a 1.3 million sq ft shopping center in Hamilton. The resident questioned if this project was off of a 30' wide sleepy area part of town and did not have the availability of access ramps. The resident wanted to be able to drive by one of her completed shopping centers so they could see how it was functioning. Ms. Dolan answered based on the traffic volumes on River Road she probably did not have a retail use of this size on a quiet road. Mr. Gadaleta asked if they had counted trucks coming in and out of the Shop Rite. Ms. Dolan did not remember but she could look it up. The resident questioned the direction for the trucks. Ms. Dolan answered they routed them and designed the larger trucks for the site to come down Main Street to Madison and enter the Madison driveway and turn behind the supermarket building and exit back to Main and go to Kinderkamack Road. Mr. Gadaleta questioned the absence of a crosswalk by Demarest Avenue. Ms. Dolan answered they had not finalized this and it was a starting point. Mr. Gadaleta confirmed they would revisit this. Ms. Dolan answered absolutely. Mr. Gadaleta asked if she was aware of the pedestrian improvements that have been made to Main Street and did she anticipate trucks going easterly on Main Street. Ms Dolan answered it was to and from the west of Main Street. The resident questioned if it was beneficial to have 20 extra parking spaces by the bank because there could be residents parking overnight, cars left over the weekend, undesirables and residents who did not want to use the garage. Ms. Dolan answered those were concerns and would be management and police issues. She said the area might not have to be striped for parking but only for emergency access and it could be further evaluated. Mr. Gadaleta thought maybe trees could be saved and not removed. Ms. Dolan said that was a site design issue. The resident asked how a car from Demarest would get to the site without a signal. Ms. Dolan answered they did not see a significant amount of traffic to and from Demarest but if the distribution was swayed so heavily in that direction, it would bring down the levels of service because it was harder to make a left or cross. The Traffic Engineer did not know if the volumes would get high enough to warrant a signal. Mr. Gadaleta asked if she could suggest Demarest Avenue be closed off. Ms. Dolan stated there were also some concerns regarding Washington

Avenue and those types of treatments might be looked at but it would also required the participation of the Governing Body. Mr. Gadaleta had concerns about the 24 hour ATM machine at the bank close to the residential apartments. Ms. Dolan answered it was not her area but agreed that nighttime lights could impact the units. The resident asked if the Board had any correspondence from the County Planning Board because he thought Mr. Dipple had said he had gone to the County Planning Board. The Board Attorney asked Mr. Del Vecchio if there was an application pending before the County Planning Board. Mr. Del Vecchio answered there was no application pending before the County Planning Board at this time.

Lori Barton 399 Roslyn Avenue questioned if the apartments with one bedrooms plus den would increase the trip generation and number of parking spaces provided. Ms. Dolan answered the numbers of bedrooms did not come into play for trip generations. The Board Attorney stated RSIS makes no distinction between one or one bedroom with den. Ms. Barton asked if they had considered the impact on Elm Street in Oradell when the Elm Street Bridge reopens. Ms. Dolan stated they have routed the traffic without Elm Street being opened and there were no counts to be done at that location. They have shown the highest orientation to and from the north using Main Street and River Road. Ms. Barton questioned the testimony that there would be a lower actual demand at the existing supermarket than expected. Ms. Dolan said she already testified that they calculated a lower parking demand than the ITE and the ordinance required. The resident asked what the size was for the existing supermarket. Ms. Dolan answered approximately 62,000 sq ft. Ms. Barton stated the existing supermarket was approximately 34,000 sq ft. Ms. Dolan would revisit that and if that was correct the existing demand ratio would be incorrect. Ms. Barton questioned why the traffic flow study was done on a Saturday instead of a Sunday. The traffic engineer stated traditionally traffic studies for retail use were done on a Saturday because it typically was the highest generated hour. Ms. Dolan stated they could look at Sunday if the Board thought that would be appropriate. Ms. Barton had concerns about the students crossing behind the high school on Madison Avenue. Ms. Dolan stated there were crosswalks. The resident asked if it was a good design to have trucks going behind the high school to Madison Avenue. Ms. Dolan answered the trucks would not be going behind the school but down from Main Street entering the site before the high school.

Miriam Pickett 222 Baldwin Avenue asked the Engineer what she meant by an underutilized road. Ms. Dolan answered the existing traffic volumes on River Road were low and was why there was excess capacity so the intersection would be able to handle the traffic associated with the project. Ms. Pickett asked how they determined it was low. The Engineer answered from the traffic counts. The resident asked what the numbers of cars were in an hour that was traveling from Madison to Main Street that made it an underutilized road. Ms. Dolan answered the capacity would be about 1900 and during the morning peak hour 500, during the afternoon peak hour 400, during the evening peak hour 450 and Saturday peak hour 360. Ms. Pickett asked if they took into consideration the middle School traffic at 3 pm. Ms. Dolan answered they did. Ms. Pickett asked if traffic northbound on River Road would have streets used as a cut thru. The Traffic Engineer stated people choose different paths but she had not modeled any cut thru patterns. The resident lived on Baldwin Avenue and asked how she would make a left hand turn out of her street. Ms. Dolan did not have specific counts at that location. Ms. Pickett asked if she thought the Board would need to know these counts to make a determination for an application of this size. She added these counts affect the citizens of this community. Ms. Dolan stated the

process was not complete and it was the applicant's responsibility to provide more studies if the Board or consultants require it. The resident asked if the Traffic Engineer agreed that the residents would have a difficult time getting out of streets that were perpendicular to River Road and Boulevard. Ms. Dolan agreed there would be an increase of traffic because of the project and during the periods of heavy traffic cars would be able to go around the block. The resident did not want to have to do that.

RECESS

Tom Berthoff 74 Beechwood Road, Oradell asked if the Elm Street Bridge was closed when the study was performed. Ms. Dolan answered yes. Mr. Berthoff asked if they took into consideration traffic on any other roads. Ms. Dolan answered they counted traffic on Main Street at River Road, Main at Madison, Madison at River and River at Demarest. Mr. Berthoff asked if they considered any flow coming from Oradell Avenue. Ms. Dolan stated they routed traffic to and from Main Street west which would go up to Kinderkamack Road but did not take the distribution that far. Mr. Berthoff asked if they considered Elm Street a cut thru or a significant thorough fare. The Engineer considered it a connection between Oradell and Main Street. Mr. Berthoff asked for clarification on truck traffic entering the site. Ms. Dolan stated truck traffic would enter from Madison and exit to Main Street turning left. Mr. Berthoff asked if she was aware of the train tracks. Ms. Dolan answered yes. He asked if they were aware of the volume of trains on the tracks. Ms. Dolan answered no. Mr. Berthoff had concerns regarding back up of traffic at the train tracks. Mr. Berthoff clarified that the traffic study did not include any impact as a result of train traffic. Ms. Dolan did not make any special analysis of that since it was an existing condition. Mr. Berthoff asked if complete dead stop traffic was acceptable in accommodating traffic flow. The Traffic Engineer stated it was inherent at that location and would not go away and it would occur when the train crosses. Mr. Berthoff asked if their study indicated the increase of traffic would add to the wear and tear of the roads. Ms. Dolan did not specialize in that area and it was probably a highway design issue. Mr. Berthoff questioned that the Engineer was not able to recall any specific projects similar to this proposed project. Ms. Dolan answered she had prepared over 2000 traffic studies and could not immediately recall specific projects but if the Board requested a list it would be provided. Mr. Berthoff stated he travels Milford Avenue and it was a dead stop at rush hour morning and evening when there was a train and how could that accommodate more traffic. Ms. Dolan stated it was a dead stop when a train comes. She stated if a train stops traffic now it would stop traffic later. They had done an analysis of the intersections surrounding the property. Mr. Berthoff asked if she should revisit Elm Street when it reopens and when the bridge was being opened. Ms. Dolan answered it was something that could be looked at but they could not perform traffic counts or analyze it now until there were volumes to count.

John Rutledge 335 River Road stated she testified this was not an exact science and she relied on the ITE Manual which provided a statistical average. Ms. Dolan agreed it provided them the ability to estimate trips for different uses. Mr. Rutledge questioned what a collector road was. Ms. Dolan said she had classified River Road as a collector type road because it was providing a regional north south orientation to the municipalities. The resident asked what the average volume of traffic travelling through New Milford was on a daily basis. Ms. Dolan did not have daily traffic volumes but they had peak hour counts. Mr. Rutledge asked if she thought that

looking further into the 2004 master plan statistics and extrapolated by the 2.5 percent growth factor would have an impact on the current analysis. The Engineer answered it did not hurt to review additional information but the data they have collected were more current. Mr. Rutledge asked if she was aware that a supermarket of 70,500 sq ft would draw about 27,000 individual cash register transactions on a weekly basis. Mr. Del Vecchio stated he would allow the witness to answer but the facts were not in evidence. Ms. Dolan was not aware of the data and their task for traffic engineering was to focus on peak hours.

Anna Leone 505 Boulevard questioned why the traffic analysis was done on a Tuesday instead of another day in their analysis. Ms. Dolan answered there was a Thursday supplemental count. Ms. Leone questioned if it would be beneficial to do the counts everyday to have an accurate analysis. Ms. Dolan repeated that the practice for the traffic engineers was to obtain the counts during a typical day that was representative of the routine activity and that is what they all do in their studies throughout the state. Ms. Leone asked if they took into consideration school functions and activities or senior activities that might occur on different days that would impact traffic. Ms. Dolan answered no they focused on the peak periods and peak hourly traffic. The resident asked if they were aware there was an application before the Board for variances for a church off of River Road which would impact traffic. Ms. Dolan was not aware of it and impact would depend on the times of services and activities. She would look into it. Ms. Barton asked how many traffic reports she prepared for mixed use or commercial development. Ms. Dolan answered over 100. The resident asked if the majority of studies showed there would be no impact on traffic. Ms. Dolan answered it would depend on the use, the location and size of the project. Ms. Barton asked for the date of the publication of the ITE Manual. Ms. Dolan answered 2008. The resident asked if there was a more recent publication.. The Engineer stated it was ordered in August and due any day. Ms. Barton asked if she was aware the new edition had updates on land use description, trip generation rates and updating codes to reflect current industry trends including shopping centers, drive thru banks and supermarkets. Ms. Dolan was aware of it and had contacted the ITE to try to obtain the data for this meeting but they had to wait for the book. Ms. Barton asked if she would be updating the current data after receipt of this book. Ms. Dolan answered this was something they could provide. The resident asked how a person with a disability would be able to cross streets without signs and crosswalks. The Engineer answered there were existing pedestrian crossings but regarding the driveway she felt they were not finished with that process.

Al Alonso 45 Clover Court requested to defer his questions to a later date based on submission of the supplemental report. Mr. Alonso questioned page 10 on the original report regarding River Road, Demarest Avenue and Site Driveway. He asked if the levels of service and delay were based on the assumption there would be a left hand lane or an existing condition. Ms. Dolan answered it was based on one lane each direction. Mr. Alonso asked why there was a left turn lane warranted if they were operating at a level of service A. Ms. Dolan answered it was a combination of thru moving traffic and left turning volume. In this case, the level of service A was because there was not much traffic southbound and because the percentage of left turns in the northbound were high they would need a warrant for the specific lane. Mr. Alonso clarified it assumed no left hand turn lane. Ms. Dolan said the levels of service were based on no specific left turn lane. The Board Attorney felt it was fair to allow the members of the public to have an opportunity to digest the revised traffic report. Mr. Sproviero asked if they would see Ms. Dolan

again. Mr. Del Vecchio said Mr. Alonso should proceed with his cross examination on the areas from the original report. The updated report was not new and had been testified to in August. Mr. Del Vecchio said there was enough clean up items to likely bring back Ms. Dolan. The Board Attorney added there was the issue if any data may or may not change due to the updated ITE manual. Mr. Alonso stated there was new information and he had questions on the levels of service and intersections. Mr. Del Vecchio stated that had nothing to do with parking, site circulation or site access. Mr. Stokes felt they should bring back the traffic engineer because of possible data changes. Mr. Del Vecchio stated he would bring the traffic engineer back but this was an example of how they were unnecessarily losing time. The Board Attorney responded the Board was giving the applicant two special meetings a month.

John DeSantis 190 Powell Drive asked if she would be coming back with new data because the size of the existing supermarket was incorrect. Mr. Sproviero answered it had been determined she would be coming back.

Ulises Cabrera 659 Columbia Street asked if the traffic engineer ever did a traffic analysis on a development of this size next to a river or high school. Ms. Dolan answered no. The resident asked if she was aware there was a large Orthodox Jewish Community that shops on Sundays. Ms. Dolan answered no but they could look at a Sunday analysis but did not think the results would be that different. The resident asked if there was a traffic light at the entrance of this complex would the analysis be different. Ms. Dolan answered yes. The resident asked if they took into consideration the weight capacity of the Main Street Bridge. Ms. Dolan answered no and it was more of a highway design issue. The residents asked if the requirement for trucks coming from Kinderkamack Road in Oradell was to go over the tracks, make a right on Madison and a left to the docking station. The Engineer answered it was not a requirement but it was the design. Mr. Cabrera asked what would happen if a truck missed the right hand turn on Madison Avenue. Ms. Dolan said they would turn right on River Road. The Engineer did not know if the larger tractor trailers would have sufficient radius to turn into the site. They would have to go down to Madison and come back up. The Traffic Engineer said they would have to check if there was enough turning radius at the site driveway. The resident asked if there would be any widening of the road. Ms. Dolan answered if wider lanes were deemed appropriate it would require widening of River Road. The resident questioned if trees would have to be removed. Ms. Dolan answered probably if they had to widen roads.

Carol DeSantis 190 Powell Drive questioned the safety of the children on Madison Avenue and the inability of trucks being able to slow down and stop. Ms. Dolan answered it was intended they would use the northern leg of Madison Avenue. She added there would be operations testimony regarding deliveries.

John Rutledge 335 River Road asked for clarification on River Road that the northbound lane would be 20' wide and the southbound lane would be 10' wide to accommodate for the left turn lane. Ms. Dolan said this was a minimum design standard and if it was felt a left turn lane should be provided and/or wider lanes than there would be modifications. The Engineer stated there were three 10' lanes. Mr. Rutledge asked if the developer decides this. Mr. Stokes and the Board Attorney answered their traffic engineer was reviewing it.

There was discussion on the appearance of traffic engineer and the Board Attorney did not think they would be ready by next week. The Board Attorney requested if there was a second supplemental report to be presented that it be provided to the Board Secretary prior to the meeting. There would be a special meeting on Thursday September 27 at 7pm.

As there was no further business to discuss, a motion to close was made by Ms. DeBari, seconded by Mr. Binetti and carried by all.

Respectfully submitted,
Maureen Oppelaar