

PLANNING BOARD
BOROUGH OF BERNARDSVILLE
Minutes – September 29, 2022
VIRTUAL ONLINE MEETING

1. **O.P.M.A. Statement:** A statement of adequate meeting notice and adherence to the state mandated emergency remote meetings protocols, as set forth on this meeting's web-posted agenda, was read by Chair Robert Graham at 7:31 pm.
2. **Roll Call:**
Present – Members Gardner, Graham, Horowitz, Kellogg, Macmillan, McQueen, and Thompson.
Absent – Ms. Paluck and Mr. Simoff.
Board Professionals Present: Attorney Alex Fisher (for Mr. Warner), Planner John Szabo, Jr. and Engineer Robert Brightly.
3. **Minutes:** Review of 9/15/22 draft Meeting Minutes: Upon review, a motion to approve the minutes as presented was made by Ms. Kellogg and seconded by Ms. Thompson.
Voice vote:
All eligible members voted in the affirmative. Mr. Macmillan abstained.
4. **Communications:** Hard copies of The New Jersey Planner, July/August 2022, VOL.83, No.4. were made available to the Board and digital copies were distributed with the agenda.
5. **Business of Visitors unrelated to the agenda:** None.
6. **Old Business:**
 - A. Memorialize Resolution #SP-239 Team Welsh, LLC.; PRELIMINARY & FINAL SITE PLAN w/ Variances, 13 Old Quarry Road, B:100, L:2.29 Zone: I, *Approved 7/28/22.*
[Eligible to vote: Members Gardner, Graham, Horowitz, Kellogg, Macmillan, Simoff and Thompson]

As approval conditions 6), 7) and 10) all had to do with a stormwater management contribution in lieu of strict ordinance compliance, it was determined that they should be combined and rewritten as a single condition. The Board agreed it should reconsider the amended resolution at its 10/13 meeting instead of adopting it at this meeting.
 - B. Memorialize Resolution #SP-242 Mine Brook Rd. Urban Renewal Assoc., L.P.; PRELIMINARY MULTIFAMILY (AFFORDABLE) RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN; Mine Brook Road, B:80, L:15.38, Zone: AH-3; *Heard and approved 8/11/22.*
[Eligible to vote: Members Gardner, Graham, Horowitz, Kellogg, Macmillan, McQueen and Simoff]

Upon review, the Board and its professionals determined the need for the following amendments:

- Pg. 3, Par. #9 – change "person" to "purpose".
- Pg. 9, Cond. 2 – No text; add word "omitted".
- Pg. 9, Cond. 5 – change "requires" to "requiring".
- Pg.10, Cond. 9 – No text; add words "intentionally omitted".

Pg. 10, Cond.7 – strike the term, "in good faith" in this and all conditions where it occurs.
Pg. 10, Cond.#13 – the items with which the applicant did not agree to comply need to be specified.

Pg. 12, Cond. 32 – it was agreed that the matter of relocating/maintaining access to the Round Top/Laurelwood trail needs further discussion at the Council level. Mr. McQueen asked Mr. Mottola to request that the Borough Clerk have the issue placed on an upcoming Council agenda.
Pg. 16, Cond. 51 – change "required" to "obtained".

Pg. 16, Cond. 53 – strike this condition as it is not appropriate at the preliminary approval level.
Pg. 6, Par. #20 – make providing a garage access opening height that is sufficient for trash vehicles and fire truck circulation a condition of approval.

The Board agreed that the resolution should be amended per above and returned for review at the 10/13/22 meeting.

7. New Business:

A. 40A Master plan consistency review of introduced Ordinance #2022-1933 re: Amendment to Quimby Lane Redevelopment Plan; Introduced 9/12/22; Public hearing by Council scheduled for 10/11/22; Planning Board review scheduled for 9/29/22.

Mr. Szabo opined that the proposed changes to the Quimby Redevelopment Plan (RDP) remain consistent with the master plan. The master plan consistencies that were previously identified for the original RDP have not changed. The proposed amendments to the RDP consist of changes to some minor bulk standards within Subarea Six and do not alter the boundaries of the Subarea. These are proposed primarily to accommodate the Equinet development on the lot at the corner of Claremont Rd. and Mill St. but would also equally apply to all of the lots within Subarea Six. Responding to Board questions, Mr. Szabo clarified that the proposed sidewalk width along Claremont Rd. is 6', two feet wider than its current 4' width, and that there is no change to the 0' setback requirement from Claremont Rd. and Mill St. He acknowledged that in the chart at the top of page 4 of the amendment document, the left column middle entry should read "Maximum Impervious Coverage". Due to NJDEP regulations that restrict developments within flood plains, he believes a park area will likely develop on its own and the proposed amendments do not preclude that from happening. The proposed 50% allowable impervious coverage is a very modest standard.

Ms. Thompson felt that the Equinet lot should become part of a larger park within the Subarea. Other members opined that a river walk could still be developed on part of the property along the bank of the stream. Mr. Horowitz and Ms. Kellogg found the information provided to be insufficient in how the proposed amendments to allowable coverage, setbacks and building height will impact the entirety of Subarea Six. Mr. McQueen said that the Council had not seen or thoroughly discussed the scope of amendment parameters set forth in Mr. Szabo's memo and that he did not believe there was such urgency that the ordinance needed to be adopted at the next Council meeting. Chair Graham pointed out that the draft findings resolution, #2022-17, that was provided for the Board's consideration, does not refer to the entirety of Subarea Six but only the Block 71, Lot 6 corner property and at the very least that would need to be revised. The Board thought that the proposed changes need be provided in a more concise, tabular format and wished to see how the proposed bulk standards for Subarea Six compare with the bulk standards for the other Subareas in the RDP. Ms. Kellogg also thought that the fire chief should be asked to comment on the seven foot side yards and allowable roof height. Even though its statutory 35

day time limit will have expired, upon voice vote, the Board decided not to act on the matter as it felt it did not have sufficient information to render a consistency finding. It wished to recommend that the Council further study the proposed RDP amendment before adopting it and asked that its recommendation be forwarded to the Council. Mr. McQueen asked Mr. Mottola to contact the Clerk and ask him not to place the ordinance on the Council agenda before speaking with him.

B. Application #SP-241 – Essex Building, LLC Preliminary & Final Site Plan w/ Variances; Corner Essex Ave. & Claremont Rd., B:75 L: 5 & 6, B: 76 L: 4 & 5, Zone: D-C; Received 6/20/22; Deemed complete 9/26/22; Scheduled to be heard 9/29/22.

Chair Graham opened the hearing at 8:56 pm. Mr. Fisher stated that he had reviewed the applicant's required notices and found them to be both good in content and timely in nature for the Board to have jurisdiction in this matter. Board member Horowitz stated that he is recusing himself from hearing and participating in the application.

Appearing on behalf of the application were attorney Frederick Zelley (filling in for Vincent Bisogno, Esq.), applicant Samuel Masucci and engineer Mark Gimigliano.

Exhibits Introduced:

- A1** – 9/29/22 "Existing Conditions Aerial Exhibit" by *Dykstra Walker Design Group, PA.*
- A2** – 9/29/22 "Proposed Conditions Aerial Exhibit" by *Dykstra Walker Design Group, PA.*
- A3** – 9/29/22 "Parking Exhibit" by *Dykstra Walker Design Group, PA.*
- A4** – 9/29/22 "Site Plan Aerial Exhibit" by *Dykstra Walker Design Group, PA.*

Mr. Zelley introduced the application, which seeks preliminary and final major site plan approval to construct a three story, 28 unit residential apartment building. The application involves three properties: the proposed building site at 24-26 Claremont Rd., B:75, L:6; the Essex Building's existing parking lot at B:76 L:4&5 and, 9 Woodland Rd., B:77, L:5 which is owned by Wachovia/Wells Fargo Bank, where the applicant leases 20 parking spaces. The proposed development will have two residential levels above two parking levels, one of which will be subsurface and not count as a story. The proposed use is permitted in the D-C Downtown Core zone district in which it is located. The residential apartments will be comprised of sixteen (16) 1-bedroom units, eleven (11) 2-bedroom units and one (1) 3-bedroom unit; 15% (5) of which will be set aside for moderate and low income families. The two level parking garage will service both the new residences and the Essex Building offices across Essex Ave. in place of the surface parking lot it will displace. A total of 94 parking spaces will be provided in the garage, with EV spaces as required by state law. Additionally, twenty-five (25) parking spaces will be provided on B:76 L:4 and twenty (20) leased parking spaces are available on B:77, L:5, the bank parking lot. No changes to the Essex Building are proposed and it will continue to have sixty-three (63) parking spaces available for its use as allowed by a 1979 variance. The applicant is currently providing 102 parking spaces for the Essex building: fifty-seven (57) on the subject lot, twenty-five (25) on lot 4 and twenty (20) on the bank lot.

Variances being sought are: 1) to have a ground level story height of 9.5' for the non-residential parking garage use where a minimum of 15' is required, 2) to have a ground floor elevation of less than one inch above the sidewalk, measured at the doorway, where a minimum of four inches is required (to provide for handicap accessibility from the sidewalk elevation); 3) a parking

variance, should the Board determine that one is required, for the relief that was granted in 1979. A design waiver is required for no off-street loading space where an on-site loading space is required. Delivery and moving trucks will park in the lot 4 parking lot, and goods will be moved over into the Essex Ave. entrance. Mr. Zellely noted that no variance is required for front yard setback due to the commercial parking element of this building that's considered a mixed-use building rather than solely residential. The applicant is also seeking modification of three conditions from the 1979 approval resolution: condition #3, which prohibited the construction of any structure on any lot without further approval of the board; condition #4, which prohibits use of the parking lot by anyone other than tenants and patrons of the Essex Building; and condition #5 which prohibits transfer of title to any of the lots without the transfer of the remaining lots, as the applicant may want to have the new building under different ownership. A post-easement (to be recorded upon approval) was submitted. It will cover the shared parking on the cited lots and allow for the Essex Building and apartment tenants to park in designated spaces in the underground parking lot. It will also provide for maintenance and for the use of the loading area on lot 4 for deliveries and tenant move ins/outs.

Prior to their testimony, Mr. Fisher swore the applicant's witnesses and the Board's professionals.

Mr. Masucci stated that the applicant, Essex Building, LLC, consists solely of him and Mr. Joseph Rossi, Jr. They have jointly owned the Essex Building and three of lots associated with this application since 1987. They do not own the lot at 9 Woodland Rd. but have leased 20 parking spaces on it since 1987 in the event they would need extra spaces for the office building, which he said they never have. Mr. Masucci said he has been a property developer for over 50 years and went on to detail number of multifamily properties he has developed of a similar nature over the years. He described how each of the three lots associated with this application are currently developed. Block 76, lot 5 is almost fully occupied by the Essex Building. Adjacent lot 4 is comprised of a 25-space surface parking lot that provides for Essex Building visitor and reserved tenants spaces. The subject property, block 75, lot 6, is also developed with a surface parking lot that presently has fifty-seven (57) spaces. Vehicular access to the twenty (20) leased spaces on the bank lot is from Woodland Rd., with pedestrian access to and from the Essex Building via an easement they have from Pfadenhauer Lane. In their entire ownership of the property, they have never experienced a parking problem. At times the reserved parking spaces on lot 4 are all filled, but not so the visitor parking spaces. The spaces on lot 6 are never more than two thirds full. Providing a general description of the proposed development, Mr. Masucci explained how due to the surrounding topography, the lower level parking access would be from Claremont Rd. and the upper parking level access from Essex Ave. The upper parking level will have its access point at approximately the same location as currently exists for the surface lot, and will supplant the current lot in providing parking for the Essex Building. They propose to use the Essex Building's loading zone on lot 4 for delivery and moving vehicles servicing the new residences. The loading zone does not interfere with the use of the parking lot. He confirmed Mr. Zellely's earlier description of the number and types of rental apartments proposed. The main entrance lobby for the residences will be on the same (lower) level as the residential parking. Both of which will have controlled access by code or key. The elevator to and from the lower level will be accessible only by residents and will be code controlled. A trash room, accessible to pedestrians and vehicles, will be located on the upper parking level. Trash and recycling chutes to the trash room will be provided on both residential levels of the building. Staff maintenance will monitor and control the trash and coordinate pickup with private contractors. In similar

developments of this size, garbage pickup is required twice a week and recyclables once a month. Garbage and recycling containers will be able to be carried out of the building by the private haulers through a man-door that will be provided.

Mr. Masucci's responses to questions from the Board and its professionals:

(Ms. Kellogg): Trash containers will be kept indoors until the private contractor comes to empty them. Garbage trucks will not idle in front of the building but will park in the loading zone across Essex Ave., with containers being carried across the street to be emptied. *Mr. Zelley interjected that the easement document that was submitted limits use of the loading zone by moving trucks to evenings and weekends.*

(Ms. Gardner): The above mentioned man-door to be used for garbage pickup is not currently shown on the drawings but will be added to revised drawings.

(Mr. Brightly): For this size of development, there will be eight to ten 45 gallon trash containers that will be carried across the street for pickup.

(Mr. Szabo): Occupancy of the Essex Building is at 75%.

(Chair Graham): The Essex building has a four story elevator that travels to the level of the building from which the parking lot is accessed.

Mr. Masucci's responses to questions from members of the public:

(Charles Schwester, 7 Essex Ave.): There will be no dumpsters. 45 gallon garbage pails like most homeowners have will be employed for garbage and recyclables and will never be parked on the street. *Mr. Zelley interjected that traffic signs will be put on the subject properties as directed by the Board. They are not permitted to install traffic signs within the public ROW. If vehicles are parking illegally on the street in front of his property the recourse is to call the police.*

(Kathy Peachey, 70 Chilton St.): He could not say whether a garbage container could "escape" being carried across Essex Ave. on an icy, snowy day and roll down the street. There will be single ownership of the building. There are no plans to sell the building once it has been built. Furniture deliveries will come from the loading area in lot 4 across Essex Ave.

(Susan Horowitz, 11 Laurel Ln.): While they will request that delivery trucks all park in the loading area provided, they ultimately have no control over how Amazon, UPS or FedEx operates. If there is illegal parking of delivery trucks on the street, it is a police matter and it should be reported. They would have no objection to adding signage regarding deliveries. *Mr. Zelley interjected that the residents will be limited to when they can schedule movers and will have to employ companies that will adhere to the allowed delivery/pickup times.*

(Jennifer Gunn, 7 Somerset Ave.) Converting the Essex Building to apartments has never been considered.

Mr. Gimigliano was qualified as an expert in the field of engineering. Using exhibits prepared by his office, he described the properties associated with the application and their current and

proposed conditions. Exhibit A1 highlighted the location of the four associated lots. Three of them are located in the D-C Downtown Core zone, with the parking lot west of the Essex Building located in the R-4 zone. The subject property has residential properties directly to its north and west and commercial uses to the east and south. Most of the subject lot is covered by a paved parking lot that is used for Essex Building parking. Retaining walls up to 15' tall run along the north and west property lines. A concrete vault underneath the parking lot stores water collected from its surface and the Essex Building parking lot across the street and discharges it to the stormwater drainage system in Claremont Rd.

Exhibit A2 was displayed to show the location of the proposed new building and the extent to which it covers almost the entire lot. Mr. Gimigliano restated that the proposed building has four levels but only three stories. It consists of two residential levels over two parking levels. He identified the locations of the parking levels' access points on Claremont Rd. and Essex Ave.

Exhibit A3 was displayed to show the layouts of the two parking garage floors of the building. The lower level will have 48 spaces, all for residents. The upper level will have a total of 46 spaces, 38 for the Essex Building and eight overflow spaces for residents and/or their guests. Electrical vehicle (EV) parking spaces will be provided on both levels in accordance with state regulations. Per the RSIS, 53 residential parking spaces are required and 56 are provided, which include residential guest parking. It is intended that residential guests park on the upper level in the spaces reserved for residents. But residents will be able to allow their guests access to the lower parking level if needed. Use of the elevator by office tenants will not be provided. Of the 63 parking spaces required for the Essex Building, 38 will be provided in the parking garage and 25 will remain in the open Essex Building lot. An additional 20 spaces are leased for use in the Wells Fargo lot, thereby providing a total of 83 available spaces. A rapid rising, key fob operated security gate at the Claremont Rd. garage access point will be placed about 20' in from the sidewalk. Due to the speed of the gate, backups onto Claremont Rd. are not foreseen at that garage entrance. The Essex Ave. garage entrance will not be gated. Although Mr. Brightly suggested in his report that the upper garage level be used for residential parking, the applicant believes their proposed arrangement is preferable and more efficient and provided justifications for same. Instead of having them on the upper level of the garage, the applicant will consider locating the required handicapped accessible parking spaces for the Essex Building in its adjacent open parking lot.

Mr. Gimigliano displayed exhibit A4 to illustrate and explain the new building's positioning on the lot and the proposed landscaping. Also shown was the location of the proposed shared loading zone on lot 4 across the street. He said that move-in and move-out operations will all be scheduled so there will be no conflicts with other deliveries or garbage pickup. Moving trucks will be a maximum of thirty feet in length. Since the apartments will almost entirely be one and two bedroom units, there won't be huge amounts of furniture being moved. The movers won't be allowed to stop traffic and will have to work around it. It is Mr. Gimigliano's recollection that *No Parking* signs already exist on the north side of Essex Ave. Describing the building layout, he noted how its footprint occupies most of the lot and also mirrors the outline of the garage levels. The two residential levels have a smaller footprint than those below. Part of the upper parking level roof, near the north property boundary, will be used as an outdoor amenities space next to a proposed one-story clubhouse amenity. A second outdoor amenities area is proposed for the roof of the clubhouse. The roof of the entire building will have internal roof drains, which will carry stormwater to a new, larger detention basin beneath the building that will replace the existing

basin beneath the existing parking lot. Like the existing basin, the new one will carry stormwater to the existing lines at the intersection of Claremont Rd. and Essex Ave. There will be no increase in stormwater runoff rates and no stormwater will discharge onto neighboring properties. The proposed system will be fully compliant with the Borough's stormwater management ordinance. To enhance screening of the building from neighboring properties, additional plantings, such as giant arborvitaes, will be added to existing vegetation above the retaining walls on the north and west sides of the building. The solid six foot high privacy fence that is proposed along the north and west property lines will provide additional screening for the neighbors. Street trees and foundation plantings are proposed along the east and south sides of the building. The building exterior will have six decorative globe style wall mounted lighting fixtures that are compatible with other exterior lighting in the downtown. The fixtures will be mounted 8' high and positioned to light the walkways around the south and east sides of the building. Light will not spill over onto adjoining properties. There will be some low-level decorative lighting in the rooftop amenity area, which will be set down below the neighboring properties so there won't be any light spillage onto neighboring properties. Gas, electricity, water and sewer utilities will all be brought into mechanical rooms in the garage from existing lines in Claremont Rd. It is intended for any gas and electric and meters to be located on an interior wall of the garage. *Mr. Brightly commented that he believes meters will be required to be located on the exterior of the building. It was his recommendation that they be located on the north side of the building and be screened from view.* Mr. Gimigliano indicated that the applicant would be amenable to doing that and detailing how that would be accomplished on revised plans.

A lengthy discussion ensued among the Board, Mr. Brightly and Mr. Gimigliano regarding the juxtaposition of the new north and west building walls, the existing retaining walls, the proposed fence and the proposed landscape plantings, as well as the gap that will occur between the new building walls and the top of the existing retaining walls, as the retaining walls are angled away from the proposed building. Mr. Gimigliano said they will look at positioning the fence beside or on top of the retaining walls and will ask their structural engineer to evaluate whether the gap can be eliminated by adding fill between the retaining and building walls.

Mr. Gimigliano closed by saying that for the most part the building complies with the bulk requirements of the zone. As a corner lot, it has two front yards and two side yards. Three-foot front yards are provided where a minimum of 2' and maximum of 5' are required. Side yard setbacks are 11' where the minimum is 10'. Impervious coverage of 82% is proposed where 90% is allowed. Building height, measured to the top of the parapet wall, will be 37.8', where 45' is allowed. Measured to the top of the elevator shaft roof, the height will be 39'-3", where 55' is allowed. A design waiver is needed for not having an on-site loading area. A variance is required for having a ground level story height of 9.5' where 15' is required. The elevations of the parking levels were set based on the street elevations at the two access points into the garage. However, the deficient floor to floor height in this case is functional and suitable to the proposed parking garage use. A second variance is required for the proposed ground floor elevation at less than an inch above the sidewalk (for the purpose of wheelchair accessibility), where a minimum of 4" above the adjoining sidewalk is required.

Mr. Gimigliano's responses to questions from the Board and its professionals:

(Ms. Gardner and Chair Graham): The functionality of the exterior walk and stairs at the northeast corner of the building was explained. Residents and their guests will have access to the

elevator from lobbies located on each of the parking levels. The sole elevator will be utilized for moving tenants into and out of the building. Only residents will have access control.

(Mr. Brightly): It is the applicant's preference that guests park on the upper garage level and that the additional six spaces required for guest parking remain unmarked and flexible for use by either office tenants or residential guests. Even if an additional six spaces must be marked as residential guest spaces, adequate office parking would still be available. The building will be outside of the county required 3' ROW easement. The county is not requiring dedication.

(Mr. McQueen): *Mr. Brightly responded that there are no parking signs on the east side of Claremont Rd. at the top of the striped triangular area across from the proposed building.* Any normal size residential vehicle will be able to enter the parking garage. The architect will have more information on the clearance heights inside the garage.

(Chair Graham): He did not know exactly, but believes there will be a 9.5' floor to floor height between the two parking levels. The architect will be able to provide the clearance heights for both parking levels.

(Mr. Szabo): The loading area on lot 4 will not conflict with the five adjacent parking spaces due to the assigned use of those spaces. Additionally, the loading area will only be used by movers after hours and on weekends.

(Ms. Kellogg) It is possible the county may require the two street trees shown at the south east corner of the building to be removed due to line of sight concerns. Trees shown on both sides of the two vehicular access points would be trimmed higher so as not to obstruct drivers' views in either direction. *Mr. Mottola responded that the Bureau of Fire Prevention was provided an application set but has not provided any comments.*

Mr. McQueen moved and Ms. Gardner seconded to extend the meeting time to 11:30. A voice voted carried the motion with no objections or abstentions.

(Mr. Macmillan): *Mr. Zelley responded that in the future, should there be separate ownership of the subject property and lot 4 across the street, an easement agreement would be put in place to accommodate the shared parking and loading spaces on the separate lots. They would stipulate to same as a condition of approval.*

It was decided to delay addressing Board professionals' review comments until the next meeting in favor of allowing questioning of Mr. Gimigliano by the public.

Mr. Gimigliano's responses to questions from members of the public:

(Jennifer Gunn, 7 Somerset Ave.): Tenants may have to wait to use the elevator if others are using it for moving belongings. People are supposed to use the crosswalk at the corner of Claremont Rd. and Essex Ave. to cross the street. The people that will be crossing the street from office building to parking garage will be the same that do it now between the office building and the open parking lot. The tenants won't need to cross the street to park. Residents' service personnel would be expected to park on the upper level and be admitted by the residents.

(Charles Schwester, 7 Essex Ave.): They would have no objection to moving the proposed perimeter fences up to the retaining wall.

(Jeff Collar, 20 Mt. Airy Rd.): Nothing is presently proposed to be placed on any adjacent neighbor's property.

(Kathy Peachey, 70 Chilton St.): If the Essex Building were to have 100% occupancy, the available parking would be adequate. The architect will provide more detail on the design of the parking garage and clearances therein, as well as buffering of rooftop noise from mechanical equipment. They have not applied for connection to the Borough's sewer system, but understand that plenty of capacity exists. The outdoor amenities are gathering spaces for residents.

(Janeene Chrisbacher, 12 Somerset Ave.): The lower level garage would be below the grade of Claremont Ave. with the new building wall being lower than the existing retaining walls. The retaining walls will not be used to support the building. So as not to undermine the existing retaining walls, they will be supported and protected during construction. New sidewalks will be 8' wide with tree wells located to provide at least 4' of pedestrian clearance around them.

Mr. McQueen moved and Ms. Thompson seconded to extend the meeting time to 11:40. A voice voted carried the motion with no objections or abstentions.

Chair Graham closed the hearing and announced its continuation at the 11/17/22 meeting without further notice to the public.

C. Review of 9/29/22 Bills List w/ Invoices.

Upon review, a motion to pay the listed invoices in the amount of **\$9,140.00** was made by Ms. Gardner and seconded by Ms. Thompson.

Roll call vote:

All members voted in the affirmative.

8. Upcoming Board Reviews/Public Hearings/Pending Applications The Board acknowledged the following matters and their respective status:

A. Review Planner's report re: Council referred request for zone line change at 477-1 Mine Brook Rd.; Review and recommendation to Council Scheduled for 10/27/22.

B. Application #SP-240 – Greyfield Management, LLC – Preliminary & Final Site Plan w/ Variances; 106 Mine Brook Road, B:97, L:3, Zone: D-C; Previously heard 9/15/22; Decision deadline extended to 12/1/22; Scheduled to be continued 11/17/22.

[Eligible to vote: Members Gardner, Graham, Horowitz, Kellogg, Macmillan, McQueen, and Thompson]

Mr. Mottola reminded the Board that it was previously announced that the Equinet application was carried to the November 17th meeting and that the Board will have to act upon it in some manner at that time.

C. Public hearing for Preliminary Investigation of 25 Claremont Rd., B:71 L:3 as Area In Need of Redevelopment per Council resolution #22-154; P.I. by Borough Planner Szabo authorized 6/30/22; Pending PI report by Board Planner – public hearing date T.B.D.

D. Public hearing for master plan adoption of 7/28/22 draft Parks and Recreation Plan; First draft reviewed 5/26/22; Revised Parks and Recreation Plan rec'd 7/28/22; Public hearing date T.B.D.

9. Business of Visitors, second opportunity: None.

10. Executive Session: None.

11. Adjournment: Chair Graham adjourned the meeting at 11:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Frank Mottola', with a large, stylized initial 'F'.

Frank Mottola, Planning & Zoning Boards
Administrative Officer & Recording Secretary

Keywords: Team-Welsh-Mine-Brook-Quimby-1933-Essex-Clairemont-Zelley-Masucci-Gimigliano