

TOWNSHIP OF SADDLE BROOK PLANNING BOARD

Following are the minutes of the Saddle Brook Planning Board's Regular Meeting, held on Monday, January 20, 2025 at 7:35 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL: Mr. Ambrogio, Mr. Browne, Mr. Compitello, Mr. Cook, Mr. Hickey, Mr. LaGuardia, Mr. Maniscalco, Councilwoman Mazzer, Mayor White and Mr. Camporeale – PRESENT Mr. Vermilyea and Ms. Barrale - ABSENT

Also present was Anthony Cialone, Board attorney, Anthony Kurus, Board engineer and Gary Paporozzi, Board planner.

2. CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCES – OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

3. NEW BUSINESS

A.) Preliminary and Final Site Plan Application

Wal-Mart Real Estate Trust, 189 Route 46, Blocks 123 & 120, Lots 1 and 1.01 & 1

Mr. Compitello – We received a letter from Walmart stating that they want to carry their application to the next meeting without the need for additional notice. The applicant renoticed in December, but not for tonight.

Mr. Cialone – I know they've been trying to set up a meeting with our professionals, but with the holidays, they haven't been able to do it. That's what the delay has been.

Mr. Maniscalco – Why don't we ask them to renotify?

Mr. Cialone – It's up to the board.

Mr. Maniscalco made a motion: seconded by Mr. Browne to adjourn the application to the February 18, 2025 meeting with new notice.

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

APPLICATION ADJOURNED WITH NEW NOTICE REQUIRED

B.) Preliminary and Final Site Plan Application

Bridge Asset Management, 125-147 North Fifth Street, Block 405, Lots 9 & 10

Matthew Gilson, attorney for the applicant came forward.

Mr. Gilson – The property is located in block 405, lots 9 & 10, with an easement running through lot 8. We're proposing to demolish three of the existing onsite structures and to clear and regrade the majority of the property to construct a macadam surface parking lot that will serve as a contractor office and storage facility. There will be no outdoor storage.

Tom Trotto, engineering for the applicant was sworn in.

Mr. Trotto – An aerial map, dated 01/20/25 was marked Exhibit A-1. The overall lot area is 3.95 acres, located in the Industrial) Zone. To the north are other industrial uses; to the south is Route 46 with commercial uses; to the east is a large industrial warehouse building, which blocks the view of our building from North Fifth St. with some residential uses beyond that; and to the west by the NJ Transit Rail Line are a few mixed use family residential uses and commercial uses. The site currently operates as an auto body shop, with the building to the northern end of the site. The remainder of the site operates as material storage yard. Both of those uses are currently not permitted uses. The rest of the site is almost entirely developed with impervious coverage, including both paved surfaces, some compacted gravel and four existing buildings. One of the buildings will remain; three will be demolished. For the past 5 or

so years, there has been piles of rubbish (broken pallets, pieces of concrete and brick) throughout the site. This application proposes to clean all of that up and pave the surface. Currently the site is accessed by two full movement driveways connecting to Fifth Street. The southern driveway is a 30 foot wide, dedicated right of way. The northern driveway is a 15 foot wide access easement, which runs through the front of lot 8 where the warehouse is located. This northern driveway currently provides access to the auto body shop. There are a handful of existing nonconformities on the lot: 1.) the current two uses onsite are not permitted; 2.) existing side yard setback is 9.6', where 25' is required; 3.) the combined side yard setback is 20.9', where 50' is required; and 4.) lot coverage is 92.8%, where 35% is allowed. This site is pretty heavily packed with easements. All were reviewed with the current development and none will impact or restrict what we are proposing today. There is one drainage easement which has a culvert running through it in the middle of our site. There's sanitary sewer easement which has a sewer main running through the site. There are four easements located on lot 8, the warehouse lot, which benefit our property, either for access or for allowing us to develop within it. There are two easements on our property that benefit lot 8 for parking and loading. There are three slope easements associated with the Route 46 steep slope that comes down on our property. We will not be touching that slope at all. There is one railroad side easement, associated with the railroad tracks to the rear of the site for loading/unloading materials for the railroad. We will not be impacting the use of these easements. A colorized site plan rendering with proposed conditions, dated 01/20/25 was marked Exhibit A-2. The site will be cleared of all of the piles of materials and operate as a contractor's office and equipment storage facility, which is a conditionally permitted use within the zone. Only the auto body shop building will remain. We are not proposing any changes to that building. It will operate as the main office for the contractor. It may also be used for some equipment storage and minor maintenance for the equipment, which will be held on site. Stock piles will be removed and the lot will be paved with heavy duty asphalt pavement to be able to withstand the load from whatever equipment they may have. A 6-foot high chain-link fence with gates is proposed around the property for security purposes. We are proposing Knox boxes for each of the gates for the fire department to enter the site if need be. Five 70' x 15' trailer parking spaces are proposed. We are proposing a 30' wide one-way driveway around the site for circulation, which will be maintained at all times to ensure safe and efficient access. There will be no equipment stored in those areas. We are proposing an employee parking area, which is at the northeastern corner of the site. The parking requirement for a building of this size is 62 spaces. However, when you account for the two space reduction for the EV spaces, we are down to a requirement of 60 total parking spaces. We are not proposing 60 at this time. We are proposing 31 total spaces, with 3 ADA and 2 EV charging spaces because a building this size typically has 10 to 15 employees operating the site. We feel that striping 60 spaces would be an excess for this type of use and that 31 spaces are more than sufficient. However, we did submit a banked parking plan as part of this application on sheet 14 for two reasons: 1.) to show that if we did need the 61 spaces, we can fit them and 2.) if a tenant came in and we did need those parking spaces, we wanted to get them approved today. The intent would be to only stripe out the 31, but if we need the additional 30 spaces, we have the ability to construct them at that time. We are requesting a variance for 9' x 18' parking space size, where 180 square feet (10' x 18') is required. We feel this will be sufficient for this use, as it will not be open to the public. Regarding stormwater, the project is classified as a major development. We do intend to comply with both the township and state stormwater standards. We are proposing a reduction in impervious coverage onsite. We will still need a variance for 92.4% coverage. To mitigate the impervious coverage, we are proposing two pervious pavement basins, which are located in the main drive isles and parking areas. They will essentially collect stormwater and treat it as it flows through the gravel bed beneath, detain it and discharge it to the storm culvert that runs through the center of the property. We're also proposing one filtered treatment device, which is near the southern

entrance drive, to collect stormwater, treat it and discharge into the culvert onsite. Through these systems we comply with both water quality and quantity requirements. Groundwater recharge does not apply here. This is a previously developed site within the Metropolitan Planning Area, PA1, so we are exempt from water quality requirements. This site is almost completely screened visually from North Fifth St. by the warehouse building, but we are proposing some landscaping around the perimeter of the site to supplement the existing trees and vegetation, which is to remain. We are proposing 92 plantings on site. We're also proposing to upgrade the lighting on site with LED fixtures: 14 pole mounted 25' high and 8 building mounted at 15' – 16' high. All will be downward facing and will minimize offsite glare. They will be on from dawn to dusk. We will comply with township lighting standards, zero footcandles at all property lines, no glare, etc. There is no tenant proposed at this time. This site is built on spec, so we are designing it so it can accommodate different potential tenants. They will comply with township requirements. The variances requested are: 1.) Parking space size 9' x 18' proposed, 2.) Impervious coverage (reducing it by 700 sq. ft.) and 3.) side yard setback – 9.6' existing, once demolished, the existing auto body shop is the next closest, set at 11.3'. These variances are either existing or improved. We can comply with all conditions requested in the board engineer and board planner's letter.

Mr. Paparozzi – There is an area on the demolition plan (page 3 of 13) shown in orange where a building is coming down. It's a building for lots 9 & 10 that encroaches onto lot 8. The easement is there because the building is there. When the building is gone, the easement is gone. I think we need a copy of that easement because on the banked parking plan (sheet 14) the trailers and some of the additional parking is on that property. So if the easement is gone and lot 8 was to fence their property, this plan is no longer valid. We need to know what that easement is. The board attorney needs to review the easement that benefits lots 9 & 10. The second issue is that they are removing the material from the yard and just vehicles are supposed to be parked there, but if you look on the pavement easement legend (sheets 4 & 1) it has an area that says storage area, which has to be removed if there's going to be no storage outdoors. Additionally, the architect's plan shows only one office, yet the testimony says offices and storage for the proposed use. If they have more offices, it would affect parking requirements. The storage on the second floor mezzanine (an area of 15' x 14') may need accommodate the construction materials. The area outside is supposed to be for parking of vehicles, that by code needs to be striped for the vehicles they are proposing. Otherwise, vehicles will park anywhere, which is not aesthetically a good site. We need to know how many vehicles.

Mr. Kurus – With regard to stormwater, can you talk a little about the catch basins and the overflow system that you have?

Mr. Trotto – Essentially this means if the pervious paving system did fail, if it got clogged up, there are grates/inlets that can still collect water and get it down to the stone storage bed. We are proposing three inlets for the larger bottom base and two for the top. Those are the lowest points of the basin. We feel like we do comply with the state standards.

Mr. Kurus – Is there an underdrain within the stone as well?

Mr. Trotto – There is.

Mr. Kurus – You also said you have one filter for water quality?

Mr. Trotto – Yes, near the entrance just because we didn't have the ability with the grades to collect that water and get it to the pervious pavement basins. We are collecting it there and treating it and it's undetained flow as it goes to the culvert. We are reducing flow within the two basins, so we are still under our allowable stormwater reductions.

Mr. Trotto – I would like to address the planner's comments regarding the easement. Our understanding from our attorney and survey team is that the easements would be tied to the property and would remain. We did provide a copy of the title report. If that area did go away with the building, we feel we could make some slight adjustments to striping and comply with what would be needed. The label on sheet 4 is a mistake. We will update the legend. There

will be no material stored outside, just the contractor's equipment. The entire building would be used by the contractor. There are no architectural plans. On a Dynamic Survey sheet, Mr. Trotto showed two office spaces to be operated by the contractor.

Mr. Paparozzi – I reviewed the title report and didn't see the easement area for that building that's it's encroaching, so I think that Mr. Cialone needs to review that.

Mr. Cialone – I reviewed the title report and there are several easements. There's was one agreement that was fairly recent that had multiple easements in it. I couldn't tell from the metes and bounds description if it included all of those easements. If it falls under that particular easement agreement, I don't think it's an issue because I didn't see anything talking about termination of the easement upon it's use. I think there was a lot of catch all language in there that talked about for any legal purpose. It looked like a perpetual easement. The issue I had is that I couldn't figure out the metes and bounds to see if it included that section. If that easement is as I think it is then you would also be adding a parking variance because you would not meet the number of required parking spaces. Also, we don't know how many offices they are going to use and that will affect parking. This auto body shop floor plan should have had a proposed plan as well.

Mr. Maniscalco – Could we make it a condition?

Mr. Paparozzi – I guess you can.

Mr. Ambrogio – Are you planning to come back once you get a tenant?

Mr. Trotto – That was not our intent. We wanted to find a tenant who would fall within the approval. If tenant came in who needed substantial changes, we would of course come back. I did respond to the planners comment about striping out the spaces for the equipment. Of course we can't do that at this time, but as a condition, once a tenant is obtained, we would appropriately stripe the lot as needed to house the equipment. That can be reviewed by the planner and engineer at that time during resolution compliance, should this application be approved. The intent was to get a conditionally permitted use, contractor storage yard and office approved here and then find a tenant that would fit in that approval language.

Mr. Ambrogio – What would your definition be of equipment storage? What does that consist of?

Mr. Trotto – It could be excavators, bulldozers, landscape contractors with lawnmowers and dump trucks. It could be a mix of equipment, depending on the tenant. A lot of this size would probably have heavier equipment. That is why we are proposing the trailer spaces to be able to move the equipment.

Mr. Ambrogio – If you had a landscape contractor, you're not proposing that they store plantings and things like that?

Mr. Trotto – Correct. No materials would be stored outside.

Mr. Hickey – Construction workers usually drive trucks. I think the parking spots should be bigger.

Mr. Trotto – I think that's something we could work with the board on.

Mr. Hickey - Will they be allowed to store trash on site?

Mr. Trotto – No.

Mr. Maniscalco – Would you have fuel there? Would you have C boxes there?

Mr. Trotto – If anything, those boxes would be stored inside the building. Only large equipment would be outside or boxes would stay on the truck.

Mr. Hickey – Are you thinking about a dumpster company?

Mr. Trotto - No.

Mr. Maniscalco – The building needs a trash enclosure.

Mr. Trotto – Right now, trash would be stored internally, but one dumpster may be possible.

Mr. Maniscalco – Are you going to be working on the trucks on site?

Mr. Trotto – Potentially, some of the equipment that the contractor would use may have some minor maintenance done inside the building.

Mr. Ambrogio – Will you restrict the hours of operation for this site?

Mr. Gilson – Our understanding of the code is that there are no specific hours. We don't anticipate this to be a 24-hour operation. We're fine with any condition the board would like to set regarding hours of operation.

Mr. Ambrogio – The town has a noise ordinance regarding loading and unloading.

Mr. Gilson – We would be fine with that restriction.

Mr. Cook – How can we anticipate what kind of conditions we need to put on this if we don't know what kind of tenant is coming in? Can you shed any light on what type of tenant you're looking for?

Mr. Gilson – The applicant has told me that a lot of tenants won't speak to you until you have an approval in hand.

Mr. Maniscalco – The hours are going to be normal hours; no weekends/Sundays? Who are we approving you for? There are residents nearby.

Mr. Pappozzi – It would be good if they came back with the tenant. The floor plan and number of offices could change. We need to see where the dumpster is going. You need to see if they need to remove the easement area. The board may like to set conditions according to the tenant.

Mr. Trotto – The parking calculation is based on the entire square footage of the building, not for the number offices.

Mr. Hickey – Also, many construction companies have construction trailers that they can park on the site. Then you would have office space that's not in the building.

Mr. Ambrogio – I think if we gave you a preliminary approval for the site to do what you're proposing, we'd want you to come back to us once you get a tenant so we know specifically what they're doing.

Mr. Gilson – We're happy to come back or to set conditions now.

Mr. Hickey – It would be very hard for me to vote on something when we don't have answers.

Councilwoman Mazzer made a motion; seconded by Mr. Maniscalco to open the meeting to the public for questions for Mr. Trotto. All in favor – YES

Steve Mariconda, 24 Harrison Ave. – Is all the lighting fully shielded? Is there uplight? What is the color temperature of the light?

Mr. Trotto – Yes. No. 3,000-4,000 is our standard.

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

Corey Chase, traffic engineer, was sworn in.

Mr. Chase – We prepared a traffic study, last revised 12/20/24. We also worked with Mr. Trotto to look at site access circulation, parking layout and overall efficiency of the vehicular access to and from the subject property. We looked at the traffic impact for the intersection of North Fifth Street and Route 46, focusing on the peak weekday morning and evening hours. Based on the presence of the adjacent school we extended weekday evening peak analysis period to start at 2:30 p.m. to 8 p.m., where we typically study at 4:30 -6:30 p.m. We found that the community influence outweighed the school influence. We looked at trip generation data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. In this case, we utilized 'specialty trade contractor' as our land use code. We didn't take any credit for the trips generated by the existing auto body use. Those trips are summarized on table 4, page 7 of our report. We broke down the traffic generation between vehicular employee traffic, as well as truck traffic during those peak hours. It's projected to generate a maximum of eighteen additional trips on the adjacent roadway network during those critical peak hours. That translates to approximately one trip every three minutes during that time. The ITE identified a threshold of 100 additional trips during peak hour as a significant increase in traffic. So, this is approximately 20 percent of that threshold. We do a pre and post development analysis at the adjacent signalized intersection, as well as the site

access point of North Fifth St. and Lanza Ave. Those results are summarized on table 5 of our report. We determined that the adjacent signalized intersection Route 46 is going to continue to operate at the no build level of service with consideration of this development.

We did look at some traffic signal timing modifications at the intersection. Unfortunately, NJDOT implements traffic signal timing and then they don't evaluate that for many years. We found that we could repurpose some of that existing green time and actually make that intersection operate more efficiently with some modifications to the traffic signal time. We also looked at the intersection of N. 5th St., and Lanza Ave. and the site driveway and decided those will operate at an acceptable level of service during both the peak hours, again with limited increase in the actual vehicle delay. We are proposing a one-way counter-clockwise vehicular circulation pattern around the internal site, with the equipment storage located within the center of that circle and on the outside of those circles as well. We are proposing 61 employee parking stalls; 30 of which will be banked. Thirty-one spaces, in our opinion will be sufficient to accommodate the needs of the tenants we are anticipating. We are requesting a variance for the size of the parking stalls (9' x 18'). Those are considered standard employee size parking stalls by the ITE and Urban Land Institute for employer low turn over vehicular stalls. Given the area of asphalt onsite, we could potentially work with the board and its professionals to increase the size of the stalls. As the board planner noted, there is some minor encroachment of those trailer storage spaces within the easement area. Those could be relocated, either internally or shift to the north on the property. Similarly, Mr. Trotto mentioned that two banked spaces potentially encroached the easement area. Those could be relocated onsite. Another concern was the striping for the equipment storage to make sure it was organized in an efficient manner. We would agree, upon securing a tenant to come back to present to the professionals, a striping plan to confirm that the equipment would be stored in an organized manner.

Mr. Kurus – Can you go over the ITE Land Use Code? Is this trip generation based on parking spaces or on the square footage of the building and area of the site?

Mr. Chase – We used specialty trade contractor for this. It's based on the building square footage.

Mr. Kurus - Is there anything to factor in the equipment storage area being that this is a large piece of property.

Mr. Chase – There is not.

Mr. Kurus – I think there's got to be some sort of correlation between what's onsite to the trips to and from. Once there's a tenant, these numbers could be a little more fine-tuned.

Mr. Chase – If there is a time in the future, whether it be securing a tenant or an increase in tenant demand, where there was a need to construct those additional 30 spaces, we would present some additional information at that time for the board or its professionals to explain why and provide an updated traffic study to account for a potential increase in demand as a result of those spaces, we've seen that as a condition on similar applications.

Mr. Paparozzi – I think the parking analysis is important. If you have 90 pieces of equipment, does that mean you'll have 90 different cars come in with people to take that equipment to a job site? Everything is open ended.

Mr. Chase – My interpretation of equipment is something that couldn't be driven. It would need to be transported by trailer. We have 5 trailer storage spaces.

Mr. LaGuardia – Did you anticipate any vehicles going out toward Market Street?

Mr. Chase – We are anticipating that everything is going to come in and out on Route 46. The board can make it a condition that all truck traffic would have to turn right out of the property.

Mr. Compitello – What did you find out as far as the timing of the traffic light at Route 46 in N. 5th St.? Traffic builds up on Fifth Street.

Mr. Chase – It does. The state does not always go out and assess travel pattern changes and update the signal timing accordingly. They allow private developers to feed them that information. That request has to come from the township. You could take our traffic study and submit

it to the DOT and say you would like them to reconsider this retiming and here's the analysis. The DOT implements it at no cost.

Mr. Ambrogio – Do you have any intention of using the entrance on the north side?

Mr. Chase - We are proposing to maintain it. Both entrances are gated. They are subject to employee access only.

Mr. Ambrogio – Ingress and egress?

Mr. Chase – We weren't proposing a restriction at this time. If you would prefer to see that as exit only or ingress only, we would be amenable to restricting that to be one way in or one way out. Because it was being used by employees only, we felt comfortable maintaining as a two-way. The easiest thing to do would be to make it ingress only and then we'd put some do not enter signs within the site, indicating that they're not to exit through that driveway.

Mr. Browne made a motion; seconded by Mr. Hickey to open the meeting to the public for questions for Mr. Chase. All in Favor - YES

No public participation.

Mr. Browne made a motion; seconded by Mr. Maniscalco to close the meeting to the public.

All in Favor - YES

Mr. Maniscalco – Do we make a motion for preliminary with a list of conditions?

Mr. Cialone – It would be preliminary and final with the conditions.

Mr. Maniscalco – Can one of the conditions be that they have to come back?

Mr. Cialone – You can do that.

Mr. Gilson - I understand the board's concerns, but perhaps we do find a tenant that fits the (inaudible) resolution, so I would ask that it be subject to your board's professionals as to whether we need to come back, rather than a blanket decision that we would definitely need to come back.

Mr. Hickey – I feel like you have to come back. We know nothing.

Mr. Paparozzi – It would be best to come back.

Mr. Kurus – I agree with the planner.

Mr. Compitello -The turning radius on Fifth with the longer trucks is a concern. We really should know who the tenant is.

Mr. Gilson – It is obviously our desire to do this in a way that we don't have to come back unless we need to. I think we can accomplish that with conditions.

Mr. Hickey – Is it possible to make conditions when we don't know who's going to be there?

Mr. Paparozzi – If they get a tenant who wants to work Saturday and Sunday and you have a condition of Monday through Friday, construction companies work mostly every Saturday and sometimes on Sunday. In my opinion, I have no problem with the application, but I'd like to see the tenant. If the board misses something in the conditions, they're going to be stuck with it.

Mr. Compitello – We can make a condition where it's no weekends.

Mr. Ambrogio – What would be an appropriate number for pieces of equipment? Do we pick a number out of the air?

Mr. Paparozzi – That's why I asked for the striping.

Mr. Gilson – I think we hear the concerns of the board.

Mr. Maniscalco – Should we start with the condition of hours?

Mr. LaGuardia – They should build to spec what they show on the plan.

Mr. Maniscalco – So they should have an architectural layout of the building.

Mr. Gilson – The testimony was that the parking calculation was based on the size of the building, which is not going to change. The parking calculation will not be different based on who the tenant is.

Mr. Paparozzi - The only way it would be is if there were more vehicles that had to be driven out. I think that all of the conditions are going to bring them back to the board when they get a tenant anyway. You could agree to the plan of contractor's office and equipment storage and

limit everything until you know who the contractor is. You can agree to the plan, which is a permitted use. You have to remember, if it's contractor's equipment and there's a break in the middle of the night, they're going to go in the middle of the night to get the equipment. It's beneficial to the township to know who the tenant is. You could subject it to some of the tweaks that the engineer needs to make with the removal of outdoor materials. See if they have to move the trailer parking for the easement area. If somebody comes in with 50 pieces of equipment, they can stripe it for what they need. Anything other than that (such as hours of operations, no left turn, etc.) would be hard to enforce.

Mr. Cook – I think it's going to be harder to rent the property with restrictions on it.

Mr. Ambrogio – I agree with Mr. Cook. It makes more sense if we can review how they're going to use it specifically.

Mr. Paparozzi – The board can approve a preliminary site plan and save the final site plan for the applicant.

Mr. Gilson – Let me consult with my client quickly. We should be okay with just the preliminary tonight.

Mr. Compitello made a motion; seconded by Mr. Maniscalco to have a 5-minute recess. All in Favor – YES Recess 9:16-9:22 p.m.

Mr. Gilson- I spoke with my client and they're happy to proceed with just the preliminary.

Mr. Cialone - Do you just want preliminary site plan approval or we can give preliminary and final with conditions?

Mr. Gilson – I think it's our intention to get preliminary and come back to the board for conditions. We would rather have less conditions at this time, find a tenant, then come back.

Mr. Cialone – I think the board was thinking about preliminary and final approval with the condition that you return to the Planning Board with tenants. Some conditions might help you such as no outdoor storage, we can settle the easement issue and revision of their client's plans.

Mr. Maniscalco – I don't want to see a 24-hour operation.

Mr. Cook made a motion; seconded by Mr. Maniscalco to grant preliminary and final site plan approval with the following conditions: the applicant has to return with the tenant once they have one, no outdoor storage permitted, no 24-hour operation, provide documentation about the easement, satisfactory to the board attorney and the board planner, amendments to the plan to delete the reference to storage of outdoor materials and compliance with Neglia's report.

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

APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

4. MINUTES

Mayor White made a motion; seconded by Mr. Maniscalco to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2024 meeting. VOTE: All in Favor - YES

5. COMMUNICATIONS

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

6. VOUCHERS

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

Paparozzi Associates, Inc., 12/02/24, Walmart, \$600

Basile Birchwale & Pellino, LLP, 01/06/25, Fourth Quarter Retainer 2024, \$607.75

Neglia Engineering Associates, 01/07/25, Walmart, \$692.50
Neglia Engineering Associates, 01/07/25, Bridge Asset Management, \$302.50
Basile Birchwale & Pellino, LLP, 01/16/25, Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust, \$677.50

VOTE: All in Favor – YES

7. OPEN AND CLOSE THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC

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

No public participation.

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

8. ADJOURN

Mayor White made a motion; seconded by Councilwoman Mazzer to adjourn the meeting.
All in Favor - YES

Meeting adjourned 9:29 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jayne Kapner
Planning Board Secretary