

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 5, 2017

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on September 5, 2017. Mr. Gruen called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: Jerry Gruen, Chairman
 Anthony Zamparelli, Vice Chairman
 Keith DosSantos, Secretary

Others: Jim Majewski, Director Planning & Zoning
 Randall Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor
 Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor (left meeting in
 progress)
 John B. Lewis, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Pamela Lee, Zoning Hearing Board Member
 James McCartney, Zoning Hearing Board Member

Mr. Gruen stated there are only three members of the Board present this evening out of five so they would need two members in favor to get Appeals approved. He stated the Applicants could choose to postpone their Appeal to the next meeting if they wish.

APPEAL #17-1785 – LOWER MAKEFIELD INVESTOR LLC

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The outline of relief and the reasons was marked as Exhibit A-3. Additional Plans and photographs were marked as Exhibit A-4. The 7/25 letter requesting a Continuance this evening was marked as Exhibit A-5. The binder with thirteen Exhibits was marked as Exhibit A-6. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3. The notice from the Township to the Applicant about the Continuance was marked as Exhibit B-4. The notice from the Township to the neighbors about the Continuance was marked as Exhibit B-5.

Mr. Matt McClure, attorney, was present on behalf of the property owner, Lower Makefield Corporate Center which is Lower Makefield Investor LLC. He stated Lower Makefield Corporate Center is a thirty-one acre office park on Township Line Road.

Mr. McClure stated they are requesting relief to allow for a third sign on Township Line Road. He stated the parcel is basically one-quarter mile long, and currently they have two small property identification signs one at each entrance; however, there is not tenant signage. Mr. McClure stated they have three witnesses present this evening to discuss the need for the signage as well as the claimed hardship. He stated the first Variance request is from the setback, and they are proposing 8' from the right-of-way line where 100' is required because it is Township Line Road; but they are really about 13' from the cartway itself. He stated the sign would be between the sidewalk and the tree line. He stated there is a large basin in the back so it makes it difficult to put a sign anywhere else along the length.

Mr. McClure stated they are also requesting a Variance as to the number of signs as they can only have one sign per property in this area. He stated if the property was three separate properties which you could do, you could have three signs each being 150' given the length they have along Township Line Road. He stated they are also asking for an interpretation as they are 164' if you aggregate all three signs where you have 150' cap. He stated it was unclear in the Ordinance whether that was per sign or in the aggregate. He stated they are asking for an additional sign so they are requesting that Variance as well. Mr. McClure stated the last Variance is an option. He stated the client has proposed an internally-lit sign, and they understand that the Zoning Ordinance does not permit this. He stated they also have an option for an externally-lit sign. He stated they believe an internally-illuminated sign under modern signage technology actually throws off less light than an externally-lit sign, but they will go with the Code requirements for an externally-lit sign if the Board requires that.

Ms. Christine Sbarro, Senior Property Manager at Lower Makefield Corporate Center, South Campus, was sworn in. Ms. Sbarro stated she has been a property manager for over twenty years and reviewed her education. She stated she has been at this site for nine years. It was noted her resume was included in the packet provided. Ms. Sbarro stated the South Campus currently has two small entrance signs which are set back from the Township Line Road, and they are rather low to the ground. She stated each of the four buildings have monument signs which state which tenants are located in each building. Mr. McClure asked if the external signs along Township Line Road have any tenant identification signage, and Ms. Sbarro stated they do not. Mr. McClure asked Ms. Sbarro if there is a need for based on her experience at the Lower Makefield Corporate Center, and Ms. Sbarro stated there is. Mr. McClure asked Ms. Sbarro if she has received complaints from

tenants or visitors to the Corporate Center, and Ms. Sbarro stated she receives complaints from both on the regular basis mostly from people who are lost looking for an office building or a particular person located in one of the buildings. She stated they pull into the campus searching for someone and cannot find them so they end up circling the complex and circling Township Line Road. Ms. Sbarro stated there are no names marking who is in the site.

Mr. McClure asked if the existing signage have the identification of the numbers of the buildings since someone may be looking for a specific building number. Ms. Sbarro stated the monuments that are in front of the buildings have numbers as well as the buildings have numbers; but unless you pull into the campus, you do not see them, and you cannot see them until you are right in front of the building.

Mr. McClure asked how the proposed sign will address the complaints she is receiving, and Ms. Sbarro stated she feels it will help direct people to the correct campus if they see the name of the company they are looking for they will know which direction to turn and pull into the right campus.

Mr. McClure asked Ms. Sbarro how does the proposed signage compare to signage on other properties located near the Corporate Center, and Ms. Sbarro stated she feels it is fairly comparable. She stated there is a sign at the campus up the street on Stony Hill Road, and there is a monument on the corner of that campus. She stated there is also a monument sign at the building across the street so she feels what they are proposing is comparable to what is in the area already.

Mr. McClure stated Ms. Sbarro has a long history with the property, and he asked her if she believes the signage will increase safety when it comes to people trying to find the property when they are driving along Township Line Road. Ms. Sbarro stated she feels it will definitely help because you will not have people driving in circles either through the campus or out on Township Line Road turning around.

Mr. DosSantos asked how many tenants they have presently, and Ms. Sbarro stated on the south campus they have fifteen. Mr. DosSantos asked if they are proposing that the sign they wish to add in the middle will list all fifteen tenants. Ms. Sbarro stated it would not list all fifteen tenants because it is not large enough. Mr. DosSantos asked how it would address their concerns if someone is looking for a business that is not listed on the sign. Ms. Sbarro stated the tenants that would be listed would be the larger tenants and those are primarily the ones who get the majority of visitors. Mr. DosSantos asked if there are monument signs in front of each building, and Ms. Sbarro stated there are. He asked if those monument signs have the list of tenants with the suite number, and Ms. Sbarro stated they do.

Mr. DosSantos stated her indication is that is not enough. He asked if you go in one entrance do you drive by all three buildings, and Ms. Sbarro stated you could. She stated most people drive into the first parking lot; and if they do not see what they are looking for, they turn around and exit back out and go to the next ingress. She stated there are no suite signs on the monument signs – just tenant names. Mr. DosSantos asked if the proposal is to put on suite numbers, and Ms. Sbarro there would just be names of the larger companies that are located inside the building. Mr. DosSantos asked if it will direct a passerby as to what building to go to, and Ms. Sbarro stated it will. Mr. DosSantos asked if it will indicated as to what ingress or egress to use; and Ms. Sbarro stated it will not, and they could use either one as long as they know that is the campus they are looking for.

Mr. Zamparelli stated the rendering shows that there is sign on the right entrance and a sign on the left entrance, and it lists all of the tenants; however Ms. Sbarro stated it does not list any tenants and it just says “Lower Makefield Corporate Center South Campus.” Mr. Zamparelli stated that they have to go in and look at each building as they ride through. Mr. Zamparelli asked how the proposed sign up front will make it different other than saying 770 Lower Makefield Campus; and Ms. Sbarro stated it will list the names of the larger tenants that are in the building. She stated if you are looking for a particular tenant, you will know that this is the right location. Ms. Sbarro stated the small signs that are there now do not have any tenant names, and they sit very low so that you do not really see them until you actually pull in.

Mr. DosSantos asked if the problem could be addressed by modifying the two signs that are there now by adding the tenant information on them and making them larger if it fits in with the Zoning Code. Ms. Sbarro stated they are very small right now. Mr. DosSantos asked if the signs could be modified within the existing Zoning Code to address the concern. Ms. Sbarro stated the issue with that would be sight lines; and if they put in a larger sign at the entrance, you would not be able to see to make a right turn out of the campus.

Mr. McClure stated both signs exist currently by Variance for setback, and they would need relief as well to enlarge the signs. Mr. DosSantos stated the sight line is an important issue and is paramount to public safety.

Mr. Gruen stated he feels they are only addressing the large tenants, and they are not the only ones who get lost. He stated people looking for the small tenants would get lost. Mr. Gruen asked to be shown on the rendering where they have concerns. Mr. McClure noted Tab 7 of Exhibit A-6. Ms. Sbarro showed on the Exhibit where the two existing signs are located. Mr. Gruen asked if they have considered putting a directory sign inside the campus so they can direct their visitors to the various tenants. He stated he feels if they

will still not be able to read the new sign if they cannot figure it out from the two they currently have at the entrances. Mr. McClure stated their sign consultant will be testifying, and he would be better able to answer this.

Mr. McClure stated Ms. Sbarro is present as a fact witness as to what the complaints are, and the sign consultant will discuss how to solve the problem and why he believes it will work.

Mr. Gruen asked Ms. Sbarro if most of the complaints are about the large tenants; and Ms. Sbarro stated she gets complaints from a lot of people, and it is not just the large tenants for which she gets complaints, however, because they are the bigger tenants with 15,000 to 20,000 square feet or more, they have more visitors so that is mostly who her complaints come from.

Mr. Gruen asked where the third sign is proposed to go, and Ms. Sbarro showed it on the Plan which is right in the middle.

Mr. Lewis asked what percentage of the square footage is full now in Lower Makefield Corporate Center, and Ms. Sbarro stated at the south campus it is about 70% occupied which is much better than it was.

Mr. Lewis stated what percentage of the total square footage would the fifteen tenants who would be displayed, and Ms. Sbarro stated they would be the vast majority of it. She stated they would put the larger tenants on the sign. Mr. Lewis stated there was a crepe place there that is no longer there, and it was very difficult to find. Mr. Lewis asked if the proposed sign would have helped that situation, and Ms. Sbarro stated it would. Ms. Sbarro stated there is another operator in that location now that serves breakfast and lunch, and there is also a gym operator in there; and both of those two tenants have expressed interest in being on the sign. Mr. Lewis asked the size of the gym operator, and Ms. Sbarro stated he has roughly 2,000 square feet. Mr. Lewis asked Ms. Sbarro if their intent would be to help out some of the smaller tenants particularly if they provide a service that non-tenants would also use. He stated the crepe place was known for the quality of their food, and it had attracted people who were not using any of the other businesses in the campus. Ms. Sbarro stated they would want to help the amenities. Mr. Lewis asked if they would be featured on the sign, and Ms. Sbarro stated that is something they are definitely looking into. She stated the food service is for those in the campus as well as people driving by. She stated the gym and the café are open for both.

Ms. Kirk stated the Township is participating but not taking a position.

Ms. Kirk asked Ms. Sbarro the size of the existing low monument signs at each of the entrances and exits. Ms. Sbarro stated while she does not know, she knows that they are low set and very hard to see from the road. Mr. McClure stated the sign consultant will have those facts.

Ms. Kirk asked as part of the request to install the third free-standing monument sign, has there been any consideration to removing the two existing low monument free-standing signs so that there would only be one free-standing sign along the roadway. Mr. McClure stated the reason for their request is related to the amount of lineal feet they have along Township Line Road. He stated it is 1,500 feet which is a quarter mile. He stated if this parcel were subdivided into three different parcels, they could have three separate signs. He stated they feel this is a hardship. He stated they could remove the two signs, but it might cause another problem; and they want to make sure that when people turn into the road that they clearly know that they are turning into the Corporate Center. He stated at the same time when they are driving down Township Line Road, they want there is be better identification as to who the tenants are and also what buildings are located there. He stated they feel that having the three signs will work, and they do not feel that anything they are proposing is injurious to the public health, safety, and welfare or that the ultimate number of signs and amount of square footage does not really conflict with the purpose of the Ordinance since if the property were three properties, they could have three signs with greater square footage.

Mr. Zamparelli asked the address of the center, and Ms. Sbarro stated each of the buildings has their own address. She stated the first building on the far right is 770 Township Line Road, the building next to it is 780 Township Line Road, 790 Township Line Road, and 800 Township Line Road. Mr. Zamparelli stated they do not want the sign just to say that, and Ms. Sbarro stated they do not because it would be hard to identify all four buildings by number. Mr. Zamparelli stated once they get in, you could see each building would have its own building number. Mr. Zamparelli stated while he is not really opposed to the sign, he does not feel it is going to remedy the situation. He stated if the sign had the four numbers out front, and each building had its own number, then each building should have its own individual sign showing the tenants in that building; and that is what he would look for if he were going there. Ms. Sbarro stated it would be hard to read all four signs as you are driving; however, Mr. Zamparelli stated you would stop and look at it.

Mr. Keith Davis, Urban Sign Company, was sworn in. He stated he is a technical design consultant who has worked in the sign industry for seventeen years. He has testified before Zoning Hearing Boards and was qualified as an expert in the past. His resume was included in Exhibit A-6.

Mr. McClure asked Mr. Davis to explain his role with respect to the proposed signage. He stated he was both the designer and consultant relative to the challenges that were being faced at the Lower Makefield Corporate Center, and he came up with the design of the proposed sign. He stated he analyzed the approach distances traveling back and forth, north and south, on Township Line Road; and he found that the current entrance ids did not provide enough visibility to easily identify the buildings numbers and site name. He stated one of the issues talking with the client as to their challenges, was that people who were having trouble navigating to the site. He stated the primary way they were navigating to the site was by GPS knowing the address of the building itself. He stated they wanted to function on was the actual address that people would be keying into. He stated a secondary piece of information was Lower Makefield which reinforces the identification and the address together positioning it within the cone of vision of vehicular traffic that would catch someone at an adequate amount of distance to be able to actually identify, react, and enter at either one of the entrances based on the direction that they were traveling. He stated the tertiary piece of information relative to the design was the identification of the tenants. He stated one of the questions was why there were only fifteen tenants being identified is because the human brain can only process so much information in such a short amount of time; and on an average, a person who is traveling 35 miles per hour can only actually process one character or one letter per .1 second. He stated if you start to add that up and think of the number of seconds that someone has to process information there is a limited amount of space. He stated the primary piece they wanted to focus on were the numbers to make sure that they were easily identifiable at a vehicular rate of travel for somebody who is traveling along Township Line Road. He stated the secondary piece was the Corporate Center name, and the tertiary piece is the tenants themselves. He stated adding the tenants was to support one of the issues which was the tenants wanted to be identified in the frontage, and there is not current identification for tenant signage. He stated they needed to draw a line somewhere as far as numbers so they decided to focus on the anchor tenants; and if they were to put all the tenants on the board, people would not be able to comprehend and read them.

Mr. Zamparelli noted the Exhibit on Tab 10, and he asked if that will be typical of the sign proposed; and Mr. Davis agreed.

Mr. DosSantos stated Mr. David mentioned the term “anchor tenants,” and he asked if they are mainly tenants that are going to have traffic coming through in by way of a customer or a client as opposed to employees; and Mr. Davis stated he does not know the answer as to the day to day working with the individual clients, and those noted are the ones that were identified as being the ones that needed to be featured on the sign. He stated the function of the signage is usually about the visitor and not the employees. Mr. McClure stated he just discussed this with Ms. Sbarro who

indicated that it has not yet been completely decided although larger tenants typically have a sign present; however, there may be someone like the crepe restaurant that would have more customers which would make sense for them to negotiate in the Lease or to arrange that they have their name on the signage. He stated he feels it will be a case-by-case call based upon the tenant mix and what works back.

Mr. Gruen stated Ms. Sbarro indicated that they could not find the tenants from the road, and they will not be on the sign anyway. Mr. Gruen stated Mr. Davis is saying that they cannot identify the Corporate Park, and he asked why they therefore need a third sign. He stated he feels they should make one sign that identified the Corporate Park well that you can see at both entrances, and put a directory inside that can direct people to the various tenants.

Mr. Davis stated the primary issue with the two existing entrance signs is that there about a 38' plus setback from the right-of-way, and they are also only about 4' tall and on approach you cannot really see them. Mr. Gruen stated maybe they should request a Variance to move the signs closer or make them a little larger instead of adding a third small sign that nobody will see. Mr. DosSantos stated they did bring up the issue about the sight lines. Mr. Davis stated they wanted to have the proposed sign within a reasonable cone of vision of vehicular traffic so that someone traveling along Township Line Road either north or south would be within the 10 to 15 degree of that cone of vision. He stated that is the intent of the proposed sign. He stated the current signs are not adequate to be able to communicate that information. Mr. Gruen asked if they could change those signs, and Mr. Davis stated they would have to be considerably bigger based on their setback to be able to meet the same requirements.

Mr. Zamparelli stated he feels they should leave the other signs alone. He stated he is not in favor of the type of illuminated sign they are requesting. He stated he understands that the Code permits them to put up an externally-illuminated sign, and Mr. Davis stated they have a second option that they would install the sign as permitted in the Code. Mr. Zamparelli stated he would be in favor of the sign they have proposed that is externally-illuminated.

Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Davis to discuss the differences between the internally-lit LED sign they are proposing compared to the externally-lit sign. Mr. Davis stated they are proposing a halo lit sign, and the copy and content would actually produce a lower lumen output than what you would have with an externally-illuminated sign that would wash the entire sign face. He stated he could provide calculations.

Mr. DosSantos stated he has a concern with regard to the external illumination because of the impact upon road traffic as those lights are easily moved, and there could be light in someone's eyes. Mr. Zamparelli stated given that information, he would not have a problem with the internally-lit sign. Mr. Gruen asked if the internal illumination would be something that could be changed like a "read board" with messages; and Mr. Davis stated it would not be changeable, and it would be a static message. He stated it these are routed push-through letters, and they will have an opaque film on the face of the letters, and the light would come out as a halo lit of all the copy and the contact so that is not face lighting on the sign itself even though it is an internal illumination; and it does maintain a lesser base lighting output. He stated it is like a back-lighting of the letters.

Mr. Gruen stated he still needs to be convinced that the proposed sign is going to do the job and asked what this third sign will do differently from the other two signs since they still do not list the tenants, and they will still go in and be lost circulating around looking around for where they are going.

Mr. Davis stated one of the questions he asked was how do people who are visiting the site most often find where it is. He stated usually you look up the location, you would then know the address, and you would then either print out directions or key it into a GPS. He stated the GPS would navigate you to the building itself, and you are always going to be governed by the building number and whether the address is really the street address of the location which is the primary piece of information that people are keying into who are navigating to the site. Mr. Davis stated his goal was making one of the largest pieces of the sign being the identification of the numbers of the building. He stated when he visited the site for the first time, he looked for the building but went right past the first entrance and then was able to see it from the periphery and make out a number; and he then pulled into the second entrance. He stated this is exactly what others were experiencing and complaining about. He stated one of the challenges he looked at was how to remedy that particular situation, and the way to do so was to catch someone who is on a vehicular path of travel and having a sign that is within a 10 to 15 degree cone of vision. He stated if you look at most regulations, that is the area that people can perceive and react to. He stated he looked at that location and the size of numbers that someone could see on approach and make a safe decision to turn into the entrance and know where they are.

Mr. Zamparelli stated he knows this property, and he is an inspector who uses his GPS all day. He stated he is always looking for a sign since the GPS is not always accurate, and he feels what is proposed is a great idea. He stated he agrees that this location needs something.

Mr. Gruen stated he agrees that what they are proposing would work, but he questions why they would need the other two signs. Mr. DosSantos stated they are ingress/egress signs. Mr. Davis stated those are reinforcement of the identification. He stated this new sign would be the primary identification for the site which is then supported at the two different entrances.

Mr. McClure asked Mr. Davis if you would know that you are pulling into the right driveway for the property without the existing signs, and Mr. Davis stated that would be in question.

Mr. DosSantos stated he relies on GPS and would be looking for 770 to 800 to make sure he was going the right way. Mr. Davis stated he was looking for the best way to get people to these buildings.

Ms. Kirk asked what are the dimensions of the proposed sign, and Mr. Davis stated it is an 84 square foot sign. Mr. McClure stated Mr. Davis is referring to Exhibit A-6, Tabs 8 and 9 which are the renderings and dimensions of the sign. Ms. Kirk asked if the top portion of the sign would be the identification for the complex; and Mr. Davis stated it would be the identification of the complex, and the largest design element would be the numbers themselves which are the two primary and secondary pieces of information that they wanted to reinforce with the sign.

Ms. Kirk stated the Plan of the proposed sign shows listing for eight tenants, and she asked if that is the maximum number proposed to be listed; and Mr. Davis stated what they talked about the major tenants that were being identified and allowing a little bit of expansion for additional tenants that were on site which are still the subject to a decision. He stated he personally would not recommend more on a sign as you cannot process that much information.

Mr. Flager asked if anyone in the audience had any questions, and there was no one present wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Gruen stated they are also requesting an interpretation. Mr. DosSantos stated it is an interpretation of 285 C 3A whether or not it is an aggregate of 150' or 150' per sign, and Mr. DosSantos stated he feels it is referring to the aggregate.

Mr. Gruen asked Ms. Kirk's opinion on this, and Ms. Kirk stated the interpretation has been an aggregate of all the signs. Mr. McClure stated the reason they raised it is because you are only allowed to have one sign per property. Mr. Flager stated he feels the interpretation is clear.

Mr. Gruen asked what was the relief they received in the prior Zoning Variance, and Mr. McClure stated it was for setback. Ms. Kirk stated she also feels it was for the number of signs.

Mr. McClure asked Mr. Davis why the sign has to be close to the road and cannot be set back 100', and he asked if there are any physical barriers. Mr. Davis stated there is a basin, and the setback would replace the sign in the middle of the water. Mr. Davis stated there is also a grading change once it reaches the tree line. Mr. McClure asked Mr. Davis if he believes that the relief being requested is the minimum required to effectively alleviate the hardship, and Mr. Davis agreed. Mr. DosSantos asked for more information about the grade change, and Mr. Davis stated there is a significant grade change as it grades down into the basin once it passes the tree line.

Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Majewski if he has checked the location of the sign, and Mr. Majewski stated he is familiar with the area of Township Line Road. Mr. Gruen asked if it will effect the line of sight for traffic in any way, and Mr. Majewski stated it will not.

Mr. McClure stated as an Offer of Proof, Mr. Genovesi is a professional engineer who would provide Testimony that he has inspected the site, and that the proposed sign has to be located where it is proposed due to physical features along Township Line Road when it comes to the setback; and that in his opinion as a professional engineer is that the siting of that sign at that location would not be injurious to the public health, safety, and welfare when it comes to sight lines, traffic conditions, and the like.

Mr. Gruen stated he feels Mr. Genovesi should provide that Testimony. Mr. McClure stated he would ask Mr. Genovesi to adopt what he just said as true and correct.

Mr. John V. Genovesi, Licensed professional engineer in Pennsylvania, was sworn in. It was noted his resume was in Exhibit A-6, Tab 11. Mr. Genovesi was offered as an expert in engineering and land surveying, and Mr. Gruen agreed to accept. Mr. McClure stated Mr. Genovesi heard his Offer of Proof at the request of the solicitor, and he was asked to confirm if that was accurate; and Mr. Genovesi agreed and adopted it as his own.

Testimony was closed.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant the relief as requested. It is agreed that it is an aggregate amount for the signs and that relief is approved as well as for the back-lit illumination.

Ms. Kirk left the meeting at this time.

APPEAL #17-1786 – JOHN & KATHLEEN VALLIER, JR.

Mr. John Vallier, Jr. and Ms. Kathleen Vallier were sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The impervious surface break down was marked as Exhibit A-3. The blueprints for the addition were marked as Exhibit A-4. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Vallier stated they moved to the home in January to be close to family. He stated they are interested in upgrading the home so that it is up to Code and has proper electricity, insulation, heating, etc. and to increase the area of the room size in the 1951 home. He stated the intent is to add a master bedroom, master bath and closet, and an office area. He stated they also want to put on a garage as the garage that was there is now being used as a family room. He stated in the 1970s the garage was converted to a family room. Mr. Vallier stated they found that they had to deal with impervious surface, and they are asking for an increase in the impervious surface from 18% to 27% which would include the driveway so that they can improve and enjoy the property.

Mr. Zamparelli asked their plan to mitigate the impervious surface. Mr. Majewski stated the maximum permitted for this area as it is in all the older neighborhoods is 18%. He stated they are proposing stormwater management to mitigate the run off created by the additions. Mr. Zamparelli asked what kind of stormwater management they are going to use; and Mr. Majewski stated he does not believe they have determined that yet, and they were looking at the possibility of French drains and/or dry wells in order to mitigate.

Mr. Gruen asked to what percentage they would bring it down, and Mr. Majewski stated currently they are at 18.9% which has been there for fifty to sixty years or more. Mr. Gruen stated they should maintain it to the 18.9% level or 19%, and Mr. Majewski stated it would be an effective impervious surface area of 19%. Mr. Gruen stated they do not have a plan on how they are going to do it.

Mr. Vallier stated they are looking into French drains around the house and behind the garage to go out into the back yard where they will have an area that will take the water in and let it drain out naturally, slowly. He stated the driveway has a little bit of a slant to the left so they are going to make sure that the water that goes off to that part of the yard. He stated they are also going to put in sod around the house so grass will take care of some of the water. He stated the French drains will have a pipe that will help the water move through and it will not just be the stones, but the pipe as well. He stated if they wanted to get the percentage down more, they could take out the pavement and put in a crushed stone. Mr. Gruen stated he did not feel they should have to do this although they could do a pervious driveway if it is necessary. He stated he does not feel they allow gravel driveways; and Mr. Majewski stated you are allowed to have a gravel driveway, but it does count as impervious surface. Mr. Majewski stated what they are proposing is from a stormwater management perspective they would be containing the water for the extra 1,000 square feet in some fashion either through a combination of the dry wells, a seepage pit, etc. so effectively it would be 18.9% from a stormwater management perspective although their number will be what was requested.

Mr. DosSantos stated the Township engineer will give the Applicant certain dimensions so that the effective impervious will come down. Mr. DosSantos asked if they have a builder they have discussed this with, and Ms. Vallier stated their general contractor is present this evening.

Pictures of the property were presented this evening but were not marked as Exhibits.

Mr. Vallier stated they are at the low end of the street, and the water comes down to their yard anyway; and it will drain off into the street.

Mr. Lewis stated the things that would generate an immediate effective rate or even real 18.9% would be if the driveway were to become pervious. He stated Makefield Elementary School has pervious paving in its parking lot, and the water seeps right in. He stated that would effectively solve the problem, but he does not know how much that would cost versus the French drain option. Mr. Gruen stated there is maintenance involved with the pervious paving. He stated as long as they bring it down to the 18.9% or 19% approved by the Township engineer it would be the Applicant's prerogative. Mr. Gruen stated he personally would not put in rain barrels as a remedy. Mr. Gruen stated what Mr. Vallier has described would be acceptable.

There was no one present to speak on this matter. Testimony was closed.

September 5, 2017

Zoning Hearing Board – page 14 of 14

Mr. Zamparelli moved, Mr. DosSantos seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant the Variance to 27% impervious surface with an effective impervious surface of 18.9% from a stormwater management perspective to be approved by the Township engineer.

Due to lack of an Agenda, Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried to cancel the meeting scheduled for September 19, 2017.

There being no further business, Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Keith DosSantos, Secretary