BOROUGH OF OCEANPORT

PLANNING/ZONING BOARD

MINUTES ● SEPTEMBER 8, 2020

Regular **REMOTE/VIRTUAL** **7:30 PM**

Municipal Building, 315 E. Main Street, Oceanport, NJ 07757

I. Call to Order: Chairman Widdis called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM

II. Open Public Meetings Statement: This meeting complies with the Open Public Meetings Act by notification on Sept. 5, 2020 of this virtual/remote meeting, its location, date and time, and URL address at which to participate in the meeting to the Asbury Park Press, Star Ledger and the LINK News and by the posting of same on the municipal bulletin board and Borough Web Site. Ms. Smith then read the virtual/remote meeting advisory advising the public how to attend and participate during public portions of the meeting as posted on the agenda, website and advertisement.

III. Flag Salute: Vice Chairman Whitson led attendees and members of the Board in the flag salute.

IV. Roll Call:

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Christopher Widdis	Chairman	Remote	
James Whitson	Vice Chairman	Remote	
Patty Cooper	Mayor's Designee	Absent	
Thomas Tvrdik	Class III	Remote	7:45 PM
Joseph Foster	Environmental Committee Liaison	Remote	
John (Jack) Kahle	Class IV	Remote	
Michael Savarese	Class IV	Absent	
Robert Kleiberg	Class IV	Remote	
Darren Davis	Class IV	Remote	
Michael Dailey	Alternate I	Absent	
Jacob Rue	Alternate II	Remote	
Jeanne Smith	Board Secretary	Remote	
Kevin Kennedy	Board Attorney	Remote	
William White	Board Engineer/Planner	Remote	

V. Board Business: Chairman Widdis reviewed matters on the Agenda and with no objections took the agenda out of order to address the following items of business that would be adjourned to another hearing date.

Old Business: PB2020-01, see as noted in minutes
New Business: PB2019-15, see as noted in minutes

1. Approval of Minutes, May 12, 2020

RESULT:	**ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	James Whitson, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Robert Kleiberg, Class IV
AYES:	Widdis, Whitson, Foster, Kahle, Kleiberg
ABSENT:	Cooper, Tvrdik, Savarese, Davis, Dailey, Rue

2. Approval of Minutes, June 9, 2020

RESULT:	**ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	James Whitson, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Joseph Foster, Environmental Committee Liaison
AYES:	Widdis, Whitson, Foster, Kahle, Kleiberg, Davis, Rue
ABSENT:	Cooper, Tvrdik, Savarese, Dailey

VI. Old Business:

1. Resolution of Denial - 64 Main Street LLC – As the Resolution had been previously provided to the Board, Mr. Kennedy summarized the resolution and conditions, which Mr. Whitson made a motion to approve the Resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Kleiberg and received the below roll call:

Motion to Adopt Resolution PR-20-27

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [5 TO 0]**
MOVER:	James Whitson, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Robert Kleiberg, Class IV
AYES:	Widdis, Whitson, Kahle, Kleiberg, Davis
ABSENT:	Cooper, Savarese, Dailey
INELIGIBLE:	Tvrdik, Foster, Rue

Councilman Tvrdik entered the meeting at 7:45 PM

2. PB2020-01 Sempkowski, Anthony

Mr. Kennedy advised that Mr. Toto, Attorney for the Applicant had advised that additional time was needed to complete revised plans in response to the Board Engineer's review letter and requested a further adjournment to the October 13, 2020 meeting as plans would not be able to be on filed in time to available for inspection 10 days in advance of the next meeting.

Motion to Carry Application to the October 13, 2020 Meeting with no additional notice required

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	James Whitson, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	John (Jack) Kahle, Class IV
AYES:	Widdis, Whitson, Foster, Kahle, Kleiberg, Davis, Rue
ABSENT:	Cooper, Tvrdik, Savarese, Dailey

3. PB2020-09 MPCC II
2 Crescent Place
Block 127, Lot 4

Exhibits

A-1 Land Development Application
A-2 Maser Consulting Review Letter, dated August 11, 2020
A-3 Topographic Survey prepared by CC Widdis Surveying, dated September 16, 2019
A-4 Preliminary & Final Site Plan, 14 Sheets, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated February 26, 2020, last revised July 27, 2020
A-5 Stormwater Management, Groundwater Recharge and Water Quality Analysis, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated February 2020, last revised July 2020
A-6 Traffic and Parking Assessment, prepared by Dynamic Traffic, LLC, dated March 25, 2020
A-7 Environmental Impact Statement, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated 4/2020
A-8 Stormwater Management Operation and Maintenance Manual, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated July 2020

A-9 Aerial Photograph of Site dated August 11, 2020
A-10 Colored Overall Site Rendering, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated 8/11/20

Mr. White, Board Engineer/Planner, was sworn in. Mr. Kennedy asked Mr. Alfieri to disclose the owners of the LLC to determine if there were any conflicts, being Carl Gross, for which there were none.

Salvatore Alfieri, Attorney for the Applicant, provided an introduction of the Applicant's purpose before the Board for amended Site Plan for proposed expansion of parking lot, and to address an outstanding matter of the parking requirement for the tenant Cross Fit as the Borough's code does not provide a standard for that use. Mr. Alfieri also advised the Board that the Governing Body had adopted an ordinance providing for on-street parking along Crescent Place with time limits of 7AM to 9PM.

Mr. Alfieri advised that testimony would be presented by three witnesses – Owner/Applicant Carol Gross, Tom Muller from Dynamic Engineering, Justin Taylor, Traffic Engineer.

Carl Gross appearing was sworn in, disclosed owners/principles of the entity and determined by the Board that there were no conflicts of interests. Mr. Gross testified as to the characteristics of the building, tenants including Barnabas Robert Wood Johnson whom occupied one section of the building and looking to expand into vacant portions of the building and CrossFit gym; RWJ offices primarily consisted of administrative functions such as billing, training, computerization of entire hospital system; lease term is for 15 years subject to provision of additional parking spaces; site currently contains 943 onsite parking spaces, the application initially sought expanded parking of an additional 515 on-site parking spaces which was request was reduced to 373 parking spaces.

Chairman Widdis asked questions about the total square footage, how much used by each tenant and what were the number of spaces proposed for Crescent Place and was advised about 116 spaces. Chairman Widdis asked what the impact was as far as Summerfield Avenue. Mr. Gross responded that they do not need or use that as an access point but for whatever purpose the town uses that. Additional questions covered availability of on-street parking to general public but would be constructed at the expense of the Applicant; on-street parking would be on an angle.

Chairman Widdis asked for questions of the Board of this witness.

Mr. Davis asked questions about the spaces approved by the Council and were they used to relieve any of the parking requirements for the application. Mr. Gross answered the spaces were open to the general public and were unrelated to the application – the application is seeking expansion of parking spaces on-site to meet the parking requirements.

Councilman Tvrdik asked Mr. Gross if he planned on presenting the approved plan to the Council for the Board's view. Mr. Gross answered he would leave that to the Engineer.

Mr. Kahle asked clarification that Crescent Place has 116 new angle spaces; the new section to develop would provide 373 spaces. Mr. Gross advised that its not 116 new as there's existing spaces already there which have been supplemented. The application is about seeking 373 spaces on-site. Mr. Kahle asked this was in addition to the spaces existing and if so what was the total. Mr. Gross responded a 373 proposed for a total of 1316 parking spaces on-site. Mr. Kahle commented that one side of Crescent is no parking but would now be new parking.

PUBLIC: Chairman Widdis opened the hearing to questions from the public of this witness.

Kristen Gillette, 41 Summerfield Avenue, was sworn in and asked questions about the number of spaces and why was the 116 on Crescent separate from the application. She commented that she believed the plan could be reconfigured to provide for additional spaces without expanding as she is concerned about the water drainage issues. Mr. Gross was unaware of cutting off Summerfield Ave – that was not their intent; as for the reconfiguration he would defer to the engineer; as for the number of spaces required, the ordinance requires a certain amount of spaces and 373 was the minimum to meet that is needed and required and he personally would prefer less spaces. Chairman Widdis advised that Ms. Gillette should save her comments for that part of the hearing later on.

Vanessa Giammarco, 37 Summerfield Ave, was sworn in and questioned the use of the spaces which added up to about 1422 spaces because now the spaces are vacant. Mr. Gross answered its very vacant because of COVID but as they build out the building, the spaces are necessary as St. Barnabas expands its area in the building and brings additional activity, they will need those spaces. Ms. Giammarco asked if all the spaces would be utilized on a daily basis. Mr. Gross answered with COVID he couldn't answer that but the spaces were necessary as they hold training for their employees system wide which may or may not occur on a daily basis. Mr. Davis commented that the standard was 5 per thousand and should actually be 1500 spaces.

Ms. Smith commented that for the public in general, that if they have submitted an email with a question but were in attendance, they would still need to raise their hand or call in to ask the questions on the records so that the Applicant has the opportunity to cross-examine.

Theresa Shirley, 42 Springfield Ave., was sworn in and asked why the application would even be entertained when it doesn't meet the setback requirement for the zone. Mr. Gross answered that he would defer to the engineer but believe they had addressed that to meet the minimum 100' setback. Ms. Shirley asked questions about the retention basin – how long would the water hold there, would it become stagnant. Mr. Kennedy interjected that the questions being asked were more appropriate for the engineer as Mr. Gross had not testified to those topics and this was the time to ask Mr. Gross questions regarding his testimony. Ms. Shirley asked about traffic and was told the traffic engineer would address those issues. There was some discussion on the process for witness testimony and questions to be asked.

Nick Seeley, 38 Fairfield Ave, was sworn in and asked Mr. Gross why a reasonable alternative to increase capacity without expansion was considered – its seems a better design would resolve the issue. Mr. Gross deferred to the engineer.

Kristen Gillette, 41 Summerfield Ave, asked was it stated that the minimum was 4 per thousand? Her calculation comes to 1200 spaces. Mr. Alfieri responded that they are not seeking a parking variance – they meet the required parking spaces – this is for a tenant requirement to increase the number of spaces.

Mr. Rue asked Mr. Gross when was the last time the tenant made the commitment for these spaces as the plans were from before COVID and perhaps that impacted the need. Mr. Gross answered they are in touch regularly and it remains a requirement in the lease. He further stated that if they don't enter to use it he will not be building the additional spaces.

Mr. Foster asked if it was possible to see the lease. Mr. Gross answered its proprietary and is an amendment of a 20-year lease and deferred to the attorney.

Mr. Davis asked if he were to apply for brand new medical spaces what was the requirement for spaces. Mr. Gross deferred to his engineer but understands the minimum to be 5 per thousand.

Mr. Rue asked if there were other alternatives considered besides the spaces on Crescent Place. Mr. Gross answered there may be a need for overflow they have considered putting that volume over at Monmouth Park I however the tenant was opposed to the users travelling. Mr. Rue furthered that an inexpensive way to address overparking was a shuttle service. Mr. Gross stated that the tenant was opposed to their employees having to use that and they have other options in the State but for them to use his site they want the spaces on site.

As there was no one else from the public, Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

Thomas Muller, Applicant Engineer/Planner, was sworn in, presented his qualifications and was accepted as an expert witness in both fields. Mr. Muller displayed an aerial photograph of the site which was marked as **Exhibit A-9.** Mr. Muller, referring to A-9, provided engineering testimony including description of the existing site; surrounding neighborhood characteristics, existing utilities, building currently occupied by professional offices as well as small cross-fit facility, described two existing non-conformities – front yard setback of 47.2' where 50' required which would not be exacerbated; and current parking space standards would require 1257 parking stalls where 943 exist; four access driveways; public utilities and stormwater conveyance systems. Mr. Muller displayed an Overall Site Plan Rendering which was marked as **Exhibit A-10**. Mr. Muller, referring to A-10, provided further testimony as to the history of the application from its initial request for 515 spaces

which had been further amended down to 373 spaces based on reviews by the Board Engineer. Mr. Muller testified to the design of the on-street parking spaces and efforts to obtain approvals for angled parking which were not shown on A-10 as they were currently still in design. Mr. Muller described proposed disturbance of 6.5 acres – about 22% of the site; seeking to increase the impervious coverage by 9.3% for a total of 65.9% where the ordinance permits 60%; no changes were proposed to the existing building; proposed parking spaces are proposed at 9' x 18' which requires a design waiver based on the Borough's ordinance that requires 9' wide with a minimum of 180 s.f. which equates to 9'x20'; their proposal is to use smaller stalls still at industry standard in order to minimize impervious coverage; the ordinance requirement requires the CrossFit facility gym to have 80 spaces which was the topic of previous correspondence – they don't believe the use requires 80 but this will be addressed further by the traffic engineer; Mr. Muller reviewed the uses of the building and square footage, which required 1257 spaces by ordinance and they are seeking 1316 spaces. Chairman Widdis asked what was the total of spaces being requested by the tenant. Mr. Alfieri responded that he would defer to Mr. Gross but did not believe there was a specific number set in the lease. Mr. Muller continued testimony concerning 18 existing ADA stalls and a proposed additional 10 ADA stalls exceeding the requirement; addressed public concern about a stockpile at the site which Mr. Muller advised was temporary and they were willing to relocate on the site; stormwater management controls with majority of proposed runoff from proposed parking areas is tributary to and above ground detention basin on the eastern side of the site as well as an underground detention basin which is located centrally within the proposed parking area; the basins would be tributary to the Turtle Mill brook to match existing conveyances in the area. Mr. Muller also addressed public comments from Mr. Gross's testimony – the drain time is 72 hours maximum but designed to be much less and required to be monitored through operations and maintenance which is deeded with the property; concerning stagnant water which is related to the drain time – there would be no mosquito breeding opportunities in this space and its positively drained outlets; grading requirements of minimum slopes within the basin are met and the Monmouth County Mosquito Commission would have comment on this application with respect to the drainage design; the proposed parking would not impact existing utilities; described landscaping of shade trees and shrubs are proposed along the perimeter of the proposed parking area of disturbance for a buffer to the residential neighbors; no changes are proposed to the existing landscaping; anything not landscaped with plantings would be maintained lawn. Mr. Muller also provided testimony concerning lighting design – with all lights downward facing, no spillage on to adjacent properties and as part of the modified drawings the residential buffer was extended from about 30' to a minimum of 100'; proposing LED fixtures; no changes proposed to the existing lighting; as requested by Mr. White's letter - Mr. Gross has agreed to reduce the hours of operation of those lights from 7AM to 9PM for the new lights only; lights would not be kept on all night – the type of development permits lighting to be reduced at 9PM. Chairman Widdis asked about the lighting for Crescent Place. Mr. muller answered that would be part of their design for the Mayor & Council; hours for Crescent Place would also be 7AM to 9PM. Mr. Muller also provided testimony concerning the site identification with only traffic signage proposed. Mr. Muller also testified that they would obtain all outstanding outside approvals including NJDEP; Fire Marshal, Freehold Soils Conservation District and Monmouth County Planning Board.

Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. Muller concerning Summerfield Ave was he familiar with it and was it required as part of this project. Mr. Muller answered yes, he was familiar with the extension of Summerfield Ave and that under normal conditions it is blocked off where it extends onto their site; they are not relying on nor benefiting from the extension of Summerfield Ave in terms of operations of the site and not for the proposed parking area. Mr. Alfieri asked whether they could have redesigned the existing parking lot to eliminate the need for additional spaces. Mr. Muller responded that in general engineering practice putting angled parking stalls was less efficient method of designing a parking area. 90 degree parking is the most efficient way from an engineering perspective to maximize the number of parking stalls. Chairman Widdis asked it doesn't reduce space required. Mr. Muller answered that angling to parking stalls within and from an engineering perspective usually reduces the amount of total paring spaces within the same footprint and in fact might lose parking.

Chairman Widdis asked for questions of the Board of this witness.

Mr. Foster asked questions about lighting, hours of operation and security for changing shifts and would the lighting be "dark skies" compliant.

Councilman Tvrdik asked if they had a more detailed landscape plan to show the buffer between the parking lot and residential areas. Mr. Muller displayed Sheet 8. Councilman Tvrdik asked him to describe it in more detail for the benefit of the public. Mr. Muller reviewed the existing tree line and the proposed landscaping on

the plan for Douglas firs, Holly shrubs, evergreens, a natural lawn buffer and the parking which started 100' from the residential areas.

Mr. Kleiberg asked the total number of handicapped spaces would be 27 and was told 28 total. Mr. Kleiberg asked if they were located next to ingress/egress spots, how many were van stalls. Mr. Muller zoomed in on the displayed plan to demonstrate where the handicap marked areas were located around the perimeter. Mr. Kleiberg asked if the spaces were located nearest the door. There was discussion about where the spaces were located in reference to outer doors. Mr. Alfieri responded that the Applicant would stipulate that the distribution of the handicap parking spaces throughout the site would fully comply with ADA requirements including access to the closest, handicap accessible doorways. They exceed the required van stalls.

Mr. Kahle asked – the disturbed area was 6+acres of asphalt being developed so where rainwater was perking in the lawn which would then be drained to the detention basin and ultimately Turtle Creek and was told yes. Mr. Kahle asked about Crescent Place and Route 36 and the severe flooding that occurs from moderate rain storm and asked how was the retention basin going to flow into something that was flooded already and more importantly how would it affect the neighbors on Summerfield Ave. Mr. Muller responded that any time they deal with impervious coverage they have to address state and local codes for runoff. They accomplish that by detaining the water. They did an existing drainage analysis which showed the peak flow condition to Turtle Mill brook and modeled the proposed conditions and detain a certain amount of the impervious area and release it at a controlled rate actually reducing the amount of water during the peak flow condition that would go to the Turtle Mill brook. Result was a net benefit for both surrounding drainage and the properties downstream of the brook. Mr. Muller further advised regarding his comment on the existing flooding conditions that they designed the basin under a flood and no flood condition as required by State code and have provided a calculation that shows the tailwater effects on the basin. Mr. Muller also testified that part of the stormwater analysis they did soils testing and did determine that the within the existing alwn areas there was essentially no permeability so a majority of the open space lawn area does drain to the brook because the subsurface soils don't drain.

Mr. Kahle asked for Mr. White's comments. Mr. White advised that they look at 2 factors – peak rates of runoff and the total volume of runoff. Mr. White asked that would not the proposed improvement increase total volume. Mr. Muller answered that he didn't have that calculation, but believes it would increase volume, however, in order to address peak condition with the additional volume, the release rate to the point of discharge was at a lower rate. Mr. White asked as far as the timing, how far back does the watershed go – and wouldn't their retention basin fill first but the backup makes it stay in the basin longer which Mr. Muller confirmed. Mr. Kahle expressed concern about the water tables and people's homes and basements. Mr. White answered that the issue has been discussed round and round and the DEP has said they would approve what they've designed but that was something they still needed to provide.

Mr. Davis asked could they expand the above ground basin to make the overflow smaller; and on Summerfield coming out, the road is blocked and not an access point – why couldn't that road be reduced to reduce the coverage or be used for an overflow area and when they did their calculations was it for the entire parking area or only a certain percentage of the parking area. Mr. Muller responded the aboveground versus the underground basin they went through an exhaustive analysis to attempt to minimize the above ground basin as much as possible as there was a limited amount of underground storage; there were a number of constraints limiting how they graded the site to provide positive drainage and in order to accomplish that they underground was necessary but was also limited as much as they could. Calculations were based on the proposed parking area as the stormwater code only requires focus on the area of disturbance however they did look at it from an overall site perspective. Regarding Summerfield Ave – they see no benefit to the extension and they have no issue removing that Summerfield Ave extension but it may be something the fire marshal needed to comment on. Mr. Davis believed it should be eliminated if its ok with the fire department and fire marshal, police etc. Discussion continued on the basins with ultimately it being determined by the DEP and local ordinance requirements for said basins and consideration of soil district conservation and believes their design accomplishes that.

Mr. Davis questioned and commented on the landscaping buffer, the use of deciduous trees which in the winter provide no buffer, and should mix up the tree line and extending it further down to benefit Summerfield based on those resident concerns; add some more color as well. Mr. Muller responded it was not a problem

to provide additional deciduous shrubs along the eastern property line and in terms of mixture the douglas fir and evergreen buffers are common and would be monitored over the maintenance period.

Mr. Davis asked questions about the maintenance of the retention basin and who was responsible for that. Mr. Muller answered yes, the Applicant would contract with any licensed engineer for the maintenance of it. There was discussion about regular inspection of the basin and placing a condition in any approval. Mr. White commented that the State requires the Borough to provide proof of annual inspection and manuals by sites of their annual maintenance which was one of his comments in his review letter. Mr. White continued that he had concerns with the buffer which were addressed by the moving of the parking back further and the additional buffer. There was discussion on the road extension removal and obtaining confirmation of its necessity from the appropriate officials.

Mr. Kahle asked about the low flow channel was it at grade level and was told yes. What does it do when it gets to the road – it crosses into the rip rap and not down towards the residential areas and not down the road.

Chairman Widdis asked what was the height of the road by the creek and was told the area of discharge is roughly elevation 8 and the creek elevation sloped down to 6-7; when there's a stream flood it rises 2 feet and would flood that road anyway and was told yes. Chairman Widdis commented that putting a system down there would be flooded anyway. He expressed concern that the water wouldn't be able to go anywhere and while most of the time the basin would work but there were times it wasn't going to work based on the flooding of that creek. Also, along Eatontown Blvd the creek floods and was there any consideration on that impact to the subject property. Was there a way to minimize that. Mr. Muller responded they did look at that as part of the requirements for the stormwater analysis and fill and in order to create no adverse impact they make sure they keep the minimum amount of flood storage on their property which actually may help the downstream condition by providing slightly more flood storage than currently exists. Discussion ensued on how to address that, the DEP's involvement as well as the County's involvement for the county road. Mr. Gross commented that he had secured a separate study on the flooding at Eatontown Blvd; Mr. Muller responded that the County is aware of the flooding there as a county road but the private property owners could maintain the stream, remove debris which would aid in removing blockage and reduces flow – that work is under review with the DEP; but ultimately that flooding issue was upland of the project, related to the volume allowed to flow under the bridge and they don't have any control over it.

Chairman Widdis asked what the lighting standard was on the west side of the building. Mr. Muller answered they did not do anything for the west side as that wasn't being disturbed. Along Crescent they would be putting in decorative lights and what was the time limits on that – Mr. Alfieri responded the ordinance limits that lighting from 7AM to 9PM.

Mr. White asked Mr. Muller to address five items from his review letter on the construction detail as to watertightness; buoyancy; an underdrain system and stone bedding to relieve the freshwater table; and the system inspections every 6 months. Mr. Muller was aware of that and would address those comments.

Chairman Widdis stated due to the lateness of the hour the remainder of testimony would need to be carried and requested that prior to the next meeting asked Mr. White ensure that direction was obtained concerning the extension of Summerfield Ave and a matter of closing it so it can be dealt with at the next meeting. Mr. White would reach out to the appropriate agencies.

PUBLIC: Chairman Widdis opened the hearing to questions from the public of this witness.

Kristen Gillette, Summerfield Ave, commented it was a great response that the stream would be cleared of debris and that attention would be made to the pile of salt; and asked if that was a possibility. Mr. Gross answered if it were a problem he would move it.

Vanessa Giammanco, 37 Summerfield Ave, commented that there used to be a gate at end of Summerfield Ave but now only had traffic barrels; and asked about the document that says the installation of the low-flow channel would make Summerfield Ave impassable would it close down the street. Mr. Muller responded that the comment was from Mr. White's review letter and that it was an existing condition from the existing condition on the applicant's property and if it were impassable under existing it would be impassable under

the new conditions. Ms. Giammanco asked about the swale. Mr. Muller responded the swale was actually made of pavement, not rocks, and would be repaved and have a dip in the pavement to allow for water during storm events and only on the subject property. Ms. Gaimmanco asked about the underground storage basin, the high water table, and asked what impact it would have on the basements in the residential area. Mr. Muller answered that the basin was submerged and it was his opinion that any impact would be negligible, if any. The applicant has agreed to Mr. White's request for the underdrain system which means when groundwater rises over seasonally high levels during certain points of the year, it will that underdrain system and drain away towards the brook and go downstream of the site. Ms. Giammanco asked if that isn't constructed correctly could it lead to potential issues with the residential basements. Mr. Muller answered that when the project is constructed it goes through an inspection process, a maintenance manual is established and even if it did fail, due to the size of the basin he did not believe there would be any impacts.

Kristen Gillette asked what the time frame was for the construction and when is it anticipated to start. Mr. Muller answered the construction sequence shown on the Site Plan indicates a general range of 6-12 months.

Mr. Alfieri consented on behalf of the Applicant to extend the Board's deadline for a decision to September 30, 2020.

Motion to Carry and Continue Hearing to the September 22, 2020 meeting with no additional notice required

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Darren Davis, Class IV
SECONDER:	Thomas Tvrdik, Class III
AYES:	Widdis, Whitson, Tvrdik, Foster, Kahle, Kleiberg, Davis, Rue
ABSENT:	Cooper, Savarese, Dailey

VII. New Business:

1. PB2019-15 Triumphant Life Church

Motion to Accept Jurisdiction and Carry Hearing to the September 22, 2020 Meeting with no additional notice required

RESULT:	**ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	James Whitson, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Robert Kleiberg, Class IV
AYES:	Widdis, Whitson, Foster, Kahle, Kleiberg, Davis, Rue
ABSENT:	Cooper, Tvrdik, Savarese, Dailey

VIII. Petitions from the Public: Chairman Widdis opened the meeting to Petitions from the Public. As no one from the public wished to be heard, Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

IX. Adjournment: As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:32 pm on a motion by Mr. Kahle which was seconded by Mr. Davis and approved by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Smith
Board Secretary