

**Borough of Ho-Ho-Kus
Bergen County, New Jersey
Zoning Board Minutes
February 6, 2014
Reorganization and Regular Meeting**

Meeting Called to Order: 8:00PM

Call to Order: Open Public Meetings Act Statement – In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act of the State of New Jersey, notification of this meeting has been sent to the Ridgewood News, our official newspaper in the Borough of Ho-Ho-Kus and notice has been posted on the bulletin board at Town Hall. **Read aloud by Board Secretary.**

Roll Call: Messrs. Tarantino, Cox (absent), Forst, Ms. Metzger, Messrs. Pappas, Rodger, Chairman Barto

Also in attendance: Mr. David Rutherford, Board Attorney; Ms. JoAnn Carroll, Board Secretary

Nomination of Chairman: Tarantino, Metzger

Roll Call Taken; All Board members present approve nomination of Mr. Barto as Chairman

Nomination of Vice Chairman: Metzger, Barto

Roll Call Taken; All Board members present approve nomination of Mr. Tarantino as Vice Chairman

Appointment of Secretary: Barto, Forst

Roll Call Taken; All Board members present approve appointment of JoAnn Carroll as Board Secretary

Attorney Resolution: Tarantino, Metzger

Roll Call Taken; All Board members present approve appointment of Mr. David L. Rutherford as Board Attorney

Mr. Rutherford: stated it has been and continues to be his pleasure to serve the citizens of the Borough of Ho-Ho-Kus for the past 28 years and thanks the Board for their continued confidence in him.

Please Note: Mr. Cox has joined the meeting at this time.

2014 Meeting Dates Resolution

Chairman Barto: asked the Board Secretary to change the July 3rd date to another day; possibly the following week; July 10th is the approved date; adoption of 2014 meeting dates with the change of July 3rd to July 10th.

Roll Call Taken; All Board members present approve 2014 meeting dates with the new date of July 10th.

Approval of Minutes: Carried to the March 6, 2014 Meeting.

September 5, 2013
November 7, 2013

October 3, 2013
July 11, 2013

June 6, 2013

Master Plan Presentation:

Chairman of the Planning Board, Mr. John Hanlon, will make his formal Master Plan presentation to the Zoning Board.

Chairman Barto: thanked Mr. Hanlon for his patience and for attending the meeting this evening to give his Master Plan presentation.

Mr. John Hanlon, Planning Board Chairman: stated he was in attendance this evening to give a presentation on the updated Master Plan; the law has changed in that Master Plans will be allowed to be reviewed every ten years; the Planning Board has decided to continue on a seven year schedule; a consultant was hired; met with the Zoning Board over a year ago asking for assistance; now on the record that the Zoning Board is in receipt of the Master Plan; Mr. Hanlon proceeded to discuss and review the items in the Master Plan.

Chairman Barto: stated that it was quite daring of the Planning Board to suggest the moving of the library; completely supports the suggestion.

Mr. Hanlon: stated the Council agreed that the location of the library is a safety situation; not user friendly; Mr. Hanlon continued reviewing the Master Plan; asked if Mr. Tarantino and Mr. Barto were the only members of the Board from Cheel Croft.

Chairman Barto and Mr. Tarantino: both responded “yes.”

Mr. Hanlon: stated the Cheel Croft section was expanded to 10-12 more pages from what was originally done; running piece of history; history of who, what, where, when and why included.

Mr. Leonard Tarantino: asked if there were any drainage schematics.

Mr. Hanlon: stated “no”, but the drainage situation is completely laid out in the Master Plan; thanked the prior Board Secretary for her help in starting the Master Plan review process; thanked Ms. RuthAnne Frank, Borough Executive Administrative Assistant, for all her help and time in putting the Master Plan together; Ms. Frank came forward and volunteered her personal time to work on this project; thanked the current Board Secretary for her help as well; thanked Chairman Barto and the entire Zoning Board for their help with the Master Plan; entire Master Plan is on line; in the future, various pictures and also copies of the record labels will hopefully be on line as well.

The entire Zoning Board agreed that the Master Plan was a job well done.

Ongoing Business:

Resolution: Kristin Gildea Fox and Ryan Fox, 21 Duncan Road, Block 106, Lot 6: approval to widen the bottom of their driveway; entire driveway will be 18' from house to street.

Mr. Rutherford: stated this application was heard on November 7, 2013; resolution has yet to be adopted; Mr. Rutherford explained and discussed the application and the resolution; Members Cox, Metzger, Forst and Rodger are eligible to vote.

Motion to Approve: Cox, Metzger

All Board members eligible to vote approve resolution.

Completeness Review

Mr. & Mrs. Garnet Henderson, 309 Racetrack Road, Block 1109, Lot 14: applicants seek a variance to construct a 1.5 story addition and covered porch; front yard setback.

Mr. Rutherford: stated that Mr. Irwin had appeared before the Board before and was aware of the procedure; no testimony would be given this evening; Board needs to determine if the plans and materials filed are complete so as to schedule a public hearing; public hearing would be held on Thursday, March 6th; prepared a sample notice; asked for confirmation that what was being sought was a front yard setback variance.

Mr. Gary Irwin, applicant's architect: stated "yes."

Chairman Barto: asked if it included lot coverage.

Mr. Irwin: stated no, it is a large lot.

Mr. Rutherford: stated this application does reflect recent amendments to the ordinance that increases the percentage of lot coverage.

Chairman Barto: asked if the Board had any questions.

There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the public hearing for this application would be held on March 6th; the published notice and notice to the applicant's 200' list need to be done 10 days in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Paul Doherty, 81 Gilbert Road, Block 601, Lot 8: applicant seeks a variance to place a generator in front yard (corner lot).

Mr. Rutherford: stated the application was filed today; will consult with the applicant regarding the notice.

Mr. Frank Cox: asked if there were other variances granted on this property.

Mr. Rutherford: stated that both he and the Board Secretary would check the files to see if there were other variances and contact the Board before the next meeting.

Chairman Barto: stated the application looked complete to him.

Mr. Rutherford: stated this application would be listed for public hearing on March 6; instructed the Board Secretary to advise the client of this fact.

Chairman Barto: stated that a break would be taken at this time while the Board reconfigures; many Board members are parishioners of St. Luke's and have recused themselves.

Recess Start time: 8:36PM

Recess End time: 8:40PM

Please note: Members Metzger, Tarantino, Cox and Pappas are available to vote; the other remaining Board members have left the dais.

New Business:

St. Luke's Church: 260-302 North Franklin Turnpike, Block 103, Lots 7 & 8: proposed cemetery with headstones and car turn-around; interior lot landscaping to be discussed.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: introduced the St. Luke's application.

Ms. Diana McGovern, Zimmerer, Murray, Applicant's Attorney: introduced herself to the Board.

Mr. Rutherford: stated Board Members Barto and Forst are parishioners and Mr. Rodger is recused because he owns property within 200 ft. of the church; members eligible to hear the matter are Tarantino, Metzger, Cox and Pappas; jurisdictional requirements have been met.

Ms. McGovern: stated the St. Luke's application was before the Board for site plan only; received a use variance a little over a year ago; bifurcated the application; increasing the existing cemetery to new Lots 7 & 8; Borough Engineer wrote a letter dated 11/4/13 and in response to that letter the applicant has accommodated all the requests except for #4 where there was a fence/evergreen buffer; the fence will be continued across the front and there is quite an evergreen buffer to be presented to the Board; the applicant does have letters from the Bergen County Planning Board that they do not have to appear before them; response from NJ Natural Resources and Conservation Program; **Exhibit A-1: Bergen County Planning Board letter dated 12/4/13; Exhibit A-2: NJ Natural Resources and Conservation Program letter dated 12/16/13;** Father James Weiner will be introduced; he will explain the idea of the development of the cemetery and answer any general questions; **Exhibit A-3: Color coded landscaping plan with revision date of 12/10/13.**

Father James (Jim) Weiner: sworn in by Mr. Rutherford.

Father Weiner and Ms. McGovern: reviewed Exhibit A-3; area between the existing cemetery and what the new property will be contains a lot of trees and those trees will remain; the internal area where the new cemetery portion will be; explained how the burials will take place; start at rear of property, then middle, last portion used would be the front of the property; existing trees at front of the property; these trees to be left as long as possible; 1,114 graves will be added to the cemetery per the plan; many years will pass until the graves at the front of the new cemetery area will be used; existing trees will be there for a long time; condition of the trees in the front are okay at this time; anticipate bringing in wrought iron fencing straight across the front; there is no driveway to Franklin Turnpike; bushes in the front will remain until the point where the graves will be used; car path will be the existing entranceway; no lighting; in terms of funerals, they would be the same as the ones that will be held at the church.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if the number of graves is the same as when the applicant was before the Board last year for a variance.

Ms. McGovern: stated there are fewer graves than last time; moved plans back so there are no side yard setback variances.

Mr. Cox: asked how many internments will take place per year.

Father Weiner: stated that most of the graves are sold; second burials; there are less than 30 graves that are available; internments are second burials; number will be lower.

Mr. Cox: asked what the projection was to reach the capacity of the cemetery.

Father Weiner: stated there are 300 graves in the existing cemetery and that took 150 years to fill.

Ms. Abigail Metzger: asked if there would be an area for ashes and is that considered the less demanding land use.

Father Weiner: stated there are regular plots; but a plot can be bought and it can be used for the remains/ashes instead of a casket.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated that 15 months ago the key significant issue was landscaping; making sure the external obsolescence to the properties adjacent to the south and to the east are basically cordoned off with significant landscaping; mission is to make sure that occurs.

Father Weiner: stated there will be evergreen trees on the property; referred to Exhibit A-3.

Ms. Bonnie Weller, 109 Blauvelt Avenue: asked how many graves will be in the new cemetery section.

Father Weiner: stated there would be 1,114 graves/plots.

Ms. Weller: asked if there would be two burials.

Father Weiner: stated some plots would be single burial others would be two.

Ms. Weller: spoke regarding landscaping; as owners of property adjacent to the new cemetery, trees in place now are insufficient to block the view of the cemetery; should the Board approve the graveyard, hopes the view of the cemetery would be landscaped fully.

Father Weiner: stated there are all new evergreens around the entire property; extensive amount of trees that would be added to the property.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the public can ask questions; can make a statement later; should be made clear that the applicant came before the Board in 2012 and received a use variance to permit the existing cemetery to expand to lots 7 & 8; question is not “if”, but “how”; this is a site plan application; the use variance already approved to expand the cemetery; the application needs to come before the Board to confirm that the applicant has complied with the site plan ordinance of the Borough.

Ms. Weller: asked if the parking and so forth would be discussed.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the issues of access and parking are relevant; the use itself has already been approved; need to focus on the site plan.

Ms. Sheila Chidiac, 119 Blauvelt Avenue: asked what type of fence would be erected.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated that Father Weiner just gave an overview; missions and goals to minimize impact of surrounding properties; questions can be asked to that regard.

Ms. Chidiac: indicated she will approach the Board again at the appropriate time with her question.

Mr. Max Stokes, 152 Ackerman Avenue: asked how the funerals would be conducted and how many people would be expected per funeral.

Father Weiner: stated the access would be through the existing cemetery; parking in the existing parking lot and then procession to the gravesite; the amount of people can range from 30-100; if the funeral mass is held at St. Luke's, the cars don't come into the cemetery at all; process from the church to the cemetery; even an outside funeral parks in the parking lot and processes to the gravesite.

Ms. Weller: asked where Franklin Turnpike was located on Exhibit A-3; present cemetery indicated; asked if there would be parking in that area.

Father Weiner: stated parking would be in the existing parking lot and the entrance to the cemetery is through the old cemetery.

Ms. Weller: asked if there would be an issue with headlights and horns.

Father Weiner: stated “no.”

Ms. Weller: asked where the existing parking is.

Father Weiner: stated it is by ECLC.

Ms. Weller: asked if the parking lot would be larger than it is now.

Father Weiner: stated “no.”

Mr. Rob Ryan, 125 Blauvelt Road: asked if there was a turning circle for cars.

Father Weiner: stated “yes.”

Ms. McGovern: stated it was required by the Borough’s Engineer.

Mr. Martin Costello, 261 Franklin Turnpike: asked about the type of grave markers there would be in the new cemetery; restrictions.

Father Weiner: stated they would be comparable to what is in the old cemetery.

Mr. Costello: asked if anything needs to be done to the entrance to the old cemetery.

Father Weiner: stated there is a clear path; nothing needs to be moved; no trees will be removed.

Mr. Thomas Ashbahian, 39 Spring Street Ramsey, NJ, applicant’s engineer/architect/planner: approached the Board.

Ms. McGovern: stated that Mr. Ashbahian has previously been accepted as an engineering and architectural expert.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked for Mr. Ashbahian’s qualifications/licenses.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated his qualifications, licenses and practices; has been accepted by this Board in the past.

Mr. Rutherford: stated that Mr. Ashbahian is qualified in all three disciplines as an expert.

Ms. McGovern and Mr. Ashbahian: discussed: the existing cemetery is on Lots 5 & 6; submitted updated drawings to the Board in response to Mr. Hals' letter; referred to SP2; **Exhibit A-4: Whole set of plans; SP1, SP2, and SP3; last revision date SP1 7/1/13; revision date SP2 6/4/13; revision date SP3 11/20/13;** recapped, existing cemetery is on Lots 5 & 6; referred to sheets showing existing conditions and entire St. Luke's property; SP2 shows where the plots are today; individual lots indicated which was requested at the time of the use variance application; referred to and reviewed Mr. Hals' letter of 11/14/13; black metal fence to be extended along the front of the property now indicated on the plans; 10 ft. setback from residential property and a 20 ft. setback from Franklin Turnpike; indicated an evergreen buffer; described buffer which was designed and where all the trees will be placed; have placed them from the western most edge along the perimeter; they will be staggered so the trees have girth to expand; four different types of evergreen materials; 5-6 ft. high at time of planting; capable of reaching 20-25 feet in height; enlarging to 10-12 ft.; 5-6 ft. high would be about 2-3 ft. in diameter at time of planting; took tree locations from existing survey; which is the border between the current cemetery and the proposed cemetery; all deciduous trees will remain unless they are dead; not taking any trees down that are largely on neighbor's property to the south; did have that area dragged and they have the survey data that shows most of the deciduous trees on that edge are on the neighbor's property; there are two large deciduous trees on center of property that will eventually come down; wouldn't come down for another 20-40 years because the cemetery will be developed from the rear and come forward; trees in the front yard that are in poor condition will be evaluated by the church's maintenance person in the spring to see if they need to be taken down; there would be a problem on Franklin Turnpike if those trees came down.

Ms. Metzger: asked which direction the graves would be opened starting from the very back; close to existing cemetery or across towards Blauvelt.

Father Weiner: stated the graves would be opened going across to Blauvelt.

Ms. Metzger: asked if the graves could be opened in a downward direction instead of across towards the neighbors; this would give the trees more time to grow so there would be more of a buffer.

Mr. Rutherford: clarified the graves would be opened as an east/west access instead of north/south.

Ms. Metzger: asked if statues were allowed on top of the headstones.

Father Weiner: stated the headstones would be like the existing stones; low stones; large stones are from the original cemetery.

Mr. Rutherford: stated this issue was dealt with in the resolution of approval the first time around; limited to existing headstone size.

Father Weiner: stated he didn't see a reason not to open the graves from east to west; would be unusual but it could be done.

Ms. McGovern: stated the cemetery would be developed vertically; the bushes would be more grown in by the time the burials are towards Blauvelt.

Father Weiner: stated it would take approximately 15-20 years to reach that area.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: referred to the NE corner of the diagram; asked what the plan was to replace trees in this corner if they were dead and/or diseased.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that many of the trees in this area are on cemetery property that is in existence; they will not be disturbed.

Ms. McGovern and Mr. Ashbahian: stated there is a lot of scrub brush that will be cleared out; the trees that are there will remain; all trees in the area will remain.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if there were evergreens in this area.

Mr. Ashbahian: replied "no"; the evergreens are extended to the extent of the eastern edge of the property; there is another 30-35 ft. extending there.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated he believes the evergreens should be extended.

Ms. McGovern: stated that would not be a problem; there would be approximately 6-8 trees added; asked if a number could be agreed upon at this time.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked what the distance perimeter line is.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated it borders the existing cemetery.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if this was the easterly line of the property.

Mr. Ashbahian: approached Vice Chairman Tarantino to show him exactly what he was discussing; extension is less than 90 ft.; the pattern would be replicated going across; dead brush will be cleared out.

Mr. Rutherford: asked if the evergreens would be extended with the balance of that line.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if Father Weiner would be willing to do that.

Father Weiner: stated “yes”, absolutely.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated he is not averse to keeping it there; feels that it is still an eyesore; feels the line should be extended.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the line of trees would be extended to the new cemetery.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked what type of gaps would be between the trees and how long would it take to fill in.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the trees are spaced 7-7.5 feet apart; they will be staggered; they are 2.5-3 ft. in diameter; that would be four feet on a diagonal; in five years they should be overlapping; if they are planted too close they will start to kill themselves off; they need room to grow.

Ms. McGovern: asked if the Board had questions regarding the landscaping.

Mr. Cox: asked if there would be a fresh cut lawn in the undeveloped section.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that forward of the area to be developed, first there is a barn, house and several sheds; they will be removed and the ground regraded; it will have to be seeded; there is a lot of pavement to be removed.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked when the removal would be done.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated in the spring.

Father Weiner: stated that as soon as the landscaping is approved, the buildings would be removed.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if all the buildings would come down at one time.

Father Weiner: stated that all the buildings would be taken down at one time.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the house, barn, sheds and pavement, including the driveway that goes out to Franklin Turnpike, would be removed immediately; new curb put across Franklin Turnpike; a significant amount of coverage will be removed.

Ms. McGovern/Mr. Ashbahian: referred to the grading plan; SP3; grading is put through all the areas where the structures are being removed; entire

area will be re-seeded; all the planting which exists will be untouched except where the new evergreen buffer is being established.

Ms. McGovern: stated she wants to make sure there is an efficient pathway; Mr. Hals was consulted; and the plan is what came about per Mr. Hals' direction.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that during the use variance application there was a driveway from Franklin Turnpike; the Board did express their opinion about it; does not believe it ended up in a resolution saying that it couldn't exist, but basically it was felt that it was not desirable; the driveway was eliminated entirely; there was a more modest turnaround originally suggested in the use variance application; Mr. Hals requested that a full residential type of turnaround be used; 80 ft. in diameter and paved; there will be a series of drainage pits that will take in additional drainage; the driveway is gone; the new turnaround is compatible as what would be seen in a residential area.

Ms. Weller: asked where the turnaround is located in relation to her property.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated it is in the middle of the rear portion of the property; Mr. Ashbahian showed Ms. Weller her property on the plans; the roadway is located behind Lot 11; the purpose is for vehicles to come into the area.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated that Ms. Weller can ask questions when this examination is done.

Ms. McGovern and Mr. Ashbahian: stated the drainage was done per the engineer's letter; drainage report was submitted to Mr. Hals; presumed he has accepted the drainage report because in item #6 he indicates that the applicant is doing the drainage as he would expect; reducing coverage on the site; not required to, but in this case they are doing a drainage plan; Soil Conservation/Bergen County Planning Board evidence of both approvals being granted; all items in Mr. Hals' report have been covered; landscape plan put together; there is a nice buffer; asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if there was a fence to be installed.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated there was no fence; in Mr. Hals' letter, he said if there were to be a fence, he wanted them to designate; they chose to put in an evergreen buffer.

Ms. McGovern: the existing cemetery only has a front fence; there is no fence around the entire back perimeter or any other part of the cemetery; it goes along Franklin Turnpike.

Vice Chairman Tarnatino: asked what Mr. Hals stated regarding the fence.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated Mr. Hals did not say and/or a fence, he just mentioned if there were to be a fence to designate it.

Ms. McGovern: stated the plans were submitted to Mr. Hals; did a quick turnaround with the changes; has not received any criticism or comment from him; suggested the landscape buffer is very significant; doesn't know how to work in a fence when an alternating concept of trees and landscaping is being proposed.

Ms. Metzger: asked what is right outside the little bit of a driveway that goes to the turnaround.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the Soil Conservation District requires them to place a stone pad down when constructing the road; there is actually a cartway that extends through the existing cemetery; testified during the use variance; there is a very clear cartway; a path that goes out to this property; can see clearly there are no grave sites in this path; that is why it is connected in that fashion; as a result of making a larger turnaround, did drop the number of burial plots.

Ms. Metzger: asked if there will be any types of walkways when the bottom part is done.

Father Weiner: stated the existing cemetery path is grass; there is no pavement.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the graves could have been extended to the existing property line; left a border; essentially a driveway is there at this time; when re-graded, it will be grass; in between each row of gravesites, two feet have been left; not edge to edge so there is ample walking space.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked for any members of the public to come forward to question the expert.

Mr. David Rodger, 149 Blauvelt Avenue: approached the Board.

Mr. Rutherford: stated for the record that Mr. Rodger is a member of the Zoning Board but being a member of the Board does not mean he gives up his right to comment on the matter. As a cautionary instruction, so the Board and everyone understands, that simply because Mr. Rodger is a member of the Board his testimony is not entitled to any greater or lesser weight than anyone else's; evaluated just as if he were a member of the public; not appearing on behalf of the Board; he has been recused as a member of the Board.

Mr. Rodger: discussed drainage; has reviewed the plans; doesn't feel there is an organized drainage plan; details not well located on the drawing; asked what happens to the water when it rains.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated there are no drainage structures on the plan or site currently; the rain will work its way from west to east in a natural pattern; that is the way the grade is running; by virtue of the proposal, the applicant is removing the pool, the house, the barn, 2-3 sheds, a significant amount of patio, pavement, walkways; in its place they are putting in a drive area and a turn around; this coverage is significantly less than all the coverage that exists today; the applicant is going to have less drainage off the site under the proposed condition; not withstanding, they could have told Mr. Hals that they weren't putting in drainage; offered to put in localized drainage pits along the selected edges of the new pavement; engineer's report submitted to Mr. Hals for his review; he took no exception to it; putting in 4 pits; removing all drainage that is running off the existing surface area; less drainage off of site.

Mr. Rodger: stated the underbrush slows the water down in the east end and allows it to seep into the soil; now it will run straight off into the right of way and who knows where it will go from there; Mr. Rodger stated it might end up on his property.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated there would be less water coming off of this site; diminishing impervious coverage area; the impervious area that will be created, they are putting in a systematic drainage system.

Mr. Rodger: asked where the seepage pits will be located.

Mr. Ashbahian: referred to the plan to show Mr. Rodger where the seepage pits will be located; Soil Conservation District requires the applicant, during construction, to put on temporary filters on basins when first installed; this is standard Soil Conservation procedure.

Mr. Rodger: asked if, during construction, there are rainstorms, water runs off, it will run into the right of way; is the applicant required to re-grade the right of way.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated "no"; during construction the applicant is obligated to put in a silt filter fence along the entire perimeter; during a rainstorm, silt that tries to move off site, the filter fabric will contain the silt; thereby it will not erode or aggravate any drainage condition that exists in the right of way; Soil Conservation District inspects the site independently from the Town's requirements; continuous filter around the entire property.

Mr. Rodger: asked if adjacent properties are inspected as well.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that a lot of the times they are; if there is a broken rod holding the fence, they will contact the contractor; they are required to have the phone number of the owner in case there is a problem; the Soil Conservation District is extremely diligent.

Mr. Rodger: stated that in the drawing, the applicant is designing for a 1 year storm.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated it is designed for a 100 year storm; could have argued that drainage wasn't needed; could have used grading; did choose to install four drainage pits that are designed for the runoff; reducing the drainage by taking down the existing structures and putting in grass.

Ms. Metzger: asked if there is any drainage on the site at this time.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated "no".

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated the topography goes from west to east; asked if the water was designed to funnel into the four seepage pits.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated "no"; the natural grades will continue for the water to move in a particular direction.

Ms. McGovern: stated that impervious coverage would be picked up by moving the house and the barn; what would normally run off of the buildings will go into the ground.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated there is less run off under the proposed development; the calculations were provided to Mr. Hals and he has not taken exception to it.

Mr. Rodger: stated he has been on the property during dusk and there is a lot of wildlife in the area; asked if there were any plans to relocate the existing wildlife there.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated there are no designs in front of the Board to address that; stated that they are maintaining a significant amount of tree buffer; in the back corner; there is still a significant amount of woods that would remain; also, significant amount of woods behind properties; not destroying a massive amount of habitat; not taking down a forest.

Mr. Rodger: stated the animals would be forced to move.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated, again, there are no designs in front of the Board to address that question.

Ms. McGovern: stated that under the site plan requirements, there is not a requirement under site plan approval that they would have to deal with wildlife issues.

Mr. Rodger: stated it was unusual for there to be wildlife in Ho-Ho-Kus.

Ms. Metzger: asked if any trees would be taken down except for the ones that are dead.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated there is a lot of transplanted material in the middle of the property; some are viable, a lot of it is not; when the first section of

the cemetery is improved, the first set of graves opened, then the planted materials in the center will be coming out; two trees close to the house will come out only when the middle third is done; trees in front only taken down if it is found they are not viable.

Ms. Metzger: asked if the cemetery encourages any type of planting of shrubbery next to the headstones.

Father Weiner: stated that is not encouraged; it is hard to maintain the plots themselves; flowers are allowed but not bushes.

Ms. Weller: stated her property adjoins the cemetery on two sides; stated there is a fence along the property that the cemetery is approved for; it is in the back of the Thompson property; there is just a plain fence; asked if the fence would stay there and then they wouldn't look at the cemetery; in the process of waiting for those trees to grow, the residents will be looking at the graveyard.

Father Weiner: stated the fence was on the churches property.

Father Weiner and Ms. Weller: referred to the plans.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the fence being discussed is between the existing cemetery and where the new cemetery will be. **Exhibit A-5: picture of fence being discussed.**

Ms. Weller: asked if something that grows faster, width-wise, could be considered; possibly rhododendrons; so they wouldn't have to look at the cemetery; didn't realize the fence would be coming down.

Father Weiner: stated the deer eat the rhododendrons; there are deer in the existing cemetery.

Ms. Weller: stated that would be more attractive than looking at space in between the trees; asked if a 10 ft. border is enough.

Ms. McGovern: asked if the question is to plant rhododendron instead of the spruce trees.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated one would kill off the other; one will compete for the same sunlight; could easily be counterproductive.

Ms. Weller: asked if the rhododendrons could be included in the staggering plan.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated if the Board was amenable to having a staggered lower and higher plant material, they will; if she is speaking of augmenting what is being shown with additional rhododendron, then no; they will have a permanent evergreen barrier; will grow in height and girth; rhododendrons don't grow high and they do not grow very wide.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if Mr. Hals has addressed the landscaping issue.

Ms. McGovern: stated the landscape plan was submitted to Mr. Hals.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that Mr. Hals instructed that a dense evergreen buffer be provided; nothing else.

Ms. Metzger: asked when the land use variance application was before the Board and was approved.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated 13-14 months ago; in addition to the 10 ft. setback.

Ms. Metzger: stated this is the first time the Board is dealing with the schematics.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the 10 ft. buffer was discussed at the time and was an issue that was raised; the gravesites could extend into the 10 ft. buffer; the applicant is now observing the 10 ft. setback in this zone; the plan reflects this; this is the first hearing on the site plan application; Ms. Weller has missed nothing.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if Ms. Weller had any other questions other than other vegetation to be planted along with the evergreens.

Ms. Weller: stated she had a drainage concern; spoke regarding bamboo at the back of the property.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that bamboo is in the far corner; for the first ten feet in each direction it will not be disturbed; other than planting the evergreens; bamboo will continue to grow.

Ms. Weller: asked about the bamboo and the drainage; started to ask about the 80 ft. turnaround.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated that Ms. Weller cut off Mr. Ashbahian and asked her not to do so; asked Mr. Ashbahian to finish his answer.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that drainage will be reduced by virtue of removing significant amounts of impervious; putting in a much smaller amount of impervious.

Mr. Tarantino: asked if any of the bamboo would be removed and also asked about the filter/fencing that would be placed on the site.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that bamboo would be removed in the corner discussed in order to plant the evergreens; the silt fencing is temporary during construction.

Ms. Metzger: asked if the bamboo would be left on the site.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that bamboo is not considered a good screening material; all of the bamboo will not be removed when the evergreen buffer is planted; bamboo expands no matter what is done to it; the portion of bamboo in the right of way is not being disturbed.

Ms. Weller: spoke regarding the view; viewing the landscaping trucks coming up the road; cars coming to view the graves and so forth that will increase the amount of cars in the parking lot and traffic in and out of the cemetery; cars have alarms that could go off; cars would travel up and down Blauvelt; asked if there would be no more than a block back-up of vehicles.

Ms. McGovern: stated the traffic issue was already dealt with during the variance application; expert testimony was given; not relevant to this discussion.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: sustained.

Mr. Rutherford: stated all of these issues relate to the use variance; Board considered traffic, number of funerals; resolution did address traffic issues; that condition directly related to the existing driveway; issues with respect to the expansion of the cemetery and the associated increases with activity were resolved during the use variance application.

Ms. Weller: asked if the movement of the maintenance trucks and people on the site was handled.

Mr. Rutherford: stated all issues were handled during the use variance application, including all the issues Ms. Weller mentioned.

Ms. Weller: stated she did not feel the ten foot buffer was sufficient; would like rhododendrons to be used along the adjoining property as well as spruce; a ten foot buffer would only allow for one spruce tree.

Mr. Tarantino: asked Mr. Ashbahian to describe the configuration of the spruce trees again.

Mr. Ashbahian: described the staggering of the spruce and the planting schedule.

Ms. Wells: asked for a larger setback.

Ms. McGovern: stated the setback was already determined during the use variance application.

Father Weiner: stated that a concession has been made to start the opening of the graves going in a different direction to allow for the trees to have time to grow.

Mr. Max Stokes, 152 Ackerman Avenue: asked if the trees that have been designated as being in poor condition been inspected by an expert or the Shade Tree Commission.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the Shade Tree Commission will not come on the property to evaluate the trees; the trees that are in poor condition on Franklin Turnpike may be removed.

Mr. Stokes: asked how many mature trees on the property would be taken down.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that no mature trees would be taken down in this vicinity; all mature trees are on the perimeter and they are staying; the trees in the center of the property wouldn't come down for 15-25 years until such time the front part of the cemetery is developed; possibly 2 trees would come down and whatever is dead in the vicinity.

Father Weiner: stated he has an arborist to take care of the trees; the same arborist evaluates and takes care of the trees.

Mr. Stokes: asked if any trees in the rear of the property would be taken down.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that on the development plan, where no cemetery plots would be placed, those trees remain.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if the trees are extended 90 ft. toward the north.

Ms. McGovern: stated this was correct based on the agreement reached earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Stokes: asked how many times Mr. Ashbahian has been on the property.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated he had been on the property approximately 15-20 times over a two/three year time period.

Mr. Stokes: asked if the trees could be planted at a larger size and why was the 5-6 ft. tree size chosen.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated it was a matter of judgment; the premise for the site to be developed all at one time is not the condition here; this is a facility which will be developed over many, many decades; as the 5-6 ft. trees start to develop, by the time they get near the neighboring properties, it is the expectation that the evergreens will reach 15-20 ft. tall; Father Weiner indicated there would be three sections; it could take 100-120 years to develop the area for graves; at that time replanting would be needed.

Mr. Stokes: asked why the applicant is choosing 5-6 ft. trees and not taller ones.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated they are following the direction of the Board.

Ms. Metzger: stated that the testimony that was heard 13-14 months ago would have answered many of Mr. Stokes' questions; only items being removed is the dead brush that is there; maybe they could put in small bushes where the brush is being taken out; in terms of the land on the other side; the applicant has already conceded they will have gravesites with no more than 2-2.5 foot tombstones over 20-30 ft. from the buffer.

Mr. Stokes: stated he was not noticed for the first variance.

Ms. McGovern: stated she received a certified list for the first variance; Mr. Stokes' name was not on the list; this time a wider net was cast; the site plan is a bigger piece of property; 200' list of St. Lukes; provided notice to all people on the list as certified by the Tax Assessor.

Mr. Stokes: stated his biggest issue is the 5-6 ft. trees; berm.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated by virtue of planting, there might be a slight berm situation; slightly elevated over the prevailing grade.

Mr. Stokes: asked who made the recommendations on these trees.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated he selected them.

Mr. Stokes: stated they are slow growing trees.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated they are but they top off at significant heights; 25-45 ft. in height if given enough room to grow.

Mr. Stokes: spoke regarding drainage, soil being removed; the house, shed, pool being removed; adding graves; not porous.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated he stood by his testimony; taking away a significant amount of impervious area that they are not re-introducing.

Mr. Stokes: asked what number he was working off of concerning drainage.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated gravesites themselves will be grassed over.

Mr. Stokes: asked about the coffins themselves.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the coffins are not part of the pervious or impervious coverage.

Mr. Stokes: asked when the impervious coverage will be added.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the roadway will be put in initially; to access those graves that are the most immediate; that impervious coverage is significantly less than all the impervious area that was removed; graves underground are not considered.

Mr. Stokes: asked what type of soil is on the property.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the soil is very permeable; plenty of growth; no growth problems.

Mr. Stokes: asked how much bamboo is there.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated he did not know.

Mr. Stokes: asked if the bamboo would be left there.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the amount of bamboo to be removed would be in relation to establishing the buffer; the bamboo is probably in the PSE&G right of way.

Mr. Stokes: asked what the turn around is to be used for.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the hearse would come down and any other carriages that the family would use; just family and the hearse; there is a significant parking lot; mourners would then come down to the site; processional part of the use.

Mr. Stokes: asked if there would be any headlight restrictions enforced.

Father Weiner: stated there will be no cars except for the hearse and/or the flower car; the family will walk into the area, not drive into it; hearse moves into the parking lot; doesn't stay in the cemetery; not a lot of traffic.

Ms. McGovern: stated the traffic issue was discussed during the use variance application.

Mr. Rob Ryan, 125 Blauvelt Avenue: asked if the applicant considered building a fence along the property line in addition to the evergreens.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the evergreens would have the effect of screening.

Mr. Ryan: stated at some points there is a direct line of site to the graveyard.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated that would occur; during the initial approval, it was stated that this property could have been developed as a residential area and have significantly greater activity than that of the proposed cemetery.

Mr. Martin Costello, 261 N. Franklin Turnpike: asked how many evergreens would be planted.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated approximately 80 trees along the perimeter.

Mr. Costello: asked if an irrigation system was being proposed.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated it is a practical matter; Mr. Ed Fleming, groundskeeper, would be maintaining the perimeter.

Mr. Costello: asked if there was a specific plan for replacing dead trees or trees that don't take.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated it has been his experience that normally the Board Attorney in the resolution would obligate the applicant to have a replacement or bond to ensure the plants would take or be replaced over 2-3 years.

Mr. Costello: asked about the re-grading of the property from the top to the back; slope; asked if soil was being taken away or added to this property.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the property is very level for 15-20 ft. and then it drops off as you get to the house/pool; Mr. Hals has asked that portion of the property to be re-graded; not touching the grade for about 2/3 of the property other than picking up the asphalt and putting top soil over it for grass; only area to be re-graded is the pool and house area per Mr. Hals; gentler slope.

Mr. Costello: asked if soil would be added to the front part of the property.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated the soil will be used that is there to create a gentler slope.

Mr. Costello: asked where the soil is coming from.

Mr. Ashbahian: stated from the excavation in this area; that is what Mr. Hals has asked to be provided, and it has been provided.

Mr. Rutherford: stated there were no further questions; opened up the meeting for public comment.

Ms. Bonnie Weller: sworn in by Mr. Rutherford; spoke regarding spruce trees growth in relation to rhododendrons; her concern is the view; fence.

Mr. Max Stokes: sworn in by Mr. Rutherford; spoke regarding the price of the lots; Board to consider scanning the plan back; landscaping by a professional company to make a judgment; drainage concern; run-off.

Mr. Martin Costello: sworn in by Mr. Rutherford; described trees; all evergreens; would like other types of trees; aesthetics; not environmentally friendly.

Mr. Rob Ryan: sworn in by Mr. Rutherford; spoke regarding site view; barrier to block view until trees mature; fence would be effective.

Mr. Cox: asked if there was growth on his property.

Mr. Ryan: stated some of the growth was located on his property.

Mr. Cox: stated the growth on his property would not be removed.

Ms. Sheila Chidiac: sworn in by Mr. Rutherford; stated she lives in one of the two houses most affected by this project; children can come into the yards; fence should be considered.

Ms. McGovern: stated the standard of the site plan is to fulfill certain requirements which were set out by the Borough Engineer; their plan is in keeping with the existing cemetery and the surrounding properties as best as can be done; they are the only ones to provide expert testimony regarding which trees would work best and what would provide the most camouflage so the effect the neighbors want will be there; not looking to make anyone unhappy; the comments have to do with the fact this is a cemetery; already decided; this is how it can work; the fact the property will be developed in the far corner, by the time any graves are placed anywhere near this perimeter, this will all be filled in to block any view of any of the neighbors; the fence is nowhere on the property except in the front; the fence along the front will be extended; line of trees that divide the existing cemetery and the new cemetery; already existing mature trees will remain; variety of trees; drainage will be improved because of the impervious coverage being removed; adding a car path; adding drainage; fulfilling requirements by Borough Engineer; that is the criteria for site plan approval; not revisiting issue.

Mr. Cox: asked Ms. McGovern to refer to A-5; existing fence; runs along the southerly boundary of the existing cemetery.

Ms. McGovern: stated this fence was included with the property that was purchased.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the fence does not run the entire depth of the property; asked how far from Franklin Turnpike does the fence extend.

Mr. Cox: stated the fence is right behind the garage.

Ms. McGovern: stated there is no fence at the back part.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the public portion of the meeting was closed and the Board deliberation would begin.

Ms. Metzger: stated she understood the desire to have a visible buffer that is bigger and better than trees; maybe that needs to be considered; some shade trees planted might make it a "warmer" place; there is a responsibility

to be environmentally caring; a small/low fence around the property would take care of a lot of problems and make the surrounding homeowners more comfortable; reasonable addition to the final proposal.

Mr. Cox: stated the existing property is an eyesore to the entire community; when completed it will look nice; right location to extend the cemetery; St. Luke's keeps a meticulous property; satisfied with the trees that are proposed to be planted; looking at the map, all of the properties, except for Mr. Ryan's, are a minimum 75 ft. back to the property line; there is shrubby by the Ryan property that won't be removed; the homeowners are open to plant anything they want at the back of their respective properties; open to a fence discussion; iron; 4-5 ft. high; wanted to make sure the fence in Exhibit A-5 was being taken down.

Mr. Albert Pappas: stated he is flexible with the screening; having a difficult time contemplating the screening; it seems, initially, people could see through the screening; it is hard to see that and when it would be completely screened; having difficulty envisioning at this point; all the points raised are great; flexible to hear about other options.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated the setback and traffic carry no weight in his opinion; a decent application has been put forth; however he has been persuaded by Mr. Stokes and Mr. Costello and Member Metzger that there needs to be a better idea with the landscaping in order to minimize any kind of damage to property values that these neighbors have; that should be the paramount focus of the Board; with that being said, in viewing Mr. Hals' report, everything has been complied with except landscaping; compelled to investigate further; there is time; no rush to judgment; it will work, it just needs to be done the right way; as far as the fence, Vice Chairman Tarantino is more inclined on the vegetation issue than the fence; his opinion; believes an expert can be brought in on the Board's end to put forth a visual display; 3D; let's make sure it is done the right way.

Ms. McGovern: stated she did call the Shade Tree Commission.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated he is not interested in the Shade Tree Commission but hiring a landscaping expert; wants a configuration that the Board can look at and get a handle on and then make a decision.

Ms. Metzger: stated that privacy and teenagers in the evening going into the cemetery and spilling over into someone's property is a real concern; believes a fence will take care of three things; security, animal issue and the visibility; wants to put it out there as an option; legitimate concern.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: wanted to discuss the fencing; iron type of fence.

Mr. Rutherford: asked if the fence would be along the southerly property line.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated he didn't think it would be along the right of way.

Mr. Cox: stated the fence didn't need to be along the right of way; though it could possibly come up the right of way a little bit; need an expert; details the Board needs to get to the bottom of.

Ms. Metzger: stated she likes the metal fencing; doesn't know if it will provide privacy.

Mr. Cox: stated the animals are already moving from property to property; thinks the iron fence is certainly classier; pines proposed will grow in over time; property owners can plant what they want on their side of the fence.

Ms. McGovern: stated an iron fence is a huge expense.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if there were any alternatives.

Please note: at this point of the meeting Ms. McGovern conferred with her client outside of the courtroom.

Ms. McGovern: stated she spoke with Father Weiner and he is willing to continue the existing fence in the front around the perimeter side and a little around the right of way; aluminum fence; will continue with the landscape plan presented; agreed with Mr. Cox, there are other plantings the property owners can plant on their property; spoke regarding a property that just sold.

Mr. Rutherford: stated there is no confident testimony regarding property value.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated the surrounding property owners are worried about their property value.

Ms. McGovern: stated this is the buffer their engineer chose to work with and Mr. Hals reviewed it and requested evergreen plantings.

Ms. Metzger: stated she just had 5- 6 ft. evergreens planted in a staggered manner on her property and it completely covered her view; believes flowering or oak trees within the property would make the cemetery a "warmer" place; no more beautiful stone work which is what made the old cemetery so beautiful.

Ms. McGovern: stated a few dogwoods and a few flowering trees could be planted but not of a substantial size because the roots systems would affect things.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the applicant stipulated to install a fence similar to what runs along Franklin Turnpike presently; along the southerly perimeter of the property; ending at the right of way; the applicant agreed to

supplement the landscaping plan with the installation of some flowering trees, ornamental trees, dogwood trees within the cemetery itself; another stipulation is the property will be developed from the NE corner and moving in an east/west direction from the north to the south; extend the evergreens along the easterly line of the property; existing tree line; approximately 90 ft.

Mr. Cox: asked how tall the fence would be.

Ms. McGovern: stated 5 ft.

Mr. Rutherford: stated it would be a similar style fence, may not be exact, and the same height.

Ms. McGovern: stated trees would be within the cemetery grounds to soften the area; ornamental trees.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked if Mr. Cox was satisfied with the neighbors having enough setbacks.

Mr. Cox: stated he was satisfied but that the only person he had any concern for was Mr. Ryan; everyone else has more than 65 ft.; Mr. Ryan already has vegetation there; 25 years before any stones end up by his end; his view will be improved in the short term; his view will change from an abandoned house to a level field.

Mr. Pappas: stated it sounds appropriate with the fence and the ornamental trees.

Mr. Rutherford: stated there should be a certain number of trees to be spaced per Mr. Hals' direction.

Mr. Cox: asked how large the property was.

Ms. McGovern: stated the property was 1.5 acres.

Mr. Cox: stated that an expert or someone with knowledge of landscaping should make the determination of how many ornamental trees should be planted within the cemetery.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated Mr. Hals input is needed on this issue.

Ms. McGovern: asked if there was a Borough Forester that could make a determination; could stipulate that the applicant will abide by the suggestion of the Borough's expert; stated they would work with the expert.

Mr. Rutherford: stated there has to be parameters to it.

Ms. McGovern: stated they are suggesting 10 trees of ornamental quality to be directed by the Shade Tree Commission.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated he would not choose a number of trees at this point.

Mr. Rutherford: stated it is up to the Board to decide on the amount and type of trees.

Ms. McGovern: stated that Mr. Hals did not suggest trees in the middle of the property; would like to complete the application this evening; offering 10 ornamental trees to be discussed with the assistance of the Shade Tree Commission.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated that he is inclined to do that but he would leave the number of “10” out.

Ms. McGovern: believes that would be appropriate.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: asked what the official protocol on hiring a Board expert was.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the Board can retain a landscape architect to work with the applicant for the purpose of breaking up that particular area a little bit; aesthetic reasons.

Vice Chairman: stated he believes the applicant has gone above and beyond the call of duty; appreciates it; is inclined to approve on a conditional basis; hire a landscaping architect; shade trees and a number of trees to be included in the interior of the cemetery.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the Board can retain a landscape architect to work with the applicant; Board comment was something along the lines of ornamental or flowering trees; not big oak or maple trees; the Board can act on the application.

Mr. Cox: stated there is maintenance with ornament and shade trees; interested to hear a discussion from an expert; certain kind of shade trees; not cause a root problem that are an issue; believes an architect or a landscaper would have some insight as to whether the existing fencing is appropriate.

Mr. Rutherford: stated that it has been done before that the Board has authorized the preparation of a resolution of approval; can outline conditions; would not be acted upon tonight; applicant could either submit a revised plan that would address the concerns the Board has raised, or the applicant could consult with Mr. Hals as a first step to address the issues raised; or the Board could choose to retain a landscape architect; applicant could come back in a month from now; with the Board’s approval a resolution could be adopted then; seems to be the only remaining issue.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated he is inclined to retain a landscaping architect.

Mr. Cox and Mr. Pappas: stated they agree.

Ms. McGovern: asked if the Board would retain a landscaping architect or would the Board like the applicant to retain a landscaping architect to draw up a plan.

Mr. Rutherford: stated the Board could authorize a resolution of approval, in the meantime the applicant could revise its plan as it deems appropriate to address the concerns the Board has raised and return next month; if the plan meets with the Board's approval, the Board would then proceed to approve the application and adopt the resolution.

Ms. Metzger: stated it seems the only issue is the trees in the middle.

Ms. McGovern: stated her applicant has been thrown a curveball; the engineer did not speak about trees on the property in his report; what the applicant is suggesting is more than sufficient in terms of what was provided; referred to plans.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated he wants a landscaping expert for an overall opinion; was persuaded by the shade tree issue.

Ms. McGovern: stated the applicant had someone they could bring in and amend their plan to show decorative trees and perhaps shade trees; if they could hold off just for that issue.

Vice Chairman: stated the other issues would not be re-opened; stated Mr. Hals will be in attendance at the next meeting.

Mr. Cox: asked for clarity of the height of the fence.

Ms. McGovern: stated that she will provide the Board with the exact height of the fence.

Vice Chairman: stated the fence and a new landscaping plan as far as the shade/ornamental trees in the interior of the lot would be provided to the Board.

Ms. McGovern: asked for confirmation that there is no change in the perimeter trees planned.

Vice Chairman Tarantino: stated there was an agreement on that.

Mr. Rutherford: stated he has been instructed by the Board to prepare a resolution of approval; the Board will be in receipt of revised plans that will address two issues; extension of fencing along the southerly lot line; detail of that and of the height of the fence, etc.; proposal for some type of deciduous tree in the interior of the cemetery; other conditions would include in the resolution would be the extension of the evergreens in the NE

corner of the property; landscaping bond for maintenance; re-grading to meet with Mrs. Hals' approval; Board has found the buffering to be acceptable as shown; fence issue resolved; will have resolution next month; applicant testimony is limited to the deciduous trees and the fence next month; Mr. Hals will be in attendance at next month's meeting but to comment on those issues only.

**Motion to Authorize the Preparation of a Resolution:
Roll Call Taken; all Board members approve Motion to Authorize the Preparation of a Resolution.**

**Motion to Adjourn
All Board members approve Motion to Adjourn.**

Meeting Adjourned: 11:10PM

Respectfully submitted by:

JoAnn Carroll
Zoning Board Secretary
March 5, 2014