

## **MINUTES**

### **CRESSKILL PLANNING BOARD**

**JULY 23, 2019**

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting at 7:30 PM and announced the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been fulfilled.

Members present at roll call: Mayor Romeo, Councilwoman Tsigounis, Mr. Morgan, Ms. Bauer, Mr. Calder, Mr. Durakis, Mr. Mandelbaum, Mr. Ulshoefer, Mr. Malone and Mr. Rummel. Also present were Mr. Schuster, Planning Board Attorney, and Mr. Azzolina, Borough Engineer.

\*\*\*\*

Mr. Ulshoefer made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 9, 2019, meeting, seconded by Mr. Malone. All present were in favor of the motion. Motion approved.

\*\*\*\*

#### **Correspondence**

Memo from Ms. Francesca Maragliano regarding Ordinance No. 19-10-1542, An Ordinance to Ensure the Proportionality of New Construction to Other Dwellings in the Zone in the Borough of Cresskill, Bergen County, NJ. Copies e-mailed to all members. She would like all comments before the public hearing scheduled for August 14, 2019. Mayor Romeo noted that this is the elimination of the FAR. There will still be a sliding scale, but it will not limit the depth of the lot. It also takes the FAR away from the Zoning Board and brings it here.

Vouchers from Mr. Steven V. Schuster for services rendered relative to the Cresskill Planning Board for the month of March 2019 in the amount of \$3,370.28, for the month of April in the amount of \$3,102.38, and for the month of May 2019 in the amount of \$3,229.08. Mr. Rummel made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Durakis. All present were in favor. Motion approved.

Memo from Ms. Francesca Maragliano regarding Ordinance No. 19-09-1541, An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 132, Flood Damage Prevention. Mayor Romeo stated that this is mandated by the State. We have to put in new zones and that affects the rating for flood policy ratings for the State. We are required to change it. Copies e-mailed to all members. Ms. Maragliano would like all comments before the public hearing scheduled for August 14, 2019.

Brochure from Rutgers for Planning & Zoning Programs for the Fall.

\*\*\*\*

#### **Subdivision Committee**

Councilwoman Tsigounis had nothing to report.

\*\*\*\*

**Report from the Borough Engineer's Office**

Mr. Azzolina stated that there are two applications currently under review. On the Kim application, 292 Magnolia Avenue, Application #1550M, he spoke with the applicant's engineer today. They are still working on the revised plans for that. It is an application for subdivision/site plan.

On the Zerrenner application, he spoke to the applicant's architect today and the plans that were submitted a couple weeks ago were the wrong plans. He is going to submit the revised plans. Mr. Azzolina will hopefully report on that at the next meeting.

Mr. Azzolina also prepared a report for tonight's Public Hearing and he e-mailed it to everyone yesterday.

\*\*\*\*

**Old Business**

None.

\*\*\*\*

**New Business**

Mr. John Campoli was present representing the Clock Tower Square. Mr. & Mrs. Stiles have yogurt shops in both Closter and Tenaflly and are interested in taking the space at the end of the building by Piermont Road for that type of operation. It was retail clothing. They have moved on and consolidated their store with the store in Englewood. The space is now available, and this couple is interested in operating a yogurt shop as a Build Your Own Yogurt. In Tenaflly it is on Washington Street. The space is 1,008 square feet. There will be two or three people working there. It will be mostly take-out and there will be a couple of booths. There will be about 15 seats. Mr. Campoli noted that there are 21 parking spots at this location. What was there had the same amount of employees. With this business, it is a little bit more walk-in than it is parking. Mr. Schuster said that it will probably have more volume than what was there. There will be more parking because they are redoing Allen Street which will help them out. Mr. Campoli agreed. They have never had an issue with parking. Sometimes the restaurants will share space across the street. Ms. Stiles said that most of her customers are young and teenagers that come from school. In Tenaflly she doesn't have parking. In Closter she doesn't have parking either except in the street.

Mr. Morgan asked if there was going to be much renovation in the building. Mr. Campoli noted that there will be no structural demolition. There are a couple displays from the retailer that they are going to take out. They will develop a plan for their equipment that stacks out in the middle of the room. It is pretty much just seating, like sofa type seats, along the outside. They are talking about polishing the concrete. It is serve yourself. There is no kitchen.

Mr. Campoli stated that the sign scales down to a nice size. It is just four letters, BYOY. The "O" is like a cup of ice cream. The sign will not be very large. It will be smaller than what is there. The letters will be the same height, but the length will be shorter. They will get permits. Mr. Campoli said that if they get approval tonight, the plan was to go back, develop the plan for building, which would be basically plumbing and electrical, and if there is any architectural it would be very little, and they would get all the information together for the sign and apply for the sign too.

They will be open from 12:00-10:00 every day. Mr. Durakis made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Bauer. All present were in favor. Motion approved.

\*\*\*\*

**Public Hearing – Application #1543 – 29 East Madison Avenue**

Mr. Bruce Rosenberg was present representing the applicant, David Patel and Cresskill Tavern. He has given the Board Attorney the affidavits and he wanted to know if the owner has consented. For the record, the owner has consented and is present this evening. The members of the Board have generally heard about the application and the concept. What they are here for is the application of Cresskill Tavern to basically expand the existing bar into two adjacent spaces. They are going to provide both indoor dining as well as outdoor seasonal seating. He has David Patel and the architect, Frank Hall, present to testify.

Mr. Dviges (David) Patel, 40 Edward Drive, Franklin Park, New Jersey, was sworn in by Mr. Schuster. He is the general partner for the LLC. Mr. Patel has owned Cresskill Tavern for five-and-a-half years. The tavern is more of a gathering spot for local contractors, plumbers, working class people. They provide liquor, beer, wine and little snacks, chips and pretzels. That is all they can do. They have no dining facility and no kitchen facility. They just have the ability to service alcoholic beverages and snacks.

Mr. Patel explained that he wanted to expand because his clientele has been asking over the last few years that they should have food in there. The other reason is because when you are serving liquor, when you serve food you eliminate some of the other problems that might arise. He has been working with a restaurant consultant in terms of the idea of having more of a dining facility in the space. He has been working on a menu. Mr. Rosenberg distributed a draft menu and it was marked as Exhibit A. This is his current vision for what he wants to have. Mr. Patel noted that this is more of a first draft. They will definitely do a lot more tasting and testing before they do a final menu. They will definitely go through a few more drafts. This is a general notion of what they intend to serve. His proposed hours of operation are Sunday-Thursday from 10:00 AM-1:00 AM, and Friday-Saturday from 10:00 AM-2:00 AM. The maximum number of employees he intends to have at the peak hours is around ten.

Ms. Bauer asked if he was going to be increasing the size of the restroom facilities. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the architect will talk about all the floorplan improvements. Mr. Schuster noted that there are bathrooms in the existing space and there are also bathrooms in the space that they are taking over. Mr. Rosenberg noted that there are, but he is going to be redoing that.

Mr. Frank Hall, 27 Chestnut Street, Ridgewood, NJ, was sworn in by Mr. Schuster. He has been here before. He testified at the preliminary presentation. His license is presently in good standing. He was accepted as an expert for today's hearing in the area of architecture. Mr. Hall stated that he prepared the set of plans that were submitted with the application. They were marked as Exhibit A-2, consisting of six pages.

Mr. Hall, referring to Sheet S-101.0, which is the site plan, noted that the tenant space currently occupied by the Cresskill Tavern is in the building at the west side of the parcel. It is along Madison Avenue. He is presently in the northerly most tenant space in the linear building at the west side that starts at the corner of Willow and East Madison and continues North. East Madison is to the west of the property. The front of all these spaces faces to the interior of the property into the parking lot. Cresskill Tavern proposes to occupy the two adjacent tenant spaces to the south of the existing Cresskill Tavern tenancy. The spaces were formerly occupied as an orthodontic office and Mom's Cooking, which was a catering space.

To the west of the building, between the building and East Madison, they propose their outdoor dining area. Three photos were presented and were marked as Exhibit A3. This is a board with three photographs. The top two photographs are of the westerly, or East Madison side, and the bottom photograph is of the easterly, or parking lot side, of the building. What these photographs are intended to demonstrate besides the existing conditions, are how basically the back of building, the building turns its back, on East Madison presently. There are only back doors and service entrances and utilities. You see gas meters and air conditioner condensers and electric meters further down. That is what is presented to the street front, which is probably not how they would plan a building if they were building today with respect to zoning expectations and good planning.

Mr. Schuster stated that the purpose of that was, originally, they didn't want to have access to the mall off of East Madison, so that is why you are backing up to it and you have access to it from the parking area. Mr. Hall noted that from the standpoint of good planning, you would like to have a more active street front, they like to

have buildings present their face, or their front, to the street and have a little bit more activity. All the entrances to the tenant spaces are presently from the parking lot. What you see in the lower photograph, at the right-hand side is the current Cresskill Tavern tenant space with the entrance on the left side of it as viewed from the parking lot. Then you see a grouped pair of entrances which were to the orthodontist's space and one of the two entrances to Mom's Cooking and down past the awning you see the public entrance to Mom's Cooking. As you will see when he gets to the floor plan, they are eliminating the pair of entrances in the middle and just maintaining the two entrances from the parking lot.

In preparing this, they have also prepared some zoning data where they have a little bit of existing building coverage still well within the requirements. Fifty percent of building coverage is allowed, and they presently have 19.8% with the two buildings on the site and they will with the new patio, which is the only expansion to the building, have 22.1%. They do have a reduction to the front yard along Madison. They are required to have a minimum of 10 feet and to the drip line of the canopy they are indicating 10.2 feet. There is no change to the lot area or lot frontage.

The off-street parking requirements are tallied at the table on the left-hand side. He is looking first at the previous existing uses, the tavern, the orthodontist and Mom's Cooking, they come up with 60.7 parking spaces required. Now looking at the proposed uses, aside from the other uses on the lot, they have the tavern in the expanded seating requirement capacity and the outdoor seating, and they wind up requiring a total of 63.96 spaces based upon the indoor seating and the outdoor seating. Combined with the other uses of the lot, they have 52 spaces. They are representing that they think this works for the property because of the non-simultaneous peak hours of the various uses on the property. Cresskill Tavern peaks obviously at dinner time and further into the evening, whereas the other uses on the lot are peaking earlier in the day and afternoons. They have observed the peak uses on the property to be the late afternoon, 4:00-6:00 PM, which does not coincide with the peak hours of Cresskill Tavern.

Mr. Rosenberg asked Mr. Hall to review the floor plan, page A101.0. At the left-hand side of this sheet is north and Madison is at the bottom of the sheet. The left-hand portion of this floor plan is the existing Cresskill Tavern tenant space. This is largely set up as it exists now. It has the L-shaped bar, the pool table, some storage and restrooms. The entrance to the expanded restaurant will be the existing entrance to Cresskill Tavern. The only change they are making is for handicap accessibility. They are changing the pair of 30" doors to a code compliant 36" door and a two-foot side light. Adjacent to the existing tavern space is the former orthodontic space, and that will primarily be the dining room and an additional bar, which is double-sided. One side faces into the restaurant and the other side will face an outdoor window, a rolling window, for serving the seasonal patio patrons. The right-hand side of this plan is the former Mom's Cooking space, which, fortunately for them, has the remains of a cooking line. It has an exhaust hood and the fans required. The fans are all existing on the roof, so they don't have to add those. There is a fair amount of plumbing in this space. This is where they are putting the kitchen. This is also where they are adding two additional accessible toilet rooms. They will have two restrooms in the existing space, and they will be adding a new handicap accessible men's and women's restrooms over here. Both sets are available to the public. The new ones are very convenient to the outdoor patio space as well. There is an entrance from the patio on the side of the bar for patrons to access the bathrooms.

Mr. Rosenberg asked about the entrance to the restaurant. Mr. Rosenberg noted that they have an egress from the patio, but they are not inviting patrons to enter the establishment from the patio side. Everybody will enter at the location that is presently the entrance to Cresskill Tavern. They will have a hostess station at that spot. There will be an improvement, from an aesthetic standpoint, on Madison Avenue, but they are not going to be inviting patrons to come up from that direction. It will be the same traffic pattern that it is now, directly from the parking lot.

Mr. Rosenberg asked about the equipment and what was going to be on the roof and that they will comply with all applicable performance requirements. Mr. Hall noted that all the equipment that is finally selected in the mechanical engineering process, will comply with the standards that are applicable. They are also eliminating, along the back, all the condensing units that face East Madison that are related to these combined tenant spaces in favor of equipment on the roof. As you see, when you look at the elevations, they believe they will be effectively shielded from view by their location sort of at the interior intersection of the new patio roof and the

existing roof. Based on the angle, they are not going to be particularly prominent. The gas meters will also be enclosed to make it much more aesthetically pleasing. All of this will make the back of the building go from a service appearance to a front of the business type of look.

Mr. Morgan asked what the outside seating capacity is going to be. Mr. Hall noted that they have 40 seats plus seven seats at the bar, for a total of 47 seats. Mr. Rosenberg stated that that is seasonal. It is basically Memorial Day to mid-September. They are not planning to enclose it.

Sheet A201.0 is the elevations. What you see at the top of the sheet is the East Madison Avenue elevation, which is the back of the building. They have a new flat roof dining patio. They have a decorative pier and double column arrangement with a decorative capital at each column location. They have a perimeter rail, three feet high. That provides a barrier between inside and outside. They don't want their patrons wandering off. They have safety bollards that he will address with the landscaping plan.

The patio is proposed to be built as a deck. It is a wood frame construction and it is supported by actual concrete piers below grade at each column location. Mr. Hall pointed out the rolling overhead door and several doors to the kitchen, to the interior of the restaurant and to the original tavern. You can see the side elevations, the profile of the existing building. It is a gable roof building. Projecting off of this is a flat roof and you can see the existing two fans, and he pointed out where they propose to put the new HVAC equipment, which is towards the center and away from the street. You are not really getting much of an angle to see it. There is a bit of a parapet wall between the roof and the cornice line to keep the equipment as much as possible out of view. They are taking all the condensing units on the ground and replacing them with rooftop equipment and then regressing the rooftop equipment back away from the roof edge. From the angle from the street, they are not really presenting it.

The sign is externally illuminated. It is not a box sign and there is no internal illumination. It is lit by some gooseneck lighting. Other than that, on the outside they have some wall sconces. More of an element to look at than casting any appreciable light. They are not doing site lighting, per se, because they are not inviting any of their patrons to occupy any space outside the patio. They have some lightings under the soffits in the existing building. Other than that, the lighting will remain as it is, other than the signing lighting, these little sconces, which are just to add some visual interest to the façade, and they have some light from inside. There won't be any question of glare on any other properties adjacent or across the street.

On the bottom of the sheet, he also has the parking lot elevation. Starting from the right, there are two windows that are in the existing tavern. The entrance will be the main entrance with a little canopy over it, which is in the approved green color with light lettering. They have a little bit of lettering on the door, so people know for sure, as they are walking up to it, that they have the correct door. The two doors next to each other for Mom's Cooking and the orthodontist will be closed up, because they wind up in the beverage and server area. The far door, which was the second door for Mom's Cooking will be their delivery entrance. That can all happen from the parking lot and per typical restaurant deliveries would happen early in the morning.

Mr. Rosenberg asked Mr. Hall to go over the landscaping. Mr. Hall referred to A2, sub L101.0, which is the landscaping plan. Due to the placement of this, they have to eliminate a couple of trees. It was a well-considered decision.

Mr. Schuster asked about the handicapped parking. Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Azzolina makes reference to this in his report. Their proposal does not change any parking arrangement or layout. It is all the existing parking. However, since they are affecting the parking count, and this is a development of the site, they recognize that, they are actually in the parking space count that would require three accessible parking spaces. Presently, the site provides one. It is an access aisle with a curb ramp and an adjacent parking space. They are both eight foot wide. They would propose then, to comply with this requirement, to add another accessible space adjacent to this access aisle. And across the lot is another accessible aisle with a handicap space with the benefit of their adjacent neighbor who has access to their site. They would propose to add another handicap space adjacent to that access aisle. They wouldn't change the parking count, they would just take advantage of two existing access aisles and re-designate two adjacent parking spaces. Mr. Schuster asked if they were going to be bigger than a regular spot. Mr. Hall noted that they are actually smaller. They have two ways to do it. They

can do 11-foot-wide spaces with five-foot access aisles. Or, they can do eight-foot spaces and eight-foot access aisles, which also gives them a van accessible space. They can double up on the access aisle. Mr. Hall explained that they will have an existing access aisle with an existing handicap space and re-designate the adjacent nine-foot space as a handicap space. They will do the same thing on the other side of the lot. He doesn't count it in his parking count because it is actually on another parcel. They then come up with three accessible spaces and they don't change their parking count. Mr. Ulshoefer asked if there was a ruling that it has to be a certain distance from the building. Mr. Hall noted that it is adjacent to the building on the other side of the lot and they are uses on this lot as well. The requirement comes from the summation of all the parking on the property. It is common in mutual parking, so it seems reasonable that it would be some benefit of accessible parking for the other building on the site as well. The parking is shared by this building and the building at 48 Union, which is also part of this parcel and the parking calculations take into account those uses, combined with the uses of Cresskill Tavern and the other uses in their building.

Mr. Calder asked how the parking needs of the employees were being accommodated. Mr. Hall explained that the ordinance addresses the parking requirements just based upon the number of seats. It is one for every five seats. That presumably, the way the ordinance is written, it doesn't ask for a count for employees separately. It presumably takes all that into account. When they talked about this, they are hoping that some of the employees can be encouraged to carpool, take public transportation, and they are putting in a bike rack. Mayor Romeo said they can park on Allen Street. There are 88 new spots there and they can walk across the street.

Mr. Rosenberg asked Mr. Hall to talk about the bollard design because he knows that safety was an issue for them. Mr. Hall stated that in and amongst the landscaping around the perimeter of the patio, which is a combination of taller and shorter types of plants, they have these decorative bollards, because they want to have a safe place for their patrons. They have bollards that are spaced less than the width of a car apart from each other. They would be set in deep concrete footings. They are intended to be a safety bollard. It is a heavy gauge steel pipe with a decorative cast enclosure over the top. They also have a couple of less decorative ones on the side because you won't really see them, but due to the fact that there is parking over there, they want to have a complete enclosure of a series of bollards surrounding the outdoor dining space. They are using decorative ones along the street, but they are not really going to feature them, per se, but they will occupy space in the landscaping. They will be aesthetically attractive.

Mr. Shreyas (Yaz) Shah, 208 Truman Drive, Cresskill, owner of Hudson Drug, wished to be heard. He noted that parking for Jack's Lobster Shack was an issue. They are only allowed to have four parking spaces in the back, but yet the Planning Board has approved them to park in the back. They have one handicap and three parking spaces in the back. That was an issue with their employees when they first opened up. Unfortunately, some of their employees' cars had been towed. What Jack decided to do is tell his employees to park across the street on Madison Avenue, in Kings parking lot by The Peddler. Mr. Schuster also stated that they could park in the Senior Center, but that is a bit of a walk. Mr. Shah noted that his employees were coming into his parking spots and it was causing a problem. Mr. Schuster stated that every time somebody comes in, we are all understanding that there is a deficiency in parking. Therefore, either everybody works together to resolve it or the titles will come in and we will change the ordinance and enforce it and then nobody is going to be happy. That is the solution as he sees it. Or you all work it out together how to do it. Mayor Romeo said that they are working it out. Mr. Shah stated that his peak hours are different than Jack's are and just wanted to point out what he is doing with the employee parking.

Mr. Hall referred to his lighting plan, A2, sub L102.0, and he is indicating the locations where he has lighting. They have two different types of lights. They have gooseneck sign illumination and it shows the detail of that type of fixture. They also have little decorative sconces on the sides and rear of the building and it also shows the detail of that fixture adjacent to the detail of gooseneck fixture. On the right-hand side of the plan, it gives detail of the types of signage that they have. They have a main sign on the canopy. It is a 15' x 11 1/2" long sign panel, 2'4" high and the sign area represents 47% of the width of the wall. It is going to be on the canopy. The letters are all the way flush right and flush with the wall. It is externally illuminated with gooseneck lighting. No internal illumination. He also has detail of the little canopy that is over the door to the entrance, the current entrance. He also shows the vinyl lettering on the door since you can't see the canopy when you are underneath it, so you know you have the right door.

Exhibit A2, Sub ST-101.0, indicates where they intend to gather stormwater, which is in a manufactured collection tank underneath the patio. They will propose to frame out some sections where the inspection ports would be so they can actually unscrew and lift out a section big enough for a man to get in and out. It is relatively low profile rather than a concrete tank, that is a polymer structure that will be surrounded by stone and have stone beneath and would collect water, as Mr. Azzolina noted, in accordance with the requirements for a major site plan, even though their application is not actually a major site plan. This is a different form of a seepage pit. It is a good solution when you don't want to go deep. They don't want to go below the footings of the building, and they have a little bit more space to spread out. Mr. Azzolina asked if there was any reason that it has to be under the deck as opposed to in the lawn area. Mr. Hall noted that if they went into the lawn area, they would be disturbing more trees. They have a large evergreen specimen that will get to remain. They also have the locations of the gas lines and the electric further down the building. It is really the one location that they had, and it also won't create disruptions to any other tenants while they are installing it.

Mr. Rosenberg asked Mr. Hall if he had a chance to review Mr. Azzolina's letter. Mr. Hall noted that he did and stated that he would be able to address the issues and changes to the plan, including those set forth in schedule A without a problem.

Mr. Ulshoefer stated that Mr. Hall seemed to bypass what he was going to plant. He is taking down a 32" and a 16" width tree. He knows that a 32" diameter tree doesn't grow over night. And putting up a couple little plants and stuff like that, is not going to do very much for the environment. Mr. Hall stated that they have a limited amount of space between their new roofed patio and the street line. They tried to work around the large tree. The problem was that once you get within the dripline of the tree you start affecting the roots of the tree. Mr. Ulshoefer noted that he knows how it works. Mr. Hall stated that his rationale is that they didn't feel comfortable getting that close to the tree with their foundation work and compromising the stability of the tree. Mr. Rosenberg said that they are also restricted by the 10-foot setback. Mr. Hall explained that they tried a plan where they regressed further back in the area of that larger tree and further forward and thought about requesting a front yard setback variance, but they have an easement there. That was pointed out in Mr. Azzolina's report. They can't offset that. Even if they went across in a straight line, they are getting well within the tree.

Mr. Ulshoefer noted that according to Mr. Azzolina's report they are planning on putting in three evergreen trees. He asked if they could put in deciduous trees instead of evergreens. They are not going to give anything back to the environment in the air like a deciduous tree would. Mr. Rosenberg asked if there was any reason they couldn't do that. Mr. Hall wouldn't propose that the tree be a 32" caliber specimen any time in the near future or that it would of that type of species. This is also the utility wire side of the street and increasingly, PSE&G is encouraging them to choose a tree side of the street and a utility side of the street, lest they come along and carve a semi-circle out of the trees. They did discuss a deciduous species that would have a bit more of a crown to it such as a weeping cherry that would give a little more color and a little more volume of foliage. Mr. Rosenberg doesn't think there is any problem with the applicant working with Mr. Azzolina to substitute evergreens with some type of other more deciduous tree.

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting to the public. No public wished to be heard. Mr. Morgan closed the meeting to the public.

Councilwoman Tsigounis asked about the 10-foot setback. Mr. Azzolina stated that they are staying out of the easement, but as Mr. Hall testified, the soffit line of the roof canopy is set back 10.2 feet from the street line. Mr. Hall noted that the 10 feet coincides with both the street side setback and the roadway widening easement. But because it is a roadway widening easement, they took a little bit more conservative measurement rather than say it is to the face of the pier and they are allowed a little bit of an extension of the cornice because it is a roadway widening easement, he took it right to the very edge of the cornice.

Mr. Calder asked if the operation of the business is going to include live music. Mr. Patel noted that he does not have any plans for live music. Most likely he is going to stay away from that. Mr. Rosenberg stated that, if the Board is inclined to approve the resolution, he would recommend that the Board allow Mr. Patel to put that in the resolution as something he has to come back and get permission to do. Mayor Romeo said that they are not going to make that a condition because the restaurant across the street has a band already.

Mr. Durakis stated that Mr. Azzolina made a note about their busiest time of the restaurant they will have 10 employees and that seems a little low to him considering if they are at full capacity with the bar and the outside and inside going. Mr. Patel noted that his count base was to have a bartender on each bar, two servers on the patio, two servers in the main dining room, two cooks, a dishwasher, a runner and a busboy. Mr. Calder asked who was doing the seating. Mr. Patel said he will have someone do that so it will make it eleven.

Ms. Bauer asked if there was any place for a bike rack. Mr. Hall said that they did discuss that, and they came to the conclusion that they should have a bike rack and it will be over by the parking spaces by the patio.

Mr. Ulshoefer wants a resolution for the two trees that when they take them down, they will be replaced by two deciduous trees. Mr. Hall has no problem with that.

Mr. Mandelbaum made a motion to approve, seconded by Councilwoman Tsigounis. On Roll Call: Mayor Romeo, Councilwoman Tsigounis, Mr. Morgan, Ms. Bauer, Mr. Calder, Mr. Durakis, Mr. Mandelbaum, Mr. Ulshoefer and Mr. Malone all voted yes. Motion approved.

\*\*\*\*

### **Other Business**

None.

\*\*\*\*

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting to the public. No public wished to be heard.

\*\*\*\*

Motion was made by Mr. Ulshoefer to adjourn the meeting at 8:37 PM, seconded by Mr. Rummel. All present were in favor. Motion approved.

\*\*\*\*

The next four regular Planning Board meetings are scheduled for August 13, September 10, September 24, and October 8, 2019, at 7:30 PM in the Borough Hall. The August 27 meeting has been cancelled.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn M. Petillo  
Recording Secretary