

TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK PLANNING BOARD

Following are the minutes of the Saddle Brook Planning Board's Regular Meeting, held on Monday, August 16, 2021 at 7:34 p.m.

1. FLAG SALUTE

2. ROLL CALL: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Browne, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Cook, Mr. Maniscalco, Mayor White and Ms. Barrale - PRESENT Councilman Gierek and Mr. Mazzone - ABSENT

Also present were Mr. Cialone, acting Board attorney, Mr. Briglia, Board engineer and Mr. Paparozzi, Board planner.

3. CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCES – OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

4. PRELIMINARY MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION

**Saddle Brook Urban Renewal Associates, LLC
435 North Midland Avenue, Block 1401, Lot 18**

Kate Coffey, attorney for the applicant came forward.

Ms. Coffey – The applicant is the contract purchaser of the subject property. This Township owned property has been identified for affordable housing in the municipality's settlement agreement. If the Board were to approve preliminary site plan application this evening, the applicant will then seek affordable housing tax credits to fund the projects. If awarded, we would be back before the Board seeking final site plan approval. This vacant property is 2.73 acres. It's accessible via an existing easement on Rosol Lane. The property was rezoned to AH6, Affordable Housing Zone, created by ordinance 1708-21. The applicant is proposing 3 multifamily residential buildings, which will contain a total of 58, 100% affordable multifamily units. Proposed is 11-1 bedroom units, 30-2 bedroom units and 17-3 bedroom units. They are also proposing to install a tot lot. We are seeking relief, including a variance for a freestanding identification sign of 15 square feet, where 10 square feet is permitted. We are also seeking de minimus exceptions from the Residential Site Improvement Standards with respect to site access, pavement thickness, parking stalls and turning areas. We're seeking a waiver from NJSA 40:55d-35, which requires that a building lot abut a street. The property is only accessible via an easement.

Kelly O'Such, engineer for applicant was sworn in.

Mr. Cialone confirmed proper notice was given.

Mr. O'Such – Detailed Site Exhibit, dated 08/06/21 marked Exhibit A-1 shows an aerial view of the site with an overlay of what is proposed. This is a 2.73 acre undeveloped, landlocked lot. There is an existing access easement to the north of the property that connects to Rosol Lane. The site is currently vacant, in disrepair and has wetlands on it. The site was surveyed and we did locate wetlands onsite. There's an existing head wall or stormwater discharge on the northern property line. There's a little section of wetlands associated with that. When they built the Conrail rail line to the west, they blocked the natural drainage path and a wetland developed over time due to poor drainage. The wetlands along the western and northern property boundaries are associated with the lack of drainage structures. Surrounding properties include: to the west – Conrail right-of-way, to the north – industrial properties, to the east – commercial and residential (condo) properties and a cemetery; and to the south – commercial and industrial development. The applicant is proposing 3 apartment buildings. The buildings to the north and

in the center of the site propose 22 units each and the third building 14 units; for a total of 58 units. Amenities proposed include a tot lot between buildings 1 and 2 and a clubhouse in Building 3. Emergency access is being proposed through the Rosol Lane easement, as well as an easement on the property to the south. If an emergency occurred, fire trucks could navigate through the site and drive all the way through from each direction. The site proposes 87 parking stalls, 14 of which will be make ready electrical vehicle charging station stalls, 8 are compact parking stalls and 6 ADA compliant stalls. Zoning requires 1.5 spaces per unit, which would equate to the 87 parking stalls proposed. However, the RSIS has a different generation of parking calculations, which would result in 116 parking stalls required. So we are asking for an RSIS exception to that standard. The applicant will comply with the state's new electric vehicle law. There are 2 trash/recycling bins proposed on the site. The applicant will have private haulers pick up as needed. Enclosures will have a red brick veneer. Two different signs are proposed: one building mounted to Building 3 to announce the clubhouse area, the other a free standing site sign that announces the development. The free standing sign is 15 square feet, where 10 is allowed. We're asking for a variance. Pole mounted and building mounted LED signs are proposed at 20 feet high. All fixtures will be full cutoff fixtures to avoid spillage on adjacent properties. Proposed landscaping includes street trees around the parking lot area, smaller shrubs along the eastern portion of the parking lot to minimize headlight exposure, foundation plantings around each building and possible fence replacement for additional screening. There are some RSIS de minimus exceptions. We are proposing a 22' wide driveway. We believe that complies with the RSIS, which allows for a 20' wide drive. However, it will be noted as an RSIS exception. There's an exception we're asking for 5:21-4.2c that requires a cul-de-sac be provided for a residential development of this size for emergency access vehicles. We cannot fit a cul-de-sac in here, but have 2 points of access for those vehicles. There's an exception to pavement thickness within the RSIS, section 5:21-4.10a and 4.19c. We are proposing the porous pavement because it is permitted by the NJDEP's new Stormwater Rules. There is an exception to N.J.A.C. 5:21-4.1.5 for the use of compact parking stalls. We're proposing those 8 stalls at 8' x 16', where 9' x 18' is required. That does comply with the zoning ordinance, which allows 10%. The other R.S.I.S. exception is 5:21-4.16e2, where a hammerhead or turning bay of 18' x 60' is required for turnaround of emergency vehicles. We cannot provide one, but we have adequate access for them to get into and out of the site. Another one is RSIS 5:21-4.19b5 parking lot access has a minimum center line radius of 15', where 100' is required for a roadway. This isn't technically a roadway; it's a parking lot. The last exception is RSIS 5:21-4.19c, which has to do with the 2 inch pavement thickness that is proposed. RSIS requires 1.5", so we're actually exceeding it. The site drains from a high point along the eastern property boundary to a low spot along the Conrail right-of-way. We're proposing more than an acre of disturbance and more than a ¼ acre of impervious surface on the site. Therefore, we have to follow the NJDEP Stormwater Management. They require green infrastructure devices to be used. The requirement is that you get 80% Total Suspended Solids removal for all dry wetted vehicular surfaces, as well as any other impervious surface that could potentially have dirty runoff. We wanted to take into account all of the excess water runoff from the neighboring properties. We didn't want to oversize our devices onsite to treat all of that existing water. There are a set of existing stormwater pipes that run along the eastern property boundary that collect all the water running down and that bypasses around the site and eventually discharges to that existing head wall along the northern property boundary that currently has that wetland. The remaining portions of the property that are being developed are then treated through the various stormwater management systems. The parking stalls are proposed in different hatching because they are porous asphalt, which collect, let the water dissipate through the surface and get treated through a media beneath the surface and then eventually are held in a stone pit/chamber. Eventually they discharge and everything runs down to the proposed bio retention basin in a low portion of the site, which is a surface basin. That

basin is also designed to do TSS removal, as well as detention to meet the 2, 10 & 100 year storm required attenuation rates of 50%, 75% and 80%. The bio retention basin is also designed to treat the water quality. We meet the state requirements of stormwater management. This site is within a state redevelopment zone and is therefore exempt from recharge requirements. Also, soil testing showed that the soil does not meet the permeability requirements for the state for infiltration to happen, so no recharge is proposed on the site.

Mr. Hickey – There's only one way in and one way out for tenants?

Mr. O'Such – Yes. Fire Truck Turning Movement, dated 08/16/21 was marked Exhibit A-2. This page was updated to address the correct size fire truck: 47'9" long, 8.25' wide, 9.85' overall body length clearance, .91' minimum body to ground clearance, 8.25' track width and the wheel angle is 45 degrees. Two different schematics are shown: a truck coming down Rosol Ln. turning into the private access easement and going all the way through the property out the emergency easement access point to N. Midland Ave. and a truck coming in from Midland Ave. down the emergency access easement through the site and out to Rosol Lane.

Mr. LaGuardia – The access easement is 22' wide?

Mr. O'Such – Yes.

Mr. Hickey – Is that easement roadway in good shape?

Mr. O'Such – It's not in the best shape. There's maintenance that needs to be provided.

Mr. Maniscalco – Did you take the warehouse angled truck parking into account?

Mr. O'Such – I did.

Mr. Maniscalco – Will the permeable paving take the weight of the fire truck?

Mr. O'Such – They are shown only in the parking stalls for that exact reason. They are not designed for heavy turning movements or heavy trucks.

Mr. Maniscalco – Will the electric car charging spots be vacant if someone doesn't have an electric car?

Mr. O'Such – Those spaces can be used for nonelectric vehicles.

Mr. Ambrogio – Does the filter system of the retention basin need to be cleaned?

Mr. O'Such – There is a maintenance manual provided with the design of the stormwater management system that goes into detailed description of how it is maintained. It is required by deed for them to maintain, not only the bio retention system, but also the porous asphalt system to make sure they don't get clogged and start failing. If they do start failing, they have to remedy them to get back to the design.

Mr. Ambrogio – Who's going to be responsible for that?

Mr. O'Such – The developer/owner of the property is responsible.

Ms. Coffey – The applicant intends to include in their manual a step for an annual report by a professional engineer to be submitted to the municipality.

Mr. Ambrogio – Two dumpsters don't seem like enough.

Mr. O'Such – The developer will schedule as many pickups as needed. There's a manager and maintenance person on site to monitor this.

Mr. Ambrogio – There's no buffer along the railroad?

Mr. O'Such – The topography drops off significantly, making it very difficult to plant anything substantive. There's a proposed 4' fence on top of a retaining wall along the edge of the building to prevent people from going down that ravine.

Mr. Briglia – Is there a buffer associated with the wetlands? If so, what is it and are you going to get a transitional waiver and buffering?

Mr. O'Such – In reviewing wetland rules, they appear to qualify as ordinary resource value wetlands, which have basically no buffer. We've applied for the DEP with an LOI. If they disagree with our assessment, then we would work with the DEP.

Mr. Compitello – How is the volume of water calculated for the retention pond?

Mr. O'Such – It's not just the basin, but the overall site that is designed to detain the water to meet the reduction requirements. It's modeled in a stormwater management program that takes

the contour area, so the physical area of the basin times the elevation difference that's in there and it calculates the volumes of water that's being stored. That along with how the outlet control structure functions, determine the rate in which the water will come out of the structure. Volume is determined by how much water you have to let out to meet those reduction requirements.

Mr. Hickey – Do the leaders go directly into a storm drain?

Mr. O'Such – Some of the leaders are designed to go into the porous pavement sections first.

Mr. Briglia – What gets transferred to these pumps that you're proposing?

Mr. O'Such – We haven't fully designed the pumps yet. We plan to work with the Township. We're proposing 2 pump systems that are going to be set to an elevation that is well below the finished floor of the buildings. When rain storms happen, the ultimate discharge of the bio retention basin gets back into the neighboring property. Once it fills to a certain elevation, pumps collect the water, pump it back out to Rosol Lane and then discharge back to Conrail further downstream, where there's proper drainage.

Mr. Maniscalco – Will there be a generator in case of a power outage?

Mr. O'Such – Yes.

Mr. Ambrogio – Are the buildings built on slab or crawl space?

Mr. O'Such – Slab.

Mr. Paparozzi – Municipal Land Use Law says that RSIS supersedes all of the municipalities bulk requirements when doing residential site improvements. The variance I have is 115 parking spaces required, 87 proposed. Parking stalls 8 – 8' x 16' proposed 9' x 18' required. The 2-way traffic should be 24', but you're proposing 22'. There's a variance for the ID sign: 10' required, 15' proposed. If you made those 8 compact spaces 9' x 18', you wouldn't encroach into any setback. You have a 22' aisle width going out to Rosol Lane. A designated area is needed for deliveries to load and unload so trucks don't park in the aisle.

Mr. O'Such – We've prepared an exhibit of potentially additional parking stalls.

Mr. Maniscalco – Was there any thought to building a parking garage?

Ms. Coffey – The reason why we did not is because this project is going to be competing for tax credits in order to finance it. Tax credits are awarded by the NJHMFA to projects that are the most financially feasible to build. A parking garage is a big ticket item.

Mr. O'Such – Additional Parking Stall Exhibit, dated 08/16/21 was marked Exhibit A-3. The most logical location is to the south of the proposed compact spaces, where we could add 3 more stalls and convert 3 of the stalls from compact to traditional. Another location would be a further south location, where we could get 1 more spot. The last 2 potential areas would be to eliminate the landscape islands in front of the buildings to get 2 more stalls. We would lose some street trees and vegetation to do that. We would go from 87 stalls to 93 stalls proposed. The site is designed for the maneuverability of the box trucks.

Mr. Paparozzi – Residents have to cross the parking lot to the dumpsters. Isn't there a better proposal?

Mr. O'Such – We are providing crosswalks at both locations.

Ms. Coffey – We'd be happy to work with the Board to come up with the right location.

Mr. Paparozzi – You have 2 ingress/egress easements. Is there an agreement on maintenance (snow removal, etc.)?

Ms. Coffey – The applicant would take on those responsibilities.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for the engineer. All in Favor – YES

Joe Schilp, 345 Heimstrand Court – Are EV chargers going to be high amperage or are they going to be 120 low amperage? Where are the shut offs going to be?

Mr. O'Such – The logistics of the EV charging stations has not been designed yet.

Mr. Schilp – Will there be solar panels?

Mr. O'Such – We are not proposing any solar panels.

Mr. Schilp – Would you consider reducing the number of apartments?

Ms. Coffey – The municipality committed to this number in their settlement agreement.

Mr. Schilp – How high is the fence around the pit?

Mr. O'Such – A 4 foot fence is proposed.

Ellen Josephson, 471 N. Midland Ave. – Will there be fencing along the eastern side of the property, including behind the cemetery?

Mr. O'Such – We would replace and/or install a fence.

Ms. Josephson – Where are you going to connect the sewer? The current sewer does not support our townhouse association. We're on a mixture of septic and sewer.

Mr. O'Such – We have a Will Serve letter from the sewer department saying they will serve the development. We would tie into the existing sanitary manhole on the edge of the property.

Sandra Laidlaw, 471 N. Midland Ave. – How high will the buildings be? Will the pine trees be removed?

Mr. O'Such – The buildings are 3 stories high. The pine trees on that property will be removed.

There are some shrubs and an additional fence proposed in that area.

Joseph Polizzotti (Fire Chief), 92 Caldwell Ave. – Making the turns are a concern. We would probably look to have a hydrant on the site.

Mr. O'Such – There's an existing hydrant and a proposed hydrant.

Fred Berghahn, 483 N. Midland Ave. – The land has all fill now, making it level, creating a drop.

Mr. O'Such – Not shown on the exhibit is the proposed grading plan. There will be grading in that area.

Mr. Berghahn – You can't push any of your water toward Rosol Lane because it is the low end.

Mr. O'Such – Explained how the pump system will address this.

Inaudible recording

Mr. Schilp – How will a garbage truck to pick up the dumpster from its proposed location?

Mr. O'Such showed the proposed garbage truck movements on the site plan.

Mr. Paparozzi – The portion of the access road from North Midland that is usable is only 9 feet, even though the easement is 30 feet. That needs to be widened. The cemetery fence, which is close to the property line, is 21 feet away from the blacktop.

Mr. O'Such – That's something the applicant would be willing to do.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

Geoffrey Long, applicant's development principle/representative was sworn in.

Mr. Long – After we met with Bob Hicswa, DPW, we walked the length of the area, from the intersection at Rosol to the drainage crossover that goes underneath the tracks north of the site. There are some maintenance issues. We would do a full survey of that area to improve the drainage. A copy of that survey will be provided to the township.

Mary Johannesen, architect was sworn in.

Ms. Johannesen – There are 2 Type A buildings, each with 22 apartments and 1 Type B building with a clubhouse, plus 14 apartments. The clubhouse includes a multipurpose community room, a fitness room, a lobby, the manager's office/leasing office, supportive services offices, maintenance and restrooms. All facilities will be located on the first floor of Building 3, with apartments above. Exhibit A-4 Architectural Sheet A-7 Prospective Building Type A, dated 08/16/21, shows Buildings 1 & 2. They are 3 story buildings that drop down to 2 stories in the center. The building height above grade is 36'6" to the highest point. The materials will be a red brick base around the entire building, with fiber cement siding and horizontal lap siding on the third floor and some areas of the second floor. The trash enclosures will have a brick veneer to match the building. Exhibit A-5 Architectural Sheet A-8 Prospective Building Type B, dated 08/16/21, shows Building 3 and an aluminum letter, backlit (LED) sign to identify the common space. Heating and air conditioning equipment for the apartments will be

maintained within the building. Clubhouse condensing units will be on a pad between Buildings 2 & 3. We can provide landscaping or a fence to screen them. These multifamily buildings and the clubhouse will have a higher grade fire suppression system.

Mr. Paparozzi – Would you consider a trash chute?

Ms. Johannsen – We hadn't considered that because we are tight on square footage.

Mr. Maniscalco – Will there be storage in the attic?

Ms. Johannsen – No. There is truss space with draft stop. Residents will not have access.

Mr. Compitello – Will there be a mailroom or common area for packages?

Ms. Johannsen – The mailboxes are exterior freestanding.

Mr. Maniscalco – Packages get delivered to the door. Could there be a package room?

Ms. Johannsen – Maintenance and management can receive them within the community room.

Mr. Hickey – Are pets allowed? If so, is there a location for them to be walked?

Ms. Johannsen – Small pets are allowed. I'm sure we can find an area for them.

Mr. Maniscalco – What is the location of the sign?

Mr. O'Such – Along the western edge.

Mr. Compitello – What about security?

Ms. Johannsen – There's close circuit TV for the buildings and parking lot.

Mr. Compitello – How do visitors access the apartments?

Ms. Johannsen – Each of the front doors will be secured. The residents will have a key fob. They use a butterfly video camera system to allow residents to know who is at the front door.

Mr. Hickey – Will parking be assigned spots?

Ms. Johannsen – Yes.

Mr. Browne – Do you limit the number of people per apartment?

Ms. Coffey – Yes

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for the architect. All in Favor – YES

Mr. Schilp - Where will the gas and electric meters be?

Ms. Johannsen – On the exterior on the sides of the buildings.

Mr. Schilp – Will disabled people be housed in the first floor units?

Ms. Johannsen – We will have 4 wheelchair accessible units on the first floor.

Mr. Schilp – Will the fire department have access to the truss area?

Ms. Johannsen – There will be hatch access.

Mr. Schilp – How will the fire department get in?

Ms. Johannsen – There will be master keys held by management/maintenance and a knox box at each building entrance.

Mr. Schilp – Will tenants be allowed to install deadbolts?

Ms. Coffey – No. that would be a lease violation.

Mr. Schilp – Will the apartments numbers be shown on a placard on the front of the building?

Ms. Johannsen – We will work with the town to provide numbers on the buildings.

Joe Polizzotti, 92 Caldwell Ave. – Will there be a standpipe?

Ms. Johannsen – I don't believe so. There's a separate fire service to each building and sprinkler room at the end. The buildings are made of protective wood construction.

Mr. Schilp – Is the attic going to be sprinklered?

Jeff Long – Yes. It's a 13 system. 13R is typically what goes into this type of 3 story walkup. Given the concerns that we've heard, we elected to go to 13 which means that all areas have sprinkler heads. It's double the amount of sprinkler heads.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to pause for a break at 9:52 p.m. All in Favor – YES

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to end break at 10:02 p.m. All in Favor – YES

John Harter, traffic engineer was sworn in.

Mr. Harter – We've prepared a Traffic Impact Analysis. The study location is focused on Rosol Lane and North Midland Ave., the main access point. The roadway has about 15,000 vehicles on a daily basis. At that intersection, both Rosol and Hayes are stop streets. We took counts at peak morning (7:00-9:00) and evening (4:00-7:00) traffic on a Tuesday and Saturday midday (11:00-1:00). Peak hours are: weekday morning 8:00-9:00, weekday evening 4:45-5:45 and Saturday 12:15-1:15. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) is a group that publishes academic data and recommends designs for traffic engineer/transportation engineers. Bergen County, NJDOT and traffic engineers utilize it for trip generation and parking generation. There's newer land use in ITE called affordable housing. There's little data on trip generation, but in parking it's very helpful. For the trip generation, the standard midrise category doesn't look at affordables as less intensive than a market rate. For the trip generation, total trips in and out in the morning peak hour is 20; evening 26; Saturday 26. ITE and NJDOT would tell us to do a traffic study at the location. On 100 or more trips, this land use is generating 20-25% of that. In the morning peak hour, we have 15 exiting over an hour. We take that trip generation and estimate the distribution of traffic. We expect 70% to head south; 30% north. We don't expect any east/west traffic. We looked at a future rate because we expect it will take two years to build the site. We expect a 1.5% per year growth. The existing conditions are important build versus no-build. For the future no-build, we'll have 1 morning cue 95th percentile, so that's the worst case estimate; evening there was 2; Saturday 1. In my build case, the morning went from 1 eastbound cue to 2; evening from 2 to 3; Saturday remained at 1. I think the cueing is pretty reasonable. There are site line issues looking north. There are properties on either side of the road that have hedges within the right of way that could be trimmed. I don't see any other mitigation that is realistic. I think with the cueing we're projecting and the volumes as low as they are, things will operate quite well with no significant impact from this land use from trips. Even if we wanted to design a signal to put in, the county would not find that we have enough volume to come close to warranting signals. The township has a parking requirement of 86; RSIS recommended 115-116. RSIS does not look at affordable housing parking demands. The ITE compiled data from many different land uses, including affordable housing. Using the number of dwelling units, ITE is projecting 44 parked vehicles for this development. Using the number of bedrooms, ITE is projecting 64 parked vehicles. These numbers include not only residents, but all vehicles. We are providing 87 spaces. This gives us a buffer of 23 spaces. We may expand the parking up to 93 spaces.

Mr. Compitello – Will the "Site Driveway Access" be given a street name?

Ms. Coffey – It's not currently a street. We will coordinate with the post office and find out what address they would like us to use. Then we will put a street sign up.

Mr. Cook – How will people get to a bus stop?

Mr. Harter – The 160 bus line has a stop on Rosol and another on N. Midland.

Mayor White – I think we have to straighten that out.

Ms. Coffey – It's tricky because it's not our property. The hope would be to put sidewalks in.

Mr. Ambrogio – If there's overflow parking from the complex, they may want to park on that road, where there are other businesses. Maybe it could be striped. Then the police could write a ticket.

Ms. Coffey – Yes and they would typically provide our manager's information to the neighbors as well, so if they have a problem, they could alert us.

Mr. Maniscalco – We really have to address both roads.

Mr. Long – We will work with the township and other property owners to figure out the pedestrian access part of this.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for the traffic engineer. All in Favor – YES

No public participation.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

Christopher Nusser, planner for the applicant was sworn in.

Mr. Nusser – The sign is located in front of Building 1. That sign is 15 square feet; the standard is 10 square feet. It is commensurate with the size of the development. I think it is an appropriate size sign so people don't miss it. The sign is up lit with LED lights. It advances purpose A to promote safety to the public and the residents of the community by giving better visibility to the site. The negative criteria, it's looking down the private lane, not impacting anybody. It would be appropriate to grant the relief. Regarding aisle width, RSIS requires a 20 foot travel way in an area with no parking and high intensity. My opinion is that in the areas that we are substandard of the 24 feet are all areas where we don't have parking adjacent. So it's 3 locations, which are all 22 feet, in excess of the 20 foot RSIS requirement. It is my opinion that the site complies with RSIS and should not require relief from that RSIS and zoning ordinance standard. When looking at the number of parking spaces and compact car spaces, you have to remember this is a very specific type of development (100% affordable). The ITE parking generation studies and what the developer has seen at the other sites should put a lot of weight to it. The parking spaces are assigned and vehicles are registered. Compact car spaces are assigned appropriately. If the Board feels additional spaces are required, A-3 shows a number of additional parking spaces we can provide, bringing us to 91 spaces. There's an additional 2 we can get, but I feel that leaving those islands in place and having those trees there would be more appropriate.

Mr. Hickey – Why not make compact spaces full sized?

Mr. Nusser – We could, but we wouldn't be able to have the additional spaces. The Board can accept alternative parking standards pursuant to the RSIS (NJ Administrative Code 5:21-4.14c), provided that the standard reflects local conditions better. Some of those factors include household characteristics. We have a bus line nearby, so the need for a car is much lower. I think the parking count relief and the parking size relief is appropriate and the Board would be justified in granting that relief.

Ms. Coffey – Other RSIS exceptions that the applicant is seeking that deal with access to the site. The sections are 5:21-4.1c, 4.2c, 4.16e2 and 4.19b5.

Mr. Nusser – I believe emergency vehicles can navigate through the site appropriately. All buildings can be serviced without issue. The looped parking area means there is a normal traffic flow with no dead end.

Ms. Coffey - The next two exceptions deal with pavement, 5:21-4.10a is pavement material, for the porous pavement in the parking area.

Mr. Nusser – Porous pavement has been used for years successfully when limited to parking stalls. There is a waiver being requested. I think the manner in which it's being used is appropriate.

Ms. Coffey – The last RSIS waiver requested is for pavement thickness, section 5:21-4.19c. 1 ½ inch is required; 2 inches proposed. We're exceeding the standard.

Mr. Nusser – We're an extra 1/2 " to the top portion of the pavement. It only makes it stronger, more suitable pavement section. There is no detriment to doing that.

Ms. Coffey – The last item is we need a waiver from N.J.S.A.40:55d-35. This is a requirement that a building lot abut a street. In this case the parcel does not abut a street, but the applicant has the easements.

Mr. Nusser – We can get emergency vehicles into the site despite the fact that we don't have direct access into the property. It is safe access for everyone.

Mr. Paparozzi – I have no issue with the sign. The aisle width is also de minimus. My concern with the aisle width is the trucks that come and park here reduce the aisle width from 22' to 15' and it's still two-way traffic. They need to provide area for deliveries. The problem with proposed parking for compact cars is if there are only 3 compact cars onsite, you lose 5 parking spaces. You could make those spaces standard size.

Ms. Coffey – The applicant is fine to adjust the size of the spaces.

Mr. Ambrogio – If you make the compact spaces full size, will you still be able to add spaces?

Mr. Nusser – Not in that area.

Mr. Maniscalco – I think the applicant has heard our concerns and can address them on the final site plan application. We can list our conditions.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public for questions for the planner. All in Favor – YES

No public participation.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

Mr. Cook – My concerns are the sidewalk on Rosol Lane Ext. and the other easement, some sort of a loading zone and parking spaces.

Mr. Maniscalco – Where does the snow go?

Mr. Long – We'd have to move it offsite.

Mr. Compitello – The operating and maintenance manual.

Ms. Coffey – The applicant's operating and maintenance manual will say that they will be responsible for maintaining its stormwater system, including the basin. We would include a requirement that we'll provide annual reporting and inspections of the basin.

Mr. Compitello – Generator requirements for the pumps.

Ms. Coffey – We will agree that the pumps will have generators.

Mr. Cook – The applicant was going to provide additional survey work for the drainage system north of Rosol Lane.

Mr. Paparozzi – Assigned spaces.

Mr. Hickey – I'm for full size spaces, not compact.

Mr. Paparozzi – Maybe 4 spaces for compact cars and then add 2 additional spaces; total 90 spaces.

Mr. Cialone – We still haven't resolved the delivery truck parking.

Mr. O'Such – We'll come up with that.

Mr. LaGuardia – Building signage.

Mr. O'Such – Yes to be approved by fire department.

Mr. Briglia – We're expecting a letter of interpretation from DEP about the wetlands to determine what kind of wetlands they are and if any other permitting is involved. There's going to be some DEP permitting for sanitary sewer – TWA. There's going to be some permitting for water, water main extensions simplified permit. Replacing fencing along the cemetery.

Mr. Cialone – Approval would be subject to them getting any other additional approvals required by governmental agencies.

Mr. Cook – Should we specify that the southern roadway is for exit only?

Mr. Cialone – We can say southern access it for emergency vehicle use only.

Mr. Long – It's going to have a chain across it, between two bollards.

Ms. Coffey – We will add a dog area.

Mr. Cialone – The 14 make ready spaces (electric charging stations) not exclusively for electric cars.

Mr. Cialone – In summary, approval is subject to: sidewalks installed along the easement access area known as Rosol Lane Ext., will provide a parking area to be provided for delivery vehicles, reconfigured parking for a total of 90 spaces (4 compact), snow to be hauled off site, applicant responsible for maintenance of the stormwater system and providing annual reports and inspections to the municipality, pumps for the stormwater system will have backup generators, applicant will provide additional survey work in order to allow the municipality to look at the cleaning out of the drainage areas north of the property, building signage will be installed in conjunction with the advice of the fire dept., subject to the receipt of a letter of interpretation from NJDEP, concerning the quality of the wetlands, applicant will install/replace fencing along the easterly line of the property, the southerly access point will be for emergency vehicle use only, applicant will install a dog run, 14 parking spaces will be make ready for charging of electric vehicles and are not exclusively for the use of electric vehicles.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to approve the application, with the conditions listed by Mr. Cialone.

VOTE: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Browne, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Cook, Mr. Maniscalco and Mayor White - YES

APPLICATION APPROVED

Ms. Coffey – If the Board attorney is willing to write a letter, saying that the application was approved tonight, you don't have to have a special meeting for the resolution next week.

Ms. Kapner – During next week's meeting, we also have to adopt the amendment to the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

Mr. Cialone – I'll have to ask Steve Pellino, Board attorney.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to have Mr. Cialone draft and send a letter to applicant's attorney stating that the Board granted Preliminary Site Plan Approval.

VOTE: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Browne, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Cook, Mr. Maniscalco and Mayor White - YES

5. PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN APPLICATION

Digital Room, LLC

431 North Midland Avenue, Block 1401, Lot 17

The Board received a letter from Brian Chewcaskie, applicant's attorney, requesting to be carried to the September 20, 2021 meeting with no further notice.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to carry the application to the September 20, 2021 meeting with no further notice. All in Favor - YES

6. MINUTES

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to approve the minutes of the July 19, 2021 meeting. All in Favor – YES

7. COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to accept and file the communications. All in Favor - YES

8. VOUCHERS

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to pay the following vouchers, provided funds are available:

Carroll Engineering, 07/15/21, Chefler Foods, \$2,365.49
Carroll Engineering, 07/15/21, Digital Room, LLC, \$1,229
Carroll Engineering, 07/15/21, Willows at Saddle Brook, \$149
Basile Birchwale & Pellino, 08/02/21, Ingerman, \$250
Galaxy Home Furnishings, 08/16/21, Return Unused Escrow, \$7,713.60

All in Favor – YES

9. OPEN AND CLOSE THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to open the meeting to the public. All in Favor - YES

No public participation.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to close the meeting to the public. All in Favor – YES

10. ADJOURN

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Browne to adjourn the meeting. All in Favor - YES

Meeting adjourned 11:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jayne Kapner
Planning Board Secretary