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CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. Welcome, everybody. It's 7:29. This is a special Planning Board meeting of the Long Hill Township Planning Board. Call to order. Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board and website, by sending a copy to the Echoes Sentinel newspaper and filing a copy with the municipal clerk.

Any hearing conducted by the Board is a quasi-judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments must be limited to issues that are relevant to what the Board may legally consider in reaching a decision, and decorum appropriate to a judicial hearing must be maintained at all times.

Meeting cutoff. Announcement is made that, as a matter of procedure, it is the intention of the Planning Board not to continue any matter past 10:30 p.m. at any regular or special meeting of the Planning Board unless a motion is passed by the members then present to extend the meeting until a later specified time.

With that, do you have the flag,
please?
(Pledge of Allegiance.)
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you,
everybody. Thank you, Deb, for that.
COORDINATOR COONCE: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Roll call.
COORDINATOR COONCE: Yes. Mayor
Rae?
MAYOR RAE: Present.

COORDINATOR COONCE: Committeeman

## Verlezza?

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Present.
COORDINATOR COONCE: Mr. Falvey?
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: Here.
COORDINATOR COONCE: There he is.
Okay.
Mr. Malinousky?
BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Here.
COORDINATOR COONCE: Mr. Pfeil?

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Here.
COORDINATOR COONCE: Mr. Richardson
is recused tonight.
Mr. Sandow?
BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Here.

2 Jones?

3

COORDINATOR COONCE: Vice Chairman

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Present. COORDINATOR COONCE: Chairman Hands? CHAIRMAN HANDS: Here. COORDINATOR COONCE: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. Thank you, Deb. Thank you, everybody.

One topic tonight is a continuation
of the application for Prism, major, preliminary and final site plan, lot commonly known as Tifa. I think this is, what, the twelfth or thirteenth meeting. And if I recall from the last meeting, we concluded with all the testimony and we left it to this meeting to offer Mr. Regan, I think it was, to offer closing remarks and -- remarks for the application on behalf of Prism. And that's where I think we left it.

And then at that point, there will be a discussion with the Board to deliberate the findings and the discussions that have been had over the last 12, 13 meetings and come to some resolution or conclusion with the

1 application.

MS. MAZIARZ: Chairman, I think you covered all of it. I think that is exactly what happened at our last hearing. At our last hearing, if I recall correctly, the objector's attorney was given an opportunity to sum up, to give a summation, because the hearing had been closed at that point.

So while technically the hearing isn't closed but the public testimony portion had been closed. So today, you are correct; the only thing left is for the applicant's attorney to sum up before the Board speaks and the Board deliberates.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Deb.
Deb, any points of order or are we good with that?

COORDINATOR COONCE: No, I think you -- again, I think you covered everything.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
Frank, is it fair to hand it over to

1 you at this point?

MR. REGAN: That would be fine, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Please do. Please continue.

MR. REGAN: On behalf of the applicant, I want to thank the Board, its professionals, and the public for their attention and input on the application. It's been a long process. The application was submitted in November 2019 and the first hearing was held on June 9th of this year in the midst of the pandemic. And tonight is, in fact, the twelfth hearing and there's been approximately 28 hours of hearings.

While the pandemic has caused the hearings to be held virtually, I do not believe that it's affected the Board and the public's ability to participate and have their say. The State Municipal Land Use Law required the Board to proceed with the application and I believe the Board has done a very effective job at conducting the hearings. The applicant has tried to reasonably address all the questions and

1 comments of the Board, its professionals, and 2 the public. The first two hearings were 3 focused on the environmental condition of the 4 property, which is not required for site plan 5 approval, but recognizing the public's 6 concerns, the applicant did its best to 7 address these concerns. the applicant, have been willing to address every question and concern raised by the public even though many of the questions and concerns were asked again and again by the public and even though it was determined by the Board's professionals this is a completely

1 conforming as-of-right affordable housing 2 project.

The applicant is a property owner in the township and pays taxes just like other residents, so it's unfair to characterize them otherwise or treat them or this application any different than you would a resident seeking to build a house or a business in the township.

The applicant acquired the property three years ago, an underutilized former industrial property currently containing a mix of industrial and commercial uses. Some objectors have characterized this project as ugly or inconsistent with the Millington aesthetic.

The project is neither ugly nor inconsistent. What is ugly and inconsistent is the out-of-place and incompatible industrial building that this project is replacing.

Let's not lose sight of the fact that this property is not farm land or open space. It's a functionally obsolescent 50-year-old hodgepodge 160,000-square-foot

1 industrial building that provides no positive 2 contribution to the township.

The applicant, on the other hand, acquired this property with the intent to clear what it views as a use inconsistent with the area and replace it with a new mixed-use development located at the New Jersey rail station while assisting the township in addressing its affordable housing obligations.

The goal has always been to improve Millington Village Center which is currently comprised of a mix of uses and structures, many of them underutilized, obsolete, and total lack of consistent architectural styles.

The public and the objectors have consistently avoided mentioning the fact that this project is part of the Township's affordable housing settlement which obligates it to provide its constitutional fair share of affordable housing, something it avoided to do for many years.

While the Board has the right to make suggestions and provide other inputs, since this is an affordable housing project permitted by ordinance as part of the

1 Township's affordable housing settlement, the
2 Board's review and approval must not cause the
3 project to be more expensive than it already
4 will be by imposing unreasonable or
5 unrealistic conditions.

The Township Committee subsequently adopted Ordinance No. 413-18 on May 9th, 2018,

1 creating the MU-O, mixed-use overlay, zone for
2 this property only, which ordinance this Board 3 reviewed prior to its adoption.

A portion of the property to be redeveloped will be remediated in accordance with all applicable environmental laws and regulations with oversight by a licensed site remediation professional who is licensed by the State Department of Environmental Protection, who must report all remediation activities to the DEP as part of the remediation and redevelopment of the property. The applicant, as property owner, is obligated by law to remediate the property prior to any development while monitoring and maintaining the closed landfill on the property pursuant to an administrative consent order with the DEP.

The applicant proposes the construction of 140 residential units in 14 ten-unit buildings with parking garages and surface parking and approximately 4,000-square-foot commercial/retail building and a total of 330 parking spaces inclusive of bank parking, along with various site amenities, approximately 1,800-square-foot community building and pool and other site improvements.

The applicant could have put forth a plan with 140 units and a single structure, the likes of many apartment buildings you see being constructed throughout the state. However, the applicant recognized the need to reduce the scale from what has existed to provide more open space for view corridors and natural light and to create more of a village feel with individual buildings whose sizes are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The majority of the residential units will be two-bedrooms, 126 of the 140 , with the balance being three-bedrooms. The residential buildings will be three stories in height with ground-floor parking, garage parking.

The proposed development complies
fully with the requirements of the MU-O zoning for the property and no variances are required. The Board planner's memo of June 4th, 2020, confirms such compliance.

I will not object -- I'm sorry.
I will not address the objections
raised by members of the public and their legal counsel and planner other than to say

1 that the legal counsel and planner for the 2 objectors do not represent the Township or the 3 Board. They were not hired by the Township or 4 the Board. They are not paid by the Township 5 or the Board. They were hired and paid by a 6 small group of objectors, a dozen or so out of 7 a population of over 3,000 in Millington who, 8 for one reason or another, don't like my 9 client's project.

11 the professionals for the Board that are, in
12 fact, hired and paid for by the Board and
13 charged with the duty to protect the Township
14 and the Board and I agree with the opinions of
15 the Board attorney and the planner with
16 regards to many of the objections raised.

21 land use ordinance, it is inartfully written,
22 ambiguous, and uses different terms
23 interchangeably, such as "dwelling" and
24 "house," and we believe it was intended to
25 apply to single-family subdivisions, not

1 multifamily developments since the Board has 2 approved other multifamily developments with 3 uniform appearance.

As to Section 152, Building Design, the applicant believes the application complies since there are no natural features of the site since it is a developed site and one that has been altered over time and the applicant believes it does relate harmoniously to the existing buildings and substantial
structures in the vicinity that have a visual relationship to the project since the surrounding neighborhood is a mix of architectural styles.

But let's not forget three important points: The project is an inclusionary zoning multifamily housing project intended for the Township to meet its affordable housing obligations and the zoning was amended for this property specifically.

The Board's professionals have
determined this is a conforming project and the ordinance that was adopted by the Township Committee creating the MU-O zone adopted in 2018 created this zone and it

1 provides a provision that "any and all other 2 ordinances or parts thereof in conflict or 3 inconsistent with any of the terms hereof are 4 hereby repealed to such extent as they are so 5 in conflict or inconsistent."

Plans and reports have been revised multiple times by the applicant and its professionals, including the site plans, architectural plans, renderings, to address a number of issues and concerns raised by the

1 Board, its professionals and the public, 2 including, but not limited to, relocation of 3 the Stone House Road driveway, parking, 4 landscaping, lighting, earthwork, and the 5 retail building.

The applicant has reviewed the memos dated December 28th, 2020, received today from the Board engineer and the Board's planner with regards to possible conditions of approvals. The applicant agrees to the recommendations in each memo, including paragraph 4 of the Board engineer's memo, provided that that doesn't result in -- with respect to fill and earthwork, doesn't result in any changes to the design of the buildings or the layout of the buildings, excessive slopes aren't created, steps added, garages removed, parking eliminated, driveways moved, increase in height and retaining walls. I don't think that's the intent, but we wanted to make sure that the Board understood that.

And, again, this is an affordable housing project and we're trying to, you know, not result -- not result in an increase in the overall cost of the development.

In addition, and notwithstanding our position, as shared by our professionals, that this is a fully conforming as-of-right application, the applicant has heard the concerns of the Board and the public and is willing to accept as a condition of final approval to have its architect develop design alternatives consistent with the suggestions made by the Board planner in her December 28th, 2020 memo provided the basic design and location of windows, doors, stairs and garages do not change and the applicant be given flexibility for the use of various types of materials. Again, an affordable housing project and we're trying to keep it economically feasible.

In closing, we believe the applicant
has provided a conforming and compliant application which has been revised to address many of the concerns and questions raised by the Board, the professionals and the public and the Board should approve the application as presented with the conditions recommended by the Board's professionals in their respective memos dated December 28th, 2020. we're clear.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. Thank you very much for that.

Just one point of quick clarification. When you said you accept the conditions, I think from Casey \& Keller, they included all the points that were outstanding in his reports, last one dated September 18,

Would that be true?
MR. REGAN: That would be true, yes.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
So at this point, unless, Jolanta, there's anything you want to add in first, and I'm not sure if we need to discuss the points on the -- normally we would go through the points from the planner and the engineer just to make sure we're in agreement to understand them, but it sounds like, at least Frank has said it, Prism is already accepting of those. You made the point about the grading. I think it was the grading where you had some question marks. At least for my purposes, do you mind just repeating what you said there? Just so

11 requires, you know, a change in the overall,
12 you know, layout of the site, creates unsafe
MR. REGAN: I think overall the concern, and I think Mr. Lanzafama has, you know, acknowledged this or talked about this in his prior comments and so on and I don't think it's the intent, though he can obviously speak for himself. I guess the concern that we have is we've proposed a fill plan and earthwork and what we don't want to find ourselves is in a situation where, as a result of making changes to that plan, that it conditions. Again, $I$ don't think that that was Mr. Lanzafama's intent. As I said, we don't want to have to redesign certain parts of the project to satisfy, you know, a reduction or a significant reduction in fill. But obviously we recognize that there's opportunities there and we're willing to explore those opportunities to reduce the amount of fill.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: And the example here is at the southwest corner of Stone House, the suggestion here is a reduction of that 3 feet or as much as 3 feet? Is that

1 still --

3

MR. REGAN: I think ultimately we have to look at that, Mr. Chairman. So we haven't delved into that. Obviously if Mr. Lanzafama has looked at that and that's a conclusion he's come to, then obviously we're willing to explore that with him. We haven't -- we haven't had our engineers look at that yet.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
And these reports dated 28 th and 29th of December, they are now up on the website, I believe, so if anybody else want to look at -- I think the engineer's report is at the top of the list, right, Deb?

COORDINATOR COONCE: Yes. I made a change to where the webmaster put it, but Mr. Lanzafama's is towards the top of the list on the Prism page and it is entitled "Engineering Memo Dated 12/28/2020," uploaded 12/29/2020. The webmaster will just have to put the note that it's a Board engineer report, so she put it in the area where the applicant's reports are.

And then the Board planner's, Liz

1 Leheny's, report is located under her reports,
2 "Board Planner Report, Phillips Preiss Memo,
350 Division Avenue, December 28th," that's
4 further down the page.
5 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

6

7

9 have any further -- do either of you have any

11 expressed on the memos in the last day or two?
MR. LANZAFAMA: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I'd like to confirm for the applicant and his attorney is that my intention was not to reengineer the entire project. The goal was to reduce the amount of fill. I looked at it. I saw certain opportunities that could be done with the regrading of the site that could reduce the volume of fill and the height of those structures on the southwest corner.

So I believe we all have the same objective: Reduce the overall cost of the project, reduce the massing of that element of the project in the southwest corner. And I

1 think me working with their engineer, I think 2 we can accomplish that. 22 of it. And, you know, that -- in an effort to

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
And may I also include -- I think there was some conversation about the northeast corner as well, being low to -below grade -- or below street?

MR. LANZAFAMA: Well, that's -- the commercial building is currently slightly below grade, the street grade. I did not study that aspect, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Would that be fair to -- if there were further study, would it be fair to include that corner as well?

MR. LANZAFAMA: Well, in as much as my proposed condition was that we restudy the grading in an effort to reduce the amount of overall fill on the project and try and lower the heights of the structures on the terrain, I would assume that we would look at the entire project and not just one small corner do that, that's how you can create a rolling effect that would end up in a greater reduction in fill over the entire site.

So we'll look at -- my intention was to look at the entire site, not just that corner.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
Frank, is that the way you would understand it as well?

MR. REGAN: I think we agree and understand that, yes. And I do -Mr. Fourniadis is obviously here, so he'll jump in if $I$ say something that $I$ shouldn't.

MR. FOURNIADIS: No, I agree with everything that's said. But, again, even though I'm not an engineer, it's not my first rodeo. You know, the challenge of the retail building was one that we grappled with. Just keep in mind, and I think Mr. Lanzafama will agree, if we're talking about trying to take 2 to 3 feet off the site, that kind of makes the retail building situation worse, not better. But we're willing to take a look at it. I'm sure we can reach a resolution.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Just so we're -thank you for that.

As we've always introduced this, this is an application for preliminary and

1 final site plan.

If there were conditions placed, are we able to separate the two at that point and potentially have a preliminary site plan with conditions discussion tonight and final -- and separate that from the final site plan?

MS. MAZIARZ: That really is up to the Board. If the Board believes that the plans that have been submitted up to this point are -- you know, they were enough to review for discussion purposes in order for the Board to determine whether or not they comply with the ordinance in a preliminary manner, then the Board certainly can grant preliminary approval this evening if the Board is inclined to approve this application and the applicant would have to comply with these conditions, resubmit these plans, and then come back to the Board at the applicant's leisure, really, because $I$ do understand that the applicant has a great deal of work that needs to be done before there is going to be any building permits issuing for the site.

So once the applicant has completed these plans, the applicant can come back for

1 final site plan approval. And at that point, 2 if everything complies with preliminary, then

3 the Board simply grants final site plan
4 approval so long as everything -- everything 5 complies.

22 longer be able to review these plans that are going to not be coming before the Planning Board but will be handled by the professionals separately.

So that is the Board's choice. The Board can still grant preliminary without granting final. That's perfectly acceptable, and actually with very large applications, and this is, quite frankly, one of the largest applications that this Planning Board has seen in a very long time, it's appropriate to grant final -- I'm sorry, grant preliminary without final. This is not a minor site plan approval. It's a large development.

MR. REGAN: If I might, just,
Mr. Chairman, you know, the applicant obviously applied for both preliminary and final major site plan approval and that's what it's requesting. We understand that there's going to be conditions as part of any approval. And obviously even if you grant final approval, it will be subject to the conditions, you know -THE REPORTER: I can't hear you, Frank.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Bob, I think --
okay. Can you just repeat, please, Frank?
MR. REGAN: You couldn't hear me?
I'm sorry. Can you hear me now? 11 proceed with, you know, even getting a

12 building permit to construct the project.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes. You were fine. It's background noise elsewhere. Don't worry about it.

MR. REGAN: I guess my point was, is the applicant obviously has submitted and is seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval. We recognize that any approval that may be granted by the Board will include conditions. And obviously the applicant would need to satisfy those conditions in order to

So, I mean, we would ask the Board to seriously, you know, consider granting both the preliminary and final site plan approval as opposed to just granting preliminary site plan approval.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Thank you for that.

MS. MAZIARZ: I think that a fair compromise because I've been looking back over the ordinance. The ordinance defines building permit to include a demolition permit. What the Board might grant, if the Board were amenable to only grant preliminary and not

1 final, is to also allow the applicant to apply 2 for any demolition permits that will be 3 necessary.

MR. FOURNIADIS: Is it appropriate

```
if I say something or is that past?
```

CHAIRMAN HANDS: No, Bob, please.
MS. MAZIARZ: Well, as long as we're not testifying. If we're talking about -- if we're talking about conditions and legalities, I suppose it's okay as long as you're not going to start testifying. I'll let you know.

MR. FOURNIADIS: Okay. You stop me.
I will talk slowly and pause between thoughts so you have time to object.

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay.
MR. FOURNIADIS: You may recall, and it's in the record when we first floated this idea, there were several members on the Board who actually, you know, talked me out of it

1 saying what are the standards? How will we 2 ever do it?

3

11 oh, she did in one memo what I've been trying 12 for weeks to articulate and put in writing and

You know, we have agreed -- we have proposed this and, you know, we were struggling over the holidays to try and come up with some standards that $I$ think work. We've done this before. We did it in Bloomfield. We did it in Dunellen. But then, fortunately, Ms. Leheny came up with some language which I read this morning and I said, these are conditions that $I$ know we can live with. We were going to come up with something that satisfies those and that they'll be happy with.

But to me going -- having to come back in for final is just something I'm not interested in doing because it's just opening up this application and continuing it and going through the same process we just went through for the past six months.

You know, I know what Jolanta said. It is a big application, but it's not unprecedented for a 140-unit application to be

1 granted preliminary and final with conditions 2 and sometimes pages and pages and pages of 3 conditions.

So that's why we proposed what we proposed. We heard the Board. We heard the public. We want to -- we want to be done so we can get to work satisfying the conditions and getting all our other approvals.

MR. REGAN: And just a further, you
know, point to what Bob is saying is obviously there are other outside agencies that the applicant will need to obtain approvals from, you know, and those sometimes require, you know, the applicant to come back and seek an amendment to the application if it's necessary. So there's a lot of hurdles that we have to go through and the idea of having both the preliminary and final, even if it's subject to multiple conditions, I think is helpful for the applicant moving forward with obtaining other permits and approvals. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. Why don't we just hold that consideration until after -- until a bit later and see -- actually, let's take -- if we were

1 to approve to the Board with that, maybe it's
2 worth going through the conditions a little
3 bit and see how -- how those would look or
4 stack up or line up and what the resolution of
5 those conditions are and maybe that will give

7

12 think perhaps if maybe the Board members have conditions. There may be some that I've missed, you know, and there may be some that people haven't thought of. So if we have a discussion together, I think, before I just rattle off conditions, I think that -CHAIRMAN HANDS: That was not my

1 intent.

11 people said that may be a condition or
12 suggested a condition.
MS. MAZIARZ: Sure.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Or I could just
stop at this point and allow the Board to speak and thoughts. I think we've got a general idea of some of the concerns that have been raised. Obviously the remediation is a big one and monitoring. I think a monitoring plan is a big one. Obviously there's jurisdictions outside the Board. It's more DEP relevant. However, we talked about a remedial investigation to be completed at some point. And I think some of the landscaping and lighting plans have been updated

1 sufficiently. So any package -- then, you
2 know, the grading, I know the retail building.
3 I'd like to think about that a little bit
4 further.
5 The architect, sounds like we're
6 moving in the right direction there. I
7 appreciate Bob and Frank for their review and
8 general acceptance of Liz's memo, so I
9 appreciate that.

11 outside the retail building, there's that
12 additional seating area. I know we modified 13 and updated that.

I had a list of a few things; but before I rattle off any further, how about we just now open to the Board to think about fundamentally, you know, I guess, to approve or not. And, if approved, is that then any conditions that should be applied or not? And if there were to be some, what would they be? And then finally determine if the approval

1 would be final -- preliminary and final
2 together or separate between preliminary
3 approval, site plan approval, and final at a
4 later date, making -- assuming that a later 5 date is not onerous to anybody.

6

7

That's my couple of minutes. Who wants to jump in and give some thoughts or comments?

MAYOR RAE: You know, David, if you want, if you don't mind, I'll lead off just with my thoughts on the application over the meetings that we've sat -- that we've been through over the last 11 -- the last 11 meetings.

And I think Jolanta makes a good point, right? This is probably the biggest application that this Board has heard in its present format and it's an important one because it really shapes the -- the Town of Millington and, to a certain extent, you know, maybe sets the tone for the whole township, right. I mean, I think about people coming in and out on the railway there, they work -- the get their impression from what they see out the window.

11 you know, we'll be living with this plus, you
12 know, it's a progeny, let's say.
And so whatever I -- as we've
been -- as we've been listening to the
professionals from -- from both sides and we've been listening to the input from our residents, and I think there are three things that have come over quite -- quite clearly as concerns, right, and certainly in my mind, there could very well be more, but three certainly -- certainly squared with me.

The first was this whole idea of remediation, right. And there is a -- it's -it's extremely important to everyone. And, you know, again, the Town doesn't have

1 jurisdiction; DEP does. And there's an LSRP
2 process. And it's really asking everybody to
3 kind of put their faith in governmental
4 entities and agencies. And I think there's --
5 I think not everybody's prepared to do that
6 nowadays for a right reason or not. They do
7 want to see some kind of oversight.

8

9

10

11

12
13
14

And so one of the things that I would -- you know, apart from all of the conditions that the applicant has already agreed to, as far as -- as far as the remediation is concerned, I think there's -- I hope that they would be amenable to working with someone from the Town, whether it be an LSRP or an environmental scientist. We could -- we could work out what the -- what the appropriate qualifications would be, but we would -- we would like to have kind of somebody in the Town's corner who is -- who is able to communicate back to the Town and to the residents to say, yeah, this is -- this is -- this is appropriate. Things are -things aren't being overlooked. Things aren't being kind of swept under the proverbial carpet. So that would be one thing where the

1 applicant would definitely work with an
2 individual there and there would be ample
3 communication with the residents.
4 The second one is the -- is the look
5 of the buildings. And I think especially at
6 our last meeting, it was -- you know, the
7 residents were -- were quite vocal in their --
8 in their -- in their -- in their opinion that
9 these were really not -- don't fit with the
10 Town of Millington.
And I've lived here 24 years, right,
12 and, you know, I -- whenever I moved here, the

22 that they build in order to keep it running, it's probably a good place to live. But the way it worked, it just wasn't particularly -it didn't seem right to me.

22 we can make the actual architecture something
And, you know, here -- here we are, you know, potentially doing something the same again because there probably isn't a distinct sale within -- within -- within the town -the Town of Millington. But the way that this particular thing is set -- this particular development is set up, it's -- it's -- it's really not seen anywhere within the -- within the town and $I$ think it's out of place.

And I hope that as part of what we can do, we can actually, as a -- as a Board, we can -- we can work with the applicant and through our planner's memo to work out some conditions that are -- that are workable, because I'm against obviously -- I've ruled against it before. I'm against this whole idea that we get a self committee together and we work on it because $I$ don't think it serves the applicant's interests and it doesn't serve ours. But I hope that we can somehow or other fashion conditions, and I believe we can, that which seems more common in Millington.

And then $I$ think -- the last and final thing I'll say is the fact that it's the

1 amount of fill -- and I think it's on
2 everybody's mind -- that's being brought into
3 this -- that's being brought into this area.
4 And I think the applicant can't be blamed for
5 it, right? They wanted to make this as a --
6 they wanted to make this job as easy as
7 possible for themselves and so they brought in
8 this huge amount of fill, flattened it, and
9 decided to -- and decided to build on that, on
10 that flat surface.

12 landscape there beside the -- beside the
railway station which is absolutely not in
14 keeping with the village, and that's something
15 that -- or with the Town of Millington. And
16 that's definitely my -- I think my biggest
17 problem with -- with -- with the plans as --
18 as written.
engineer has proposed somehow or other some
21 kind of regrading there that makes it
22 certainly, you know, whenever you walk along
23 Stone House, it makes it more -- it makes it less imposing and more of the streetscape that we envisioned whenever we talked about this --

1 this ordinance.

3

4 come back as much as we can to that. And I realize that there are reasons why we can't just do that. There has to be some grade in there, but we should keep that to an absolute minimum.

So there is -- those are the three things that I've -- that I've -- that strike me about the application. I'd like to see -I'd like to see it discussed and get -- and perhaps change.

And, you know, the only other -- the only other thing is, you know, to get back to the question of preliminary versus final, this, you know, as I said at the beginning and

1 Jolanta said, this is one of the biggest
2 things that we've worked on. It's the biggest 3 thing, I think, that we've worked on and it's 4 important.

6 I'm thinking about, not what everybody else is
7 necessarily bringing to the table here
8 whenever they talk about the application, I
9 certainly would like to see -- you know, be
10 able to see the plans again before giving the
11 final approval once we've -- once we've kind
12 of taken everything and that we've put it

1 kick off with that. And thank you for
2 allowing me to.

3

4
5
6

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Brendan, I think you obviously put a lot of thoughts together and really very relevant categories. So thank you for that. Appreciate it.

Anybody else want to jump in?
Dennis?
BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: I'd like to concern -- talk about the fill issue a little bit more. Our engineer has proposed reducing the fill by as much as 3 feet at the southwest corner. To me that's inadequate.

He states that the entire site should be held to a 5 percent grade. Well, 5 percent grade taken from the northeast corner to the southwest corner is 5 percent of about 750 feet, which is 37 feet, which is about the total extent of the fill that is proposed. We can do nothing on that site and still have an average grade of 5 percent.

The problem is the 5 percent grade is not linear from corner to corner. It's much more pronounced at the southwest corner. But, nonetheless, as many of you know, I've

1 got a three wheel electric scooter which many 2 of you have seen when $I$ take it out on the 3 streets and I can negotiate the existing slope 4 with that scooter.

Now, the ordinance on fill permits goes on to say that if a site plan is involved

1 and a site plan is approved by the Board, then 2 that stands in the place of a fill permit.

3 But to the extent that the approving authority
4 within the ordinance has no guidelines as to
5 how much fill is permitted, then I would
6 suggest that the Planning Board, taking over
7 the role of approving authority for the fill
8 permit, likewise has no restrictions on how
9 much fill it can permit or not permit. That
10 would leave it up to the applicant to explain
11 in great detail why it needs that much fill
12 and the only explanations that I have heard to

15 that. As I said, the 5 percent slope which
16 we're targeting would not require any fill at
17 all. I'm willing to compromise somewhat on
18 the amount of fill that is required, but we
19 need more testimony as to just what is required for accessibility. Does the accessibility extend from corner to corner of that site or does it only apply to getting from your car into your apartment on a micro level rather than on a macro level?

We have not heard that testimony.

1 We have not heard any indication as to why the
2 fill permit should be granted to the extent
3 that it is, 25,000 yards.
4 And so I would suggest that the
5 applicant be given the opportunity to examine
6 a much greater reduction than 3 feet and
7 that's a reason for bringing it back again for
8 a final approval and letting -- just sticking
9 with the preliminary approval as the mayor has 10 suggested.

11
12

That's my major concern. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Dennis.
Thank you. Thank you for the detailed thought.

Anybody else? Victor, please jump ahead.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: All right. I would say that to me, the LSRP, having the applicant work with our LSRP is huge, safety being, you know, the utmost importance in the forefront of our minds here.

Nextly, I think that when it comes time for Millington, Millington has kind of like a warm, colonial, eclectic personality

1 about it, not a uniform kind of cold
2 personality to it. So I think that another 3 condition would be a design that more fits 4 Millington's personality.

5 And then, thirdly, my third
6 condition is definitely the height. I'm under
7 the impression currently from the sidewalk to
8 the highest point on the rooftop, we're
9 looking at, like, 70 feet. If there's any way
10 that we can reduce that height and reduce the
11 fill, as the mayor and Dennis just mentioned,
12 that would be a third condition that was of

1 a small sidewalk across the street from the 2 Prism application site and it's right there 3 under the light, just before you get to the 4 bridge on the -- I'm going to say it's the 5 south side of Stone House. So if that 6 sidewalk can come all the way down to there 7 and pick up where that sidewalk crosses Stone 8 House, that would be -- that would be great.

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: My question there, Mr. Chair, would be if you only receive preliminary, does that hold up the applicant from seeking approvals from the -- from all the other agencies that they have to go in front of? Because $I$ know we're just one small piece in the -- in the machine. So I'd like that question answered. I'm of the preliminary mindset.

MR. LANZAFAMA: The preliminary

1 approval would allow the applicant to pursue
2 his sewer extension permit and his water main
3 extension permit, which are probably his two
4 most difficult permits to get. As you know, 5 we're under a self-imposed sewer moratorium.

6 We have an INI issue. They've agreed to do a
7 downstream sewer study to help identify any
8 issues such as extraneous flows into the
9 system so that we can better assess the
10 potential impact to this development, not only
11 on our collection system, but on the treatment
12 plant as well.
So they can -- they can pursue all
14 of that under their preliminary approval.

22 remediation and demolition can be conducted under preliminary approval.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: So just for
clarification, no negative impact for the

1 preliminary site plan?

2
3
4

11 significantly, particularly in the area of the 12 fill. 22 brought down significantly to -- you know, to

MR. REGAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I might -- and Bob can jump in -- the reality is, you know, the studies that Mr. Lanzafama just talked about are going to be costly. And what I'm hearing, you know, from the Board members, you know, about preliminary approval and not final approval and then as the mayor said at the end, you know, talking about substantial changes. I mean, that concerns us

I don't -- I don't know why the applicant would go ahead and spend, you know, all kinds of money doing preliminary -- you know, the studies that are necessary based on preliminary approval knowing that it has to come back to the Board and deal with the fill issue, you know.

And from what we're hearing from one Board member saying, you know, it should be what's recommended by your engineer, where he's projecting 3 feet, you know, it's an issue that concerns us immensely and I'm not

1 sure that the applicant, you know, is going to
2 be willing to agree to that and we may
3 ultimately ask the Board to just take a vote
4 on the application as it's currently
5 presented.

6

Bob, do you have anything to add?
MR. FOURNIADIS: No. There isn't a single ancillary approval $I$ could go for because what I've heard is we're going to have to reengineer the site, come back and spend God knows how many months getting a new plan reapproved, and that's just not what we had in mind.

And as far as demolition goes, I'm not going to demolish the property during preliminary and before final because the way I hear things going right now, that building may never be demolished. I may just clean it up, put the sidewalk in on Division Avenue, and start renting it again because you're basically asking me to start all over again, which I'm not going to do.

And since you've given me the floor, just so -- in case somebody else wants to bring it up, the suggestion about the LSRP is

1 a nonstarter. The LSRP is licensed by the 2 State of New Jersey, the DEP. He is

3 essentially the DEP. That's who he is
4 responsible to to make sure things are done. 5 We cannot insert any other entity, 6 not this Board, not the Township, not an LSRP 7 you hire, to come in and peer review anything 8 that we're doing. Now, that LSRP that you 9 hire is free to file an OPRA request and get 10 everything that we file with the DEP available

11 to him and he can look at it and he can tell
12 you, yeah, they know what they're doing or,
13 no, don't trust the DEP, it's a rigged system,
14 they're changing votes, and, you know, do
15 whatever he wants. But he cannot tell us what
16 to do. He can't tell our LSRP what to do. He
17 can't tell the DEP what to do. And I'm sure
18 you ask any professional, any LSRP, they're
19 going to tell you the same thing.

22 liable for what he designs and proposes and is not going to do what some other LSRP says who doesn't have that liability because he's not the project LSRP.

So I respectfully submit that we will not accept that as a condition to this approval. I'm sorry.

MS. MAZIARZ: I don't know that anybody suggested that. I believe that what Board members are suggesting is that Prism make any reports available to the Township. They're public record anyway. And that Prism not impede any Township expert's review in any way and that there be some cooperation between the applicant and the Township.

I don't think that any Board member has suggested that any expert that might be hired, any environmental consultant that may be hired by the Township, they haven't hired anybody yet, that that person is going to dictate anything to Prism or to the LSRP. Obviously both myself and the Township attorney, I'm sure, is not going to want for the Township and will not advise the Township to take liability on itself. There is not an environmental consultant out there that is going to do that either. And that's never been -- that's never been discussed to my knowledge.

The condition that was in my mind at least while the Board members were discussing this is simply a collaborative cooperative process by which any Township consultant simply be allowed to work with your consultant. That doesn't seem unreasonable.

MR. FOURNIADIS: Well, I think it's very unreasonable because I don't know what "collaborative" means. I don't know what "work with my consultant" means. We answer to the DEP. The information that goes to the DEP can be obtained by anybody. And if they think we're doing something wrong, if they don't trust our LSRP, if they don't trust the DEP, if they don't trust the government in New Jersey, they're free to follow whatever avenues they want to address those grievances. But when you start putting language in like cooperate and collaborate, that's exactly what $I$ can't and won't do. MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. MR. FOURNIADIS: So what you're saying is absolutely true, Jolanta. And because it's true, you can do that without putting anything in the resolution. Whoever

1 you hire can get everything that we submit to
2 the DEP. There's no secrets here. And they
3 can review it. And if they want to make noise
4 to the DEP that our LSRP doesn't know what
5 he's doing, they're free to do that. We don't
6 need to put it in a resolution and I'm not
7 going to agree to it in a resolution.
discussion because $I$ think you put it very well. You stated it very well what our intention was. It was never to usurp the L -the Prism LSRP's position or what they were doing. And I think that's why, you know, I said either an LSRP or environmental scientist or -- but it was somebody who the residents at least feel is in their corner. And I think whenever you work collaboratively, it actually works to the benefit of Prism as well and -if they seem to be working collaboratively with someone from the town. And it's really to -- you know, if there are major -- major disagreements, then, sure, okay, there are avenues that the Town can pursue. Maybe or maybe not. But $I$ think in general, it just --

1 it makes everybody certainly in Millington
2 sleep a little bit easier at night knowing
3 that there's someone from the Town or who's
4 been hired by the Town just to kind of make 5 sure that everything is being done by the

6 book. Nothing's being swept under the carpet.
7 That's it. It's as simple as that.

8
9

11 whatever they do and then reporting that to
12 DEP and DEP having to come down and investigate. It leaves that whole suspicion on the part of the residents and actually makes the whole process, I think, work that much better.

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Yes,

22 unfortunately we have someone on our Board who
Actually it probably works even more
to Prism's benefit because you won't get
residents taking photographs or videos or
whatever they do and then reporting that to
DEP and DEP having to come down and
investigate. It leaves that whole suspicion
on the part of the residents and actually
makes the whole process, I think, work that
much better.
VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Yes,
Mr. Chair, I agree with Mayor Rae. It's also
applying four-eye principle, right? It's
inspecting what's being inspected. And it
removes that cloud of doubt. And
unfortunately we have someone on our Board who
is in that arena but can't be here today
because of the fact that there's a -- he had
to recuse himself for obvious reasons. So,

1 you know, we don't want to put him in an 2 uncomfortable situation. But there's value in 3 that.

6 that site. And I know you're going to hold it
7 to the law because otherwise the penalties on
8 you would be just too great. And I don't
9 think that the LSRP that they hired wants to
10 risk losing his livelihood, so he's going to
11 be doing what he needs to be doing to make
12 sure things are done appropriately.
But I think that added layer of piece of mind can go a long way.

MR. FOURNIADIS: You already have that added layer. Your LSRP can go down to Trenton and spend as much time as he wants reviewing the submissions and reviewing the files. He doesn't have to talk to us. We don't have to collaborate with him. And you already have that. I just don't understand -I've said my piece.

> MR. REGAN: And I don't want to belabor the point. Mayor, I think the Township can hire someone. We don't disagree

1 with that. And I think, you know, you have
2 every right to do that. But the idea that the
3 Township consultant would have some type of,
4 you know, oversight, access to the site,
5 cooperation, it just -- it creates liability
6 concerns, you know, for the applicant.
7
8 the LSRP, as Mr. Fourniadis said, you know, is
9 all going to be public information that can be
10 reviewed by the Township consultant. I
11 just -- I just --
12 MS. MAZIARZ: You know, with all due
13 respect, I have no idea what kind of liability
14 any of this creates. I mean, if the
15 consultant is providing reports that he is
16 submitting to the DEP anyway, why is it a big
17 deal for this person to just submit that to
18 the Township simply for the Township's review?
19 Regardless of who's reviewing it. It might be 20 just members of the public who want it on the

21 website, who just want to look at it. I don't
22 understand what type of liberty -- liability
23 that is.

1 But this is the Board's show. The Board is
2 the one who's going to make this decision one 3 way or another. The Board is going to impose 4 reasonable conditions. And I haven't heard 5 anything unreasonable yet.

8 ultimately. And I am aware of certain members 9 of the public who are perhaps not happy with 10 how this is occurring. So just for members of

11 the public, let me say that, first of all,
12 this is Board deliberation. There is no more the applicant. And the applicant is

21 discussing conditions in an as-of-right
22 application with the Planning Board. Any memoranda that come from the Planning Board's professionals is a recommendation to the Board. It is not for cross-examination. It

CHAIRMAN HANDS: No, you're good.
MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. First of all,
this is Board deliberations. The applicant is public input.

I'm sorry, is that me squeaking like that? I'm sorry. I apologize. Am I breaking up?
memoranda that come from the Planning Board's

1 is not for anybody's benefit except the
2 Board's benefit. So it can come late. It can
3 come early. The Planning Board professionals
4 have been working over the holidays, working 5 and reading and rereading all the transcripts 6 in order to be able to compile all of their

7 recommendations based on what is on the
8 record -- because they're not making this up
9 on their own -- in order to create
10 recommendations that the Planning Board can
11 use in fashioning conditions. This takes
12 time.
Our last meeting was on December 8 th so that is the reason for the Board professionals' reports coming when they did.

And, again, let me reiterate. Those reports are for the Board, not for the public to cross-examine. Not for anyone else. They are public record. They can be OPRA'd. We have put them on the website because, of course, anything produced is a public record.

And by the way, any work that professionals do on this application is paid by the escrow of the applicant and not members of the public. I just wanted to put that out

1 there just so there was no misinformation
2 floating around because I've been seeing
3 things. So that's it.

5 And thanks, everybody, for the conversation so 6 far.

7 Tom, you can now speak. I'll get to
8 you next. And then Dennis. I want to hear 9 from Tom.

11 would suggest is we mentioned having an LSRP
12 represent the town. I don't think we need a

16 environmental background because there's going to be a lot of reports coming out, the remediation report, the air quality monitoring report, health and safety plans. There's going to be plans for material coming in, the sewer line hookups. When it's all said and done, the response action plan.

That -- somebody that could take a look at those plans, read all these technical plans, and then turn around and report to the

1 citizens and residents is what we'd be looking 2 for. Whether they put it on the website, come 3 to Township Committee meetings, or just

4 report, you know, in a newsletter to people 5 what's going on. This way it will take some 6 of the fear of the unexpected away. And I 7 think it would help calm the fears of the 8 residents and their concerns about their 9 health and safety.

22 the street are 25 foot from where I am in back
So I know this is trucked-in fill,
so it's a different story from a natural fill,

1 but we are on hills in Long Hill. 11 Board to at least speak once before we all go 12 back.

Before I go to Dennis, Dennis, if you don't mind, I'd like everybody on the

Alan, would you jump in?
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Yes. Thank
you, Mr. Chairman. The opposing attorney and his professionals -- his professional, as well as our Board professionals, seem to be in agreement that the ordinance creating the overlay zone was not artfully crafted, as they put it. I certainly concur with that.

What I've learned from this application is that the Township needs to be very specific in terms of what we want and what we won't accept when we're writing these ordinances for these mixed-use affordable

1 locations.

Hopefully the Township will take the opportunity to take a close look at the other zones and the ordinance for those sites before we receive applications; but once we receive an application, the application is to be judged based on the ordinance.

Clearly Prism, I believe their application is in conformance with the ordinance as it's written. I don't believe the Planning Board can deny the site plan approval. I was in the camp after the last meeting that $I$ wanted to see a little bit more flexibility from Prism with regard to the comments that were raised.

I was delighted this evening to see that Prism has agreed to the conditions that our Board engineer's reports stated and they've also agreed with our Board planner relative to design enhancements. In my opinion, that's huge.

> What Prism is proposing is a huge improvement on what's there now. That place is a disgrace. It's been a disgrace for years. We're going to add green space and

1 landscaping where there's none now. We're 2 going to replace, hopefully replace, poorly 3 maintained and unattractive buildings that 4 will go a long way to improving the area in 5 town.

6 Having said that, I just want to
7 make an observation. I think we should all
8 consider this. These 140 units are likely to
9 be only the first of what's probably going to
10 be 400 or more if we're going to be building
11 all these to -- or allowing these to be built
12 to conform to the Fair Share Housing
13 agreement.

When prospective renters are looking to rent one of these 400 or so units, the free market is going to determine whether they like the way the place looks, whether it's maintained, and the competition that will be created in the fair market, you know, will drive Prism to make further improvements. I don't think we need to do that now.

Again, I don't think the Board can deny the site plan approval. And, further, I would support tonight approving both preliminary and final since $I$ think all the

1 conditions that are in the ordinance have been 2 met. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Jim, please jump in.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: I guess I somewhat agree with Mr. Pfeil.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: My opinion as a Millington resident, not as a Board member, because I think this whole project is a judicially imposed abomination, $I$ think it is inappropriate for that site.

However, my quibble is not with the developer who's put a lot of time and effort --

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Exactly.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: -- and spent a lot of money and essentially played by the rules. Now, I don't like the rules. My quibble is with the courts and special interest groups that are allowed to run roughshod over taxpayers of this state. I applaud the Town Council. I think they got the best deal they could playing by the rules

1 imposed by the court.

3

4

CHAIRMAN HANDS: John, thank you. Appreciate it.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: I would second what Mr. Falvey just said. I don't want to see this back here again after a court says you guys are crazy. I mean, we've done -- I think we've done as much as we can do based upon the ordinance that was written and the application that was submitted in accordance with that ordinance.

If we -- if we -- if we try to twist arms any further, this is going to wind up back here or God forbid we get a builder's

1 remedy that's happened in townships like Wayne 2 where they lost total control of the zoning of 3 a site. You know, we could wind up with the 4400 units that were originally planned for 5 this or the 200 and something units and a 6 high-rise and God knows what else. Take what 7 we've got and learn from it.

8 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Alan.

12 wanted to observe that with regard to the

16 "monitor," that would be consistent with what
17 I believe we heard the commenters from the
18 public talk about, is someone to monitor the
19 environmental issues. Perhaps that would make
20 it easier for the applicant to understand the
21 role that the residents of the town have asked
22 for.
Mayor Rae, would you go along with 11 stake, you know, with the decisions that they 12 make.

MAYOR RAE: Yeah. I mean, I think, Dennis, you know, I would -- monitor certainly is perhaps more -- more accurate, but at the same time, it's not a matter -- it definitely isn't one of those things where -- one of those relationships where the Town -- the -the -- the Town representative really has any say over the day-to-day operations of the LSRP. We all know that Prism's LSRP is in charge and is putting their livelihood at

But certainly, you know, monitoring those, as you say, is perhaps a better term and then explaining to the -- to the township -- to the township residents just what's going on and -- and -- and how things are being done.

And, you know, as I say, it's -it's -- you know, everybody wins in that situation because if we go ahead without that type of system in place, then $I$ believe that the DEP is -- you know, is basically going to be on speed dial and it's going to be -- it's going to be to the detriment of the -- of the

1 development of the site.

So, again, long-winded perhaps, but I think, you know, I would -- monitor would be -- would be a better word.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you for that. Thanks for the additional clarification.

Is it fair to say then, without belaboring this point too much more, that that type of monitoring is outside the conditions, obviously, I would think, should we place anything on the application? But it's, if you will, a request of the Township to do exactly that and to take that review, that monitoring. And as Tom mentioned, Malinousky mentioned, an engineering firm with maybe that specific knowledge, including health and safety, the air contamination monitoring program as well, presuming that information is readily and easily accessible as a matter of course and can be independently worked upon without detriment, is that something the Township would then look to do, to work arm's length with the applicant -- and I wouldn't say work with, but just arm's length with the applicant? And I presume there's recourse

1 should something, you know, be identified as a 2 problem.

3
4

11 oversee or monitor or whatever other word we 12 use.

All we're doing right now is discussing potential conditions. We've already heard from the applicant that the applicant is absolutely unwilling to accept anything. But the Board is going to have to make a decision about what this is supposed to look like. The applicant's concerns are duly noted.

Perhaps this should be something along the lines of an intermediary. Perhaps someone who necessarily interfaces with the applicant's professionals or the applicant's LSRP, but someone, after obtaining

1 documentation, reviews it, and almost, you
2 know, for lack of a better term, translates it 3 for the Township and the residents so everyone 4 understands what stage the applicant is 5 entering into, what is being done, what is 6 happening on the site to allay the fears of 7 the residents that live in close proximity to 8 the site.

10 don't know if the applicant's attorney would
11 agree to something like that. Obviously that
12 doesn't pose any type of liability for the
applicant. I don't see it.
MR. REGAN: I mean --
MR. FOURNIADIS: Frank. Frank.
Excuse me. I would just like to just remind
everybody here of one thing. Several meetings
ago -- it's in the transcripts; I'm sure
you'll find it there -- I agreed that whatever
we submit to the DEP, we would submit to
Mr. Lanzafama. And then somebody said, well,
maybe Mr. Lanzafama's not the right person to
whom we should submit it. And I said, fine,
tell me whoever it is you want it to go to to
save them having to do the OPRA process.

Now, I can agree to that as a condition, but I can't agree to monitoring. I can't agree to -- I won't agree to an intermediary. I won't agree to collaboration because $I$ don't understand why you need it. Your professional can get the documents either from me or from the DEP if he thinks or if people in the town think I'm not giving him or her all of the documents, that I'm hiding stuff. And then once he gets it, he can look at them and then he can sound the clarion call if there's a problem with what we're doing. Putting this as collaboration, cooperation, and monitoring in a resolution condition is something that, you're right, you can vote, but I will take an appeal of that. I can't live with that because it's illegal. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jolanta, let me jump in here. My intent was your view, Bob, I think. And thank you for offering documents to be proactively provided. I think where I was taking the conversation, this is more directed to the Township and less a condition of the -- to be included. Right? So if you say you're going to submit

1 documents as a matter of course, then $I$ think
2 that's essentially how we go. The other side
3 of the coin is the Township is over to you
4 then to work and do what you need to do
5 independently of anything -- any resolution
6 conditions within the potential application.

8 problem. I understand that the Board does not
9 have jurisdiction over this matter. It
10 doesn't. That's a simple fact.
MS. MAZIARZ: Well, here's the

And I do recall and I did pull those excerpts out of the transcript. I have them in front of me. I can tell you, you know, verse and -- you know, chapter and verse where it was stated. And I think that's very helpful and that's very nice that the applicant has offered to supply all of those reports and things to the Township.

However, if we don't have that written down anywhere, $I$ know it's in the transcript, if we don't have it written down anywhere, if it's not imposed as any type of requirement, it may or may not happen.

And I understand that these are public documents and $I$ understand that they

1 are reviewable and that they are obtainable 2 from the DEP, but the applicant did say and 3 did mention on the record, and I do have that, 4 that they would be provided to the Township.

Now, you know, if the applicant's attorney can provide me with some kind of explanation as to why that poses some type of a great hardship or issue or liability upon the applicant, if it's simply stated, recited in the resolution, I'll take it out. I mean, I will share the language, whatever language I come up with, I will share with the applicant's attorney to ensure that we are not imposing anything beyond what the applicant already promised to do during the hearings. MR. REGAN: As long as -- I mean, if it's consistent with what Bob just said about sharing, you know, providing the information, we have no problem with that.

MR. FOURNIADIS: It's in the resolution.

MS. MAZIARZ: I've been prewriting these conditions --
(Indiscernible cross talk; reporter requests one speaker.)

MR. FOURNIADIS: I'd like to speak. Jolanta, I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. I said I would agree as a condition to our approval that everything we supply to the DEP will also be supplied to the Township, whoever they direct us to supply it to --

MS. MAZIARZ: Right.
MR. FOURNIADIS: -- without having to go through the OPRA process. I just want words like "collaboration," "cooperation," and "monitor" in there. It's just confirming what I agreed to do months ago. Whatever we give to the DEP, we'll give to the Township. We have nothing to hide.

MS. MAZIARZ: Very good. That's -I think that's all the residents want to know and I appreciate that. Thank you. And, you know, while we discuss collaboration, we discuss an intermediary, we discuss many different things, but, you know, that really is something that is going to be dealt with after the fact. And if the Board is comfortable with imposing that as a condition, I don't have a problem with that.

I don't think that the Board was

1 looking for much more than that, actually.
2 MAYOR RAE: Yeah, I mean, actually,
3 you know, I think whatever word we used,
4 collaboration, monitor, I mean, I think what
5 you're willing to do is that -- that's
6 basically the definition in my head, right.
7 It was to do just what you were doing. Before
8 you said, no, you can go down and OPRA it.
9 Well, that wasn't -- that wasn't working with
10 us, that wasn't collaborating with us. And
11 so, you know, just the -- just that statement
12 that you'll provide them to us at the same
13 time that you're submitting them to DEP, I
14 think that certainly satisfies me. And then
15 we can -- as a Town, we can do whatever we
16 want to do with them, whether we go and we
17 hire somebody or not, whatever the Township
18 Committee decides at that point.

Does that also go to any input to the DEP from his LSRP? Would his LSRP also be bound to share everything that he submits back

```
to the DEP?
```

MR. FOURNIADIS: Well, the answer is yes. The LSRP works for me. I don't submit anything. I'm not an LSRP. But whatever our professional submits to the DEP in compliance with whatever it is we have to comply with from an environmental perspective, we will give to the Township. They're public documents. We have nothing to hide.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Thank you.
MAYOR RAE: And -- and just one -sorry. One thing I thought you were asking, Dennis, with what the DEP gives back, the answers the DEP gives to the LSRP, that correspondence will be shared as well?

MR. FOURNIADIS: Sure.
MAYOR RAE: Okay.
MR. FOURNIADIS: Yeah. Nothing to hide.

MAYOR RAE: Yep.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
Victor, were you going to say something?

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: No, I think we're all in agreement on that issue. That's

1 what I'm hearing. Am I hearing it wrong?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: No, I don't think so personally. Then all we're saying from the Planning Board now is to the Township Committee, that there's -- that's what we would support, right, asking basically do you guys accept?

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Yep.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Sounds good. Jolanta, after that substantive conversation, on some of the other points, where's the balance, if there is one, between preliminary versus final and conditions that can be monitored without them necessarily coming back for a final site plan and just put it as conditions? How do we cross that -- as we work down the list of suggested conditions, again this is assuming approval, of course, does it work going down that list and get an idea of what we're talking about and how that best fits in with final versus preliminary? MS. MAZIARZ: Certainly, Chairman. I've been going through some of the transcripts, through some of the professional reports. And $I$ think that at this point, I

1 think it's appropriate to have that
2 conversation about which of those conditions 3 the Board is going to impose, which of those 4 the Board is still uncomfortable with or, you 5 know, that still need clarification. Because 6 there are a couple of little outstanding

7 things that I picked up on. And I know Liz 8 and Mike have as well.

11 of course, is that the applicant will comply
12 with their representations and their testimony
So conditions that would usually be applied, which are applied on every applicant, before the Board, any exhibits that were provided. The applicant will comply with Township ordinances except as specifically modified by any resolution of the Board if the Board chooses to approve this application. The applicant will need to secure the approval and permits of every other agency maintaining third-party jurisdiction over the proposed development, such as, but not limited to, those agencies that are listed in the Board engineer's memoranda, as well as the Department of Environmental Protection, the DCA potentially.

Okay. Yes. And the applicant will comply with the Board engineer's comments in his report, first dated December 28th, 2020. I believe that the applicant has already stipulated that that -- the applicant would comply with those seven conditions.

The first condition references the Board engineer's memorandum that was last revised on September 18th, I believe. It's a long one. I'm trying to get up to the top. September 18th, 2020. There are certain conditions and certain recommendations in that report that have not been complied yet. The first is on page 3 under "Technical Review, Site Plan, C-1." The updating of the zoning relief table to include a waiver for tree species groups. In addition, okay, amend the plans to include all of the waivers on page 4, under $\mathrm{C}-2$, the existing conditions plan. They need to still provide a survey signed by a licensed planner -- a licensed surveyor, I apologize.

> Going to page 7, under paragraph number two, subparagraphs B, C and D, which relate to signage, that is still outstanding.

Let's see. Okay. On page 15, again under a paragraph numbered 2, subparagraph B, that references a sewer study that's still outstanding.

On page 16, under $C-9$, the lighting plan, those lighting fixtures still need to be updated on plans and resubmitted.

Also on page 20, under paragraph 0 , subparagraph 3 -- three little I's -- those are the tree planting requirements. And, in addition -- okay. And that's it for the engineer's memorandum.

The applicant has also stipulated here on the record tonight that the applicant will comply with the planner's report dated December 28th, 2020 .

Now, going back to the engineer's report, $I$ think there is still a discussion to be had with regard to the fill. Board members -- some Board members -- some Board members indicated that they would like the Board engineer to work with the applicant's engineer to come up with more of a -- I'm sorry, I apologize. Somebody's texting me. It's difficult for me to concentrate -- with

1 more removal of fill from the site. That's 2 still outstanding. We're still going to

3 discuss that. I don't think that I have a

4 handle on what that condition needs to look 5 like.

9 things. So that $I$ don't think is something
10 that we have fully -- that I haven't fully
11 understood what the Board expects the
12 condition to look like yet.
So the engineer's memo, the December 28th memo, number 4, to be continued after I get through this list so we can discuss other

The next condition, this is a general condition that we generally place in every resolution, that the applicant will replenish the escrow. The applicant has to make sure that the real property taxes are paid and will supplement escrow account as needed.

The applicant has to comply with all statutory requirements in accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law and Township ordinances for bonding and guarantees.

As Mr. Lanzafama did note in his report, there may be some guarantee or bonding

1 required for the extensive amount of fill that
2 is being brought to the site. There are also
3 site improvement performance bonds,
4 maintenance bonds, that will need to be 5 submitted to the Township.

12 discussed this a moment ago. Actually, no, we
The applicant will enter into a
developer's agreement with the Township
Committee in a form and satisfactory to the
Township attorney.
As stipulated to and agreed to on
the record, the applicant -- and we just
discussed this a moment ago. Actually, no, we
didn't discuss this. But the applicant will
provide an air monitoring plan which shall
include a plan for monitoring the interior of
the site and a plan for monitoring the
perimeter in accordance with the regulations
that are applicable to such plans and shall
further ensure that an appropriate expert is
present on the site to conduct the monitoring
as required.
I also pulled testimony from the
applicant's professional who appeared at the
first June meeting who effectively testified
in this regard.

The next condition as stipulated and agreed to on the record, the applicant shall submit its remediation plan, monitoring plans, any other health and safety plan to the Township. I believe any documentation that is produced by the LSRP to be submitted to the DEP will be submitted to the Township. And I think that we asked if -- any expert retained by the Township would not be prevented from reviewing this material. But if that is unacceptable language, then $I$ will leave it out.

Now, there were still some questions about lighting that were left over. I think that the applicant discussed dimming the lighting overnight. Mr. Lanzafama has the illumination, the total illumination, in his engineering report and it does far exceed what the Township's standard is and, therefore, the applicant does need a waiver.

Mr. Lanzafama, in his introductory paragraph in his December 28 th report, goes through the waivers that are still required. Lighting is one of them. The applicant on the record testified that they would dim the

1 lights overnight, so I think it's an
2 appropriate time at this point for the Board
3 to make a decision, perhaps guided by the
4 applicant and maybe by Mr. Lanzafama, as to,
5 you know, how dim the lights should be dimmed, 6 what level.

8 ensure that the lights will be downward
9 facing, any lights, in accordance with our
10 ordinance, and that they will be dark sky
11 compliant.

We did have an in-depth conversation

1 with their engineers. They did modify the
2 lighting plan to the greatest extent possible.
3 What we allowed them to do was have different
4 lighting levels in the parking areas versus
5 the residential courtyards. That still
6 produced an average footcandle of 2.3 , where
7 under the ordinance, after 2 (sic) p.m. we're
8 supposed to be down to . 2 footcandles.
9 In my opinion and in conversations
10 with other professionals in my office, we felt
11 that that lighting level was much too low for
12 safety reasons for this type of development.

22 opinion, we should be able to achieve that

With regard to the trees, we had a

1 conversation with their landscape architect 2 and he agreed that he would modify the

3 distribution of the trees. By that I mean in
4 our ordinance we have three different
5 categories -- Group A, B and C -- that we need
6 to choose trees from. He was going to adjust
7 the different species of trees so that their
8 distribution met our ordinance requirements.
9 So that waiver was no longer required.

MR. LANZAFAMA: Correct.
MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. Very good.
And I think that another condition that -- and I believe that $I$ heard this in testimony. The applicant's attorney can correct me if I'm wrong. But the applicant will restrict the use of the community building, that's that building with the pool, to resident use only, is that correct?

MR. REGAN: That is correct.
MS. MAZIARZ: Thank you. Because I believe that during the testimony, the applicant referenced those amenities as being accessory. So, yeah, they will be restricted to use by residents only.

The applicant also testified that parking spaces will be designated for the units, correct?

MR. REGAN: Correct.
MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. Another condition that was brought up by a Board member is adding a sidewalk from Division to River Road. And would the applicant be amenable to doing that?

MR. REGAN: I think we -- Bob, I believe we were okay with that, correct?

MR. FOURNIADIS: Yeah. Yeah, we are.

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. Thank you. Very good.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Can I chime in on that sidewalk issue?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: I understand

1 and have observed that there's a lot of foot
2 traffic coming off of River Road. Walkers,
3 dog walkers, and so on. It turns out that the
4 Stone House Road is not as unoccupied as it
5 would appear to be, and so the sidewalk design
6 has to cater to access from River Road even
7 though that's at the tail end of the
8 development. Probably -- probably also going
9 as far as the bridge. beyond your property.

MR. FOURNIADIS: All right.
MS. MAZIARZ: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Well, your

1 property extends as far as the bridge except
2 the last couple feet is the capped Superfund 3 site, but it is still a part of your property. MR. FOURNIADIS: Okay.

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. Now, going back to two big conditions. The first, the architecturals. So the applicant is -- and I know that $I$ did mention that as a condition, compliance with the planner's memorandum dated December 28th, 2020. And the condition there is that the applicant is committed to working with the Board's professionals to change the design, the architectural design, the facades, of those buildings in accordance with the suggestions in that memorandum, correct?

MR. REGAN: That is correct. I just do want to point out, you know, in the last -on the last page of the memo, under "materials," it says the building should use HardiePlank or other fiber cement siding instead of vinyl siding. Obviously the applicant would like the flexibility, you know, in working with the Board professionals to explore the use of all kinds of materials. We don't want to be required to use

1 HardiePlank, which is obviously a specific 2 manufacturer, but obviously also says other 3 fiber cement siding, you know.

5 to be locked into no vinyl. There is
6 good-looking vinyl and we think we can work it
7 into the design. But, again, it will be
8 subject to collaboration with the Town's 9 professionals.

12 initially agreed that the applicant would
13 comply with the entirety of the December 28th,
142020 memorandum, including paragraph 4, which
15 deals with the earthwork and the fill that is
16 brought to be on the site. There were a
17 couple of Board members -- there were a couple
18 of Board members who suggested -- I'm sorry, I
19 have to plug in my phone because it's dying -22 site than what was suggested by the Board's 23 engineer. that suggested that the site be reworked in order to remove perhaps more fill from the

Would the applicant be amenable to working with the engineer to remove as much

1 fill as possible without -- you know, while 2 still in compliance with ADA requirements, 3 obviously RSIS requirements. If the removal

4 of any fill is going to remove parking spaces 5 or it's going to alter pedestrian walkways, 6 then obviously it can't happen. No one has 7 looked at it. Our engineer hasn't looked at 8 it that extensively. But would the applicant

9 be willing at least to explore that
10 possibility with the Board's engineer with the
11 knowledge that the Board is not going -- is
12 not asking -- I haven't heard anyone on the Board ask the applicant to redesign the entire site, but to remove and lower the site, if it's possible, if it's possible, with the understanding that fill was brought in in order to make some of the parking, the driveways, the pedestrian accessways possible. MR. FOURNIADIS: If I could ask my attorney a question.

Frank, the language that you put in your summation has the caveat to complying with Mr. Lanzafama's suggestions and working with Mr. Lanzafama. I think if we could put that in as part of the condition, I'd be okay

1 with that. If you want to go over that again
2 for Jolanta and the Board.

3

4 know, I think conceptually, you know, the Item
5 Number 4 in Mr. Lanzafama's memo, you know, is
6 agreeable to the applicant and I think it's
7 consistent with what Jolanta just said. We
8 just -- that the extent of those changes, you
9 know, do not result in the need to redesign
10 the buildings, create excessive slopes, that
11 we have to add steps to buildings, remove
12 garages, eliminate parking, move driveways,
13 affect retaining wall height. Those are the
14 concerns we have because those go to, you
15 know, essentially changing, you know, the
16 design of the project.
MR. FOURNIADIS: And potentially increasing the cost, which you're not supposed to do on an affordable housing project.

MR. LANZAFAMA: Well, Mr. Chairman, can $I$ chime in?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Before you do that, I just want to add we have a limitation as much as 3 feet. I'll just question if we need to have that as opposed to maximum amount

1 possible. But --
2 MR. LANZAFAMA: My goal was to
3 quickly -- and I didn't have a huge amount of
4 time to study the entire site. I just quickly
5 looked at the area from Division -- the
6 intersection of Division and Stone House Road.
7 And I just moved across that one section of
8 the site and I was easily able to lower
9 Building Number 6 by 3 feet.

11 at the entire project, there might be the
12 ability to lower it even further. And as

15 architecture of the building. If anything, to
16 eliminate retaining walls and to make sure
17 that the site was still ADA compliant. And
18 those were our goals.
19 And Mr. Sandow, I know, had
20 indicated that he can maneuver the site with
21 his motorized scooter. However, the DEP and
22 the building code requires that any walkway
23 that's over 5 percent be classified as a ramp
24 and certain additional elements have to be
25 installed such as handrails and things of that

1 sort.

2
3

4

11 of 12 to 15 feet on that side of the site. If
12 I can get that down or if the applicant's
So we wanted to try and avoid that and we still want to make sure that all of the first floor apartments are ADA accessible as required by building code.

So I think we can achieve the goal of reducing the fill, lowering the buildings. I don't believe that we're going to eliminate the fill on the southwest corner of the site completely. We have fills in the neighborhood engineer can get that down to, say, 8 feet or 9 feet, I think that's a huge accomplishment and I think that would save the applicant a huge amount of money in having to bring fill in and reduce the potential impact on the community because it's that -- that many less trucks that need to come to the site. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. With that -BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: My concern here is that the language of Recommendation Number 4 says "as much as 3 feet." That means 3 feet or less. So what I propose to do -what $I$ am proposing is that 3 feet would be an

1 absolute minimum amount of reduction and a 2 reduction of more on the order of 10 feet 3 would make that retaining wall issue a lot 4 less concerning than it is now. But as much 5 as 3 feet is not enough.

6 MR. LANZAFAMA: What I was trying to
7 point out in my memo was what I was able to
8 accomplish in the short period of time that I
9 had to review. It was not my intent to limit
10 them to just 3 feet of reduction. If we can
11 achieve more, I'm sure the applicant would be
12 happy to see that happen and still make sure

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Mr. Regan has agreed that he would -- Mr. Regan has agreed with the phrase "as much as 3 feet," so he has to agree to something a lot more aggressive

1 than that. 11 that's what I'm trying to do now.

MS. MAZIARZ: Well, that's why I left that out. That's why I wanted to talk about it at the end and just not leave it in the middle. I wanted to amend paragraph 4 as a condition.

What I could do is that the applicant will comply with 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7, those paragraphs from the report, and not 4, and we can fashion our own Number 4. And

So I think that Mr. Lanzafama's suggestion that we leave it as to the greatest extent possible so long as it doesn't alter the positioning of any buildings, garages, pedestrian walkways, doesn't eliminate parking. It does not cause the applicant to have to expend substantial costs in order to do this.

And also that it doesn't impede or go against any rules or regulations for the remediation of the site. Because we also have to keep in mind that there's a possibility, and I don't know that this is true or not, that the LSRP or that the regs will require

1 some fill for this site. So we can't lose 2 sight of that. Because if that comes into 3 play, then the applicant is not going to be 4 able to reduce it as much. So I think that to 5 the greatest extent, understanding that there 6 may be circumstances which will dictate that 7 they will have to have fill.

MS. MAZIARZ: Oh, absolutely agreed.
Absolutely right, Mr. Sandow. I'm going to have to figure out a way to write that. So when I'm talking about additional costs, I'm talking about costs that would be -- that would -- well, obviously the cost, any cost,

1 would have to be offset by a savings. But any
2 additional cost to the applicant once we
3 reduce the savings of the fill, anything
4 that's substantial, which might require some,
5 I don't know, redoing of parking areas or
6 something else on site that's going to cost
7 more money than it's saving them, is probably
8 what I'm trying to say, would be --

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: The difficulty that I have with even using the word "cost" is that that can be played either way in later

1 discussions. I think the use of "cost" in your resolution is unnecessary. I think good engineering will always result in a reduced cost. We don't have to say that. MAYOR RAE: I -CHAIRMAN HANDS: I agree. MAYOR RAE: I would agree with Dennis. And just one other thing, and, Jolanta, this may be, you know, completely unnecessary, but in the resolution that it would -- that whatever is done, whatever amount of fill is reduced, has to meet -- has to be to the satisfaction of Mr. Lanzafama.

MS. MAZIARZ: Yes, absolutely. No. That, yeah, any -- any condition that requires engineering reviews will be to the satisfaction of Mr. Lanzafama and any condition in the application that has to do with the planning aspects will be to the satisfaction of Board planner, Liz Leheny. MAYOR RAE: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. Victor, please jump in. BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I'm sorry, I may be batting out of order here. But we're

1 talking about costs, unperceived costs, and, 2 you know, moving soil. At one point we had 3 mentioned some type of bond that the applicant 4 would be responsible for putting up so that 5 they just couldn't walk away from this project 6 should they deem, you know, midway through 7 that it's too expensive, the remediation is 8 more than they originally anticipated, and, 9 you know, they decided to just stop and walk 10 away with it and leave us all in the bag.

I thought we discussed or mentioned at some point some type of bond.

MS. MAZIARZ: Well, there are a couple of different types of bonds that can be required. The ordinance prescribes a bond for fill and excavation, I believe. I think I -yeah, I did see that. That is in Mr. Lanzafama's report. There are also bonding requirements that come right out of the Municipal Land Use Law that were codified into your ordinance. So there are performance bonds. They are -they are now the new safety and stabilization bonds that developers may be required to submit and then there are maintenance bonds

1 that are submitted after the fact. Now, these bonds are -- they're prescribed by the Municipal Land Use Law and by other laws, by your ordinance. It's not something that's within the Board's purview. This is something that is going to be enforced eventually by the Township and the Township Committee because this developer is being required to enter into a developer agreement with the Township Committee. And that developer agreement, once it goes to the Township Committee, will have all of those requirements in it. So this really isn't for the Planning Board, per se. It's really for the Township. So that will happen.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Thank you for that point of clarification.

THE REPORTER: Excuse me. I'm going to need a break. We've been going over two hours.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: So how about we do that. 9:45 we can return. I have some additional comments on the retail building and on the fill again. So, yeah, at 9:45, please.
(Whereupon, a recess is taken.)

CHAIRMAN HANDS: To continue, Jolanta, you had been toward, I think, the end of your conversation or suggestions and conditions. I did have a couple of things, but I'll wait until you continue on.

MS. MAZIARZ: I think I'm done.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Is that right?
MS. MAZIARZ: I am.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. I still want to discuss the retail building as well. But before that, can $I$ just clarify a couple of points? I know this is back of the envelope, Mike. You were sort of sketching out a thought. Above and beyond the three things, you rattled off some different numbers, 10 feet and stuff. This is back of the envelope, I know.

But just in my mind, where do you -do you go beyond that 3 foot amount? MR. LANZAFAMA: I'm sorry, I didn't quite get the whole question. I think you're asking me how $I$ arrived at that number, is that --

CHAIRMAN HANDS: No, no, no. Sorry. Let me just clarify my question again. A few

1 minutes ago as we were doing this, you started
2 to do back of the envelope that we could get
3 above and beyond 3 feet and you said something
4 more 8 feet or so. I don't want to hold you
5 to anything --

MR. LANZAFAMA: No, no. What I was saying was that when $I$ looked at their cut and fill plan, the area on that southwest corner is they're indicating fills between 12 and 15 feet roughly.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Right.
MR. LANZAFAMA: And $I$ was saying if we could get those numbers down to about 8 feet, I think that would be a huge accomplishment.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: You're talking about 5 to 7 feet possible.

MR. LANZAFAMA: Correct.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: At least that's what you're suggesting right now. Thank you.

MR. LANZAFAMA: That's why I felt that the wording of "to the greatest extent possible" is more appropriate because I can't be certain that $I$ can get it down by 5 or 7 feet.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to frame in my mind what that number was.

The other thing I wanted to just confirm, we talked about the LSRP documents to be provided and maybe correspondence. So all correspondence going backwards and forwards from the LSRP to the State, et cetera.

You used the word "air monitoring plan." Can I just clarify, does that still fall under the LSRP, air monitoring plan?

MR. REGAN: I don't believe that it does, Mr. Chairman. That was not my recollection.

MS. MAZIARZ: No.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Air monitoring
plan, even if it doesn't fall under DEP, would it be the same -- would it take the same condition, to provide any information to whoever the Board -- the Township appoints?

MR. REGAN: Yeah. I think -- I
think Jolanta had touched upon that in terms of environmental. I mean, the air monitoring, you know, is going to be dependent, I think, you know, is going to be tied into

1 particularly the demolition and clearance
2 activities. But, yeah, I mean, whatever
3 reports are generated by any of the, you know,
4 professionals involved in the remediation and
5 the demolition and clearance, I believe Bob
6 had previously said we're fine with sharing 7 that information. reports only. That's the point.

MS. MAZIARZ: Right. And I did have that in one of my conditions. I have it as Number 10, but not that that means anything to anybody because I haven't circulated these, but I will.

I have that. That any air
monitoring plans, because as I understand and I reread that part of the transcript where the applicant's professional, well, the LSRP, when he testified, he testified that he was not the professional that was going to be monitoring any air monitoring plan or implementing any air monitoring plan; that that would be a different entity or contractor. And so in that condition, we request that they provide

1 any -- any remediation plans, health and 2 safety plans. Any plans that are prepared for 3 the site, whether for demolition or 4 remediation, be submitted to the Town. And 5 the applicant $I$ think agreed to that. And I 6 believe they agreed to it on the record as 7 well. I pulled a couple of excerpts from that 8 transcript and I believe that they did. 9 CHAIRMAN HANDS: And then all 10 correspondence with any agency with the DEP, 11 correct? generally put that in the condition, where they're required to get any outside agency approvals, they're also required to submit those outside agency approvals to the Township for our records.

1

2 5 building. I know we saw some other suggested

6 plans for what that retail building could look
7 like, a little bit more expansive than what
8 you have right now. I'm just asking just the
9 Board right now. Does anybody -- I would like 11 building to tie in more to the neighborhood, 12 more to the corner, more to the town, more to

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. One thing still in my mind at least, I know we talked about the retail building. I know you finally provided revised plans for the retail to see a little bit more with that retail Millington. And we saw some plans from Mr. Kaufman.

Is anybody inclined to discuss or wish to consider more to the retail building? Alan, do you want -- Dennis.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: I would just like to agree. I think a change of style would be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Alan?
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: I think we went
down that path and they did change the style.
I think the biggest thing that $I$ saw from Mr. Kaufman's submission was a second floor.

1 And I know from testimony long, long ago, that 2 the applicant doesn't have a plan for one -- for single floor apartments. So that's out as far as I'm concerned.

I think they did a credible job listening to the concerns that were voiced a long time ago and made architectural changes. And I think it's fine as is.

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I concur with Mr. Pfeil.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Anybody -- just so I'm on record, I prefer the -- I actually prefer the original retail building, which is more towards what Mr. Kaufman has, you know, sketched out. So I had a preference to the original building even though the revised is currently shown. Just making my point clear.

Anybody else?
BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: I'm fine with the retail building that was resubmitted when we asked for it.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Anybody else?
BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I like the revised version. I'm with Mr. Pfeil on that. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Sorry, Victor, you

1 broke up. Can you just repeat? Victor, are 2 you okay with the revised version? I think 3 he's frozen.

22 and final where there's a consequence to doing
MR. FOURNIADIS: I could have sworn he said he liked it.

MS. MAZIARZ: I think he did.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: I wonder why. I'm sure you did.

Victor, is that true?
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Good
translation.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: So nobody else had any comments about the retail building?

MAYOR RAE: No.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: No.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. With
everything said, Jolanta, you went down that list of potential conditions and we obviously have to see, you know, still whether that's all true with them or agreeable, do you see anything under discussion between preliminary this all -- to doing them both as one or --

MS. MAZIARZ: It's really up to the Board. I mean, the Board -- if the Board

1 believes that, you know, the Board and the 2 applicant would benefit from another -- you 3 know, another trip back to the Board before 4 final for final approval, the Board can -- you 5 know, I understand that the applicant did 6 request both preliminary and final, but boards 7 are empowered to grant or deny that which they 8 believe is appropriate. If the Board believes 9 preliminary itself is appropriate, then that's 10 a perfectly reasonable stance to take and the

11 Board can grant preliminary if the Board is
12 inclined to grant this application.

21 them. They're going to be public record. You 22 know, everyone in the public is going to be able to view them, but the Board will not be able to approve them because, you know, they will have been sort of approved after final.

It's a little bit of a nuance, $I$ think, because the conditions still have to be complied with regardless. Even if you grant final today, they still have to comply with the conditions. I think the only difference is you don't get to see them as a Board again. And I think hearing the applicant, the applicant's concern was coming back to the Board and having another 12 hearings. I think that's what the applicant's concern is.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay.
MAYOR RAE: What if we cap the meetings at 11 for the next one?

MS. MAZIARZ: You want to cap -- you want to make that a condition on any approval, that final approved is capped at 11.

MR. FOURNIADIS: So long as we do it over one weekend.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: There you go.
MS. MAZIARZ: That's it. One
weekend. That's all we get.
MAYOR RAE: You know, David, I mean, I think that's -- I mean, personally speaking, it's kind of, as I say, you know -- I said in the beginning, this is the most major -- this

1 is the first major application that this
2 Board's heard as we're currently constituted.
3 I mean, I think next year we're going to be
4 pretty much the same group. So, you know, I
5 think it would be -- it would be good -- I
6 would like to see -- I would like to have one
7 more look at it in its entirety. And so I
8 would be more inclined to go with preliminary
9 and just be able to kind of, you know, one
10 more look at everything. Because, you know,
11 these -- especially the design -- the
12 architectural changes, I'd like to see just
13 what was agreed to and how they were agreed to
14 as well as the whole thing and -- as well as
15 the whole discussion on the fill. I'd like
16 to -- I'd like to have some kind of a -- an
17 idea of just how far we went and satisfy
18 myself that we went as far as we possibly can
19 because that's a -- that's a -- that's a big
20 issue for me.

22 maybe I'm kind of, you know, come late to it my mind because the massing along -- along

25 Stone House is still -- even if we manage to

1 reduce it, the fill, that goes some way to
2 satisfying my -- my -- the issues I have. 22 ordinance, was poorly written, let's fix it

But, you know, would there be any possibility to move the buildings back a little bit? Right now it's 20 feet. Maybe move them back 10 feet or whatever just to -just to, you know, make that maybe a little bit more visually appealing? I don't know whether anybody else has that same, you know -- shares that issue with me, but I just throw it out there for the Board's consideration.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
Alan, jump in. Yes.
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: A couple of
comments. One, with regard to the building setback, they're conforming to the ordinance. If we wanted bigger setbacks, we should have written them that way. And hopefully we'll be able to revisit some of the other zones, as I said before. If we think this one, this for the next time.

The other point I want to make is that when we -- when we -- when we went out to

1 look at changing our professionals, I think
2 universally we felt that we needed a stronger
3 group of professionals. We went through a
4 process and we selected two outstanding firms
5 and they've -- they've spent a lot of time,
6 they have a lot of wisdom that this Board just
7 frankly doesn't have, and they made some
8 recommendations.
9 I think at some point, we've got
10 to -- we've got to let this go and say we
11 believe in the engineering professionals,
12 Casey \& Keller, and, you know, we believe in

22 anybody off, then I'm willing to keep it until -- until later.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: No, go ahead, please.

MAYOR RAE: Okay. I mean, I think, you know, we're all familiar with how -- or many of us are familiar with how this ordinance was shaped. Right? It was -- and I think, as I said earlier, the idea was that there would be more kind of -- or less scale, right, certainly along Stone House and maybe Division. And we never -- I don't think we ever envisaged what has actually come to pass where we would get this huge amount of fill and flatten the site completely and build. That was just something that certainly wasn't on my mind and I don't think it was in any of our minds. Right? And so whenever we say, yeah, the applicant has complied with the letter of the -- with the -with the letter of the ordinance, that may be true, right, but they didn't comply with the spirit of it.

And I know that Mr. Fourniadis was a
frequent visitor to our PB meetings around that time and certainly $I$ would imagine, knowing how diligent he is, he certainly probably reviewed the tapes. And so I think -- you know, I think that that -- how we

1 viewed the ordinance and how it came to pass 2 was very -- is known to the applicant and was 3 known to the applicant.

5 working together because we're going to be --
6 we're going to be colleagues, neighbors,
7 hopefully friends for a long, long time, and
8 so I think that's really in the -- you know,
9 it's in that vein that these -- that certainly
10 my comments are made.
11
12 Alan, you were chairman at the time. You --
13 you -- you -- you shared, I think, the
14 sentiments that $I$ just stated and let's try
15 and, you know, work together as best we can to
16 get a product that at least we're reasonably
17 happy with. None of us may be entirely happy
18 with it, but at least reasonably so. And
19 those -- you know, the reduction of the fill
20 and whatever we can do to make that better,
21 plus maybe a setback. It may not be possible.
22 It may not be something that anybody feels is
23 important, but $I$ just think it's worthy of a discussion and worthy of consideration by the applicant in the vein of working -- working

1 with the Town, a town where, you know,
2 hopefully there's going to be a long and happy
3 relationship with.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you, Brendan.
By the way, I think I echo your sentiments. I think the difference of 3 feet to maybe 8 to, you know, 5 to 7 feet, that's material. That's material. And I think I would like to see that.

Dennis, please, go ahead.
BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: I am concerned
about the fact that if we grant final now and leave it up to the professionals, the public will not see another set of plans. All they will see some two, three, four, five years from now is construction beginning and they will not have seen the plans that reflect these final adjustments that are made by the professionals, not that $I$ look forward to having another hearing and going through another debate about the result of those final plans. I think it would be well to have an opportunity to put the final plans on the table for the public to see before construction begins.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you for that.
Anybody else?
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: However, the risks of only granting preliminary site approval, in my opinion, the risks far outweigh the benefits. You're not going to get -- you're not going to get much more than our planner and our engineer have already -have already suggested and we've agreed upon. You're just not going to get it. If you wanted more setbacks, we should have written that three years ago. We didn't. So let's learn from that.

But this project is approvable in its current form and I hate to see this come back to us in a court mandate to say you've got to approve this or, God forbid, you know, bypassing this Board in favor of a builder's remedy. The risks are way too high in my opinion. Let's just end this.

MS. MAZIARZ: Mr. Pfeil, if you're granting an approval of preliminary or final, it's still an approval.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: But granting

1 preliminary and final and letting the details
2 --

3

4

11 not -- but you're not -- you're not granting
12 it to the satisfaction of the applicant.
MS. MAZIARZ: Well --
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: And I don't see -- and I don't see what is going to change between now and -- and a final site approval. You still have an ordinance that they have to comply with and, in my opinion, they've complied with it.

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. Well, of course. That's what the Board is deliberating upon right now, so...

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jolanta, may I ask, are we able potentially to put the final contingent only on one or two points, e.g.,

1 architectural design and fill?

MS. MAZIARZ: Well, no. I mean, if you're going to grant preliminary and final, it will be subject to the conditions that we have already articulated --

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Not preliminary and final. I said preliminary. MS. MAZIARZ: Oh, preliminary. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Preliminary and with the notion of what final means. Is it just a review of very specific points, i.e., architecture and fill?

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. Generally final approval, for lack of a better term, is a rubber stamp. Once an applicant has complied with the conditions that were imposed at preliminary -- and some of those conditions obviously can and do survive final approval, such as, you know, they'll be dimming their lights. They're not only going to be dimming their lights for a few months while working on getting final approval, you know, they'll be dimming their lights forever. And that condition will survive a final approval. But for the conditions that need to be satisfied

1 before final approval, such as coming up with 2 the architectural design so they can come up 3 with the architectural plan, that has to be 4 done before final obviously.

5 And if you do grant final, they're 6 still going to have to do that but, as I said 7 before, it simply won't come before the Board 8 again. It will -- as other Board members have 9 mentioned, it will simply be done after the 10 fact. And, no, the public will not have an

11 opportunity to opine on it.
what conditions are, things that they still have to comply with and complete, if there are

1 things that you want them to do, then
2 obviously they're going to have to do that
3 after preliminary, but you're not going to be
4 able to come up with new things as a result of
5 looking more into the zoning ordinance or
6 whatever it is. You're not going to be able
7 to impose new conditions on them post final.

9 question.

11 leads to the question of the consequences,
12 right. So, for example, if you said
13 architectural standards -- or the
14 architectural design, rather, and we allow Liz
15 to work with -- you know, with the applicant
16 and they came up with something that they feel
17 comfortable with, if it comes back as a
18 condition for final, what's the -- what's
19 the -- what's the leeway that we have at that

MS. MAZIARZ: I think it's somewhere
in the middle. You know, it's -- you know, I don't think that after they are complying with these conditions, after our Board

1 professionals are relatively satisfied with 2 what's going on here, I don't think that, you

3 know, you get to redo the entire architectural
4 plan when they come back for final. I don't
5 think that can happen.

7 suggestions at that time? Small suggestions;
8 you know, things that are, you know, kind of
9 minimal and still within the same vein, same
10 parameters that were established for
11 preliminary. Because, look, some of the
12 parameters being established for preliminary
13 or for any approval for conditions that we've
14 been talking about, you know, are a bit
15 subjective. The applicant understands that.
16 The applicant agreed to them. But they are a
17 little bit subjective. That's why, you know,
18 the applicant is not able to work on them on
19 their own, but they will consult with the Board's professionals because they are a little bit subjective. They are subject to a little bit of interpretation, artistic interpretation, I think, if you're dealing with architecture.
So in that -- in that respect, can

1 the Board redo the whole thing? No, when they
2 come back for final, because they're working
3 within the parameters that you're setting
4 right now.

8 overlooked, great idea, you know, something

5

6

A couple of suggestions?
6 Absolutely. If the applicant's amenable, if
7 it's something that maybe was perhaps 9 that doesn't change it too much, then $I$ think that would be acceptable and I don't think the applicant would really object to something like that. But it really has to be that minor and working within those parameters that we've established.

Now, if the Board -- and there are certain Board members who might be concerned, the Board might establish a subcommittee to work alongside our professionals, perhaps two or three Board members that could review this also in conjunction with the professionals.

The Chairman and the Board are entitled to form any types of subcommittees that they need. The Municipal Land Use Law actually, you know, recognizes that there may be subcommittees of this type to assist and to

1 help in reviewing applications and perhaps 2 design like this.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: The thing is, how can this be discussed, if at all, and make sure everybody has a final look into what these plans, in this case the architectural plans and the fill? How do we have a final look into that if we don't -- if we grant final tonight as well.

MS. MAZIARZ: Well, if you grant
final, then the Board is not going to have a final look. I mean, the Board might also -after final approval, the Board might also appoint a subcommittee of the Board, of Board members effectively, to work with the professionals. And that subcommittee can come back and make reports to the Board about what's going on and how these conditions are being complied with. I mean, if the Board is satisfied with something like that, that can also be done.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Then it's between preliminary and final but still give the opportunity to get some visibility to what those plans are, particularly architectural

1 and fill.

11 some -- one person or the Board is going to
12 have to make a decision on the plans; otherwise, there's no construction permits.

MS. MAZIARZ: Absolutely true,
Mr. Sandow. Until the conditions have been complied with, whether it's via preliminary, final, it doesn't matter. Even if the conditions are being complied with as a result of any final approval, the Chairman and the Board secretary are not going to sign the final plans until the professionals have issued their compliance reports and the compliance reports indicate that all the conditions have been satisfied.

So nothing gets signed and they

1 are -- they do not get to apply for
2 construction permits until the plan is final.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: And that is essentially a judgment by the Board secretary or the Board chairman that they accept the final reports, final compliance reports, of the professionals. And if they -- and that leaves the judgment to them, I guess, as to whether or not they're going to accept those reports as being fully compliant.

MS. MAZIARZ: Yes. Yeah, agreed. Because it is really within the purview of, yes, absolutely, the Chairman who signs off on the site plan as a result of reviewing the compliance reports and upon the recommendations of the engineer and the planner that they're finished.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: The consequence if they don't sign off if they don't like something?

MS. MAZIARZ: If the -- if the -CHAIRMAN HANDS: If they're saying the --

MS. MAZIARZ: Well --
CHAIRMAN HANDS: If they don't like

1 it, don't sign off, what's the consequence? MS. MAZIARZ: Well, if you don't sign off, well, you know, then that becomes another issue that we may explore down the road, hopefully not. But, you know, look, while this is happening, that's why I'm suggesting perhaps a subcommittee of the Board to have a conversation with your professionals and, you know, to bring reports back to the Board on how we're doing, that may inform our professionals in their review and -- because you don't get past final -- a final-final sign-off without the professionals saying we recommend that this is finished. CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. MS. MAZIARZ: At least in terms of site plan. Because then there are other things that need to happen. But at least in terms of site plan.

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Chairman, the time --

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes, it's 10:17. Should we extends the meeting to 11 o'clock.

MAYOR RAE: So moved.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Second. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. All in

```
favor?
```

(Whereupon, a voice vote was taken; chorus of "ayes" heard.)

MAYOR RAE: You know -- oops, sorry. BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Jolanta, can you just clarify the timeline if we grant preliminary approval? Do they have three years before they come back? Can they come back at any time?

MS. MAZIARZ: The applicant can come back whenever they want. Upon granting preliminary approval, what that does is it affords the applicant a three-year period of protection from any zoning changes. So if the Township decides that they are going to change the zoning for this site, which is not likely in this case, or change any requirements in the zoning ordinance, the applicant, upon securing preliminary approval, is almost, I guess you can say, grandfathered into the old ordinance and that none of those aspects can change on their site.
So if the applicant isn't ready,

1 let's say, in three years to come back for
2 final approval because they're still working
3 through conditions or for whatever other
4 reason that they don't come back, they can
5 apply to the Board for extensions of that
6 preliminary approval for two more years. But
7 that's up to the applicant. It's not up to
8 the Board to -- you know, the Board can grant
9 those. Obviously they can ask.
But the applicant can come back in a
11 couple of months if they've worked through
12 these issues with the professionals. They believe that they have a plan that complies with the parameters and the conditions that are being established. They can come back immediately and request final as soon as, you know, they're finished doing what they said they would do.

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Are there any restrictions on what they cannot do with preliminary? Can they still go ahead with all of their planning and testing?

MS. MAZIARZ: They can do all of that. Any remediation that's going on right now, the Board doesn't have jurisdiction over

1 that anyway. All of that is going to
2 continue. The only thing that they cannot
3 do -- and obviously they can't anyway. They
4 don't have architectural plans. They can't
5 get a building permit and construct anything.
6 But they can't anyway. The architectural
7 plans aren't complete.

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: But nothing would be put on hold on preliminary with them moving forward?

MS. MAZIARZ: Look, we gave the applicant an opportunity to tell us on the record here today what exactly is going to be put on hold? Nothing is going to be put on hold. The only thing, the only thing that $I$ see, and that's only according to the definition of construction permit in your ordinance, is demolition is under the definition of construction permit. So if the Board waives that in any approval and says, look, you don't need to wait for final if you want to start demolition tomorrow if you're able to, the Board can say that in this resolution. The Board can add that. I think that the rest of the ordinance in the way it's

1 structured supports that type of an exception 2 from the ordinance, from the land development ordinance. And I think the Board can do that.

So the applicant wouldn't be precluded from doing any remediation work, any site work, demolition work. You know, the only thing they can't do is construct, at this point construct buildings, but they can't anyway.

Even if you were to grant final site plan approval tonight, they still can't construct anything until they've satisfied the conditions because until they satisfy them, you're not going to have architectural plans that are going to be able to be designed, you know, and finalized by an architect.

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Just, David, to the -- let me ask another question to Board members. Other than fill, architecture, possible setback, and I have a note on the sidewalk, and I'll leave the retail building out now, does anybody see any other areas of substantial -- you know, where they might want

1 to review any changes? Whether it be lights, 2 whether it be landscape. Or are we just 3 really focused at this point on architectural,

4 fill, in particular architectural, fill, plus
5 we add the sidewalk and I'm not sure about
6 setback. I just want to make sure there's
7 nothing else.

9 that seems to be it, David, right. But, I
10 mean, I don't know whether you're going
11 towards limiting a review of a potential
12 final, but I really don't see -- I don't see
13 the need to limit it, right, I mean, because
14 I'd like -- you know, as I say, I'd like to
15 see it, one final -- one final view of it.
16 You know, as Jolanta said, in many respects,
17 it's kind of a rubber stamp if everything's
18 been met. I'm okay with that. But I'd like
19 to see it all, right.
And Dennis made I think a really
21 important point and that is that the
22 residents, right, who you may not always agree
23 with them or the way that they express
24 themselves necessarily, but they've been
25 really very, very engaged in this, in all of

1 these -- you know, we've sat through 12
2 meetings. They have, too, and they've been
3 very engaged with it. And I think, you know,
4 we owe it to our residents for one last
5 hurrah, just say, okay, here's where all the
6 work that you've put in has taken us and this
7 is what you've achieved, right. I mean,
8 because they have been -- you know, as I say,
9 they've really been kind of partners with us.
10 They've definitely helped this process
11 immensely. could work with -- who could work with our professionals and the applicant, you know, and these three important points that you just mentioned, you know, have risen to the top, maybe that's something that we want to consider as well and that just makes it that much better. Because some of us have strong

1 opinions on certain aspects and others don't 2 share necessarily those strong opinions. But

3 I think we could work together that way and 4 feel confident, you know, whenever we do see 5 the final that it's a good work product. 22 that they've satisfied any conditions, you 23 know, in order to enable them to be more in CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. And, Jolanta, with -- if you go down

8 that sort of approach, still coming back for 9 final, but not making a -- I hate to use the word rubber stamp, but certainly not a drawn out process before the Board, with a subcommittee maybe working with the professionals beforehand, are we limiting ourselves to final to being -- or can we limit to a very specific review?

MS. MAZIARZ: I think final by its nature has to be a very specific review because the only thing that you do in final is confirm that they are in compliance with the same zoning regulations that you found them to be in compliance with during preliminary and compliance with the zoning ordinance and the design standards. I think that's all you do

1 in final, is just -- you are ensuring that
2 they've done what they said they were going to
3 do in preliminary. What the Board imposed
4 upon them in preliminary is done. And that's
5 the reason why applicants often will apply for
6 preliminary and final together because final
7 is that much of a rubber stamp. It is that
8 much of a simple acknowledgment that
9 everything that they got in preliminary has
10 been completed.

11
12
13 CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: I think that it's important to notice that the gating issue here is probably the reinforcement of the sewer system by American Water and that is very likely to take the contractual length of time, which is, I think, five years. If we grant final approval tonight, there probably won't be construction for another four or five years and that's a long time to expect the citizens who have commented to wait around and see just what they're going to get when the bulldozers start working, which is why I think a final review at some point just prior to construction start would be appropriate in

1 terms of maintaining relationships with the 2 residents who put so much into this.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay.

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. Except that if the applicant who chooses when to come back for final. So it's up to the applicant really.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Just before we go to -- turn it over to Bob and Frank, just to maybe summarize, there's many conditions that you suggested, Jolanta. Some of them are very functional, right. They have to comply with testimony, et cetera. Very functional stuff. MS. MAZIARZ: Yes. CHAIRMAN HANDS: One or two are a little bit above and beyond, like the, you know, correspondence backwards and forwards with various agencies, things like that, that's reasonably okay.

The subcommittee, if we went down that path, do we just limit that review to, I'll just use the words architecture and fill for the moment, are they able to limit that review just to those points and then they'll have final at a later point in time? All

1 being well, it's not a rubber stamp, but it's
2 not a drawn-out process at that point. 16 feet, not 20 feet. And we're not changing the

MS. MAZIARZ: Right. Well, it shouldn't be a drawn out process at that point.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Is that a fair way to summarize it?

MS. MAZIARZ: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Frank, Bob, you've heard the conversation.

MR. FOURNIADIS: Oh, yeah, I've heard it, and I thought we were going in the right direction, but now we're talking about coming back for final in four years and changing setbacks, which, by the way, is 30 setbacks. We're not redesigning the site. We're not moving the buildings further away from Stone House Road. I mean, we've agreed to everything that you've asked for. And every time we agree to it, you ask for something else, which I'm envisioning now since someone mentioned the public, that when we come back for final, we're going to have public comment and we're going to have another

1 eleven meetings while everybody is debating
2 whether the plans that we submitted are good
3 enough for Millington or whether the -- we
4 should have tried harder to reduce the site to
55 feet instead of 3 and $1 / 2$ feet. And
6 obviously you don't trust your professionals
7 because you want a subcommittee to oversee 8 their work.

11 ever going to be approved, you know, without
12 us having to go to court. Because what I'm

And one Board member is leaving I
heard at the end of this year.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.
MR. FOURNIADIS: So another Board member leaves. If somebody's not reappointed, I -- I don't know. 11 me. So I know that's not an answer to your 12 question, but frankly I don't know how to

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jolanta, how do we -- how do we --

MR. FOURNIADIS: I just don't know. I thought we had made some progress with the conditions, but now it looks like everybody wants to have more public hearings, invite the public, let them tell me how much they don't like our project or our designs and how much I'm destroying the character of Millington Village, which still no one's ever defined for answer your question, David. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you. MR. FOURNIADIS: I'm done. MAYOR RAE: I mean, Bob, if I can just say a word to one thing. I think the whole setback thing was really -- it came from me. It was a suggestion. It certainly didn't seem to get any traction with the rest of the Board. So, you know, it was a thought. It was more of a -- it was more in the vein of, you know, what do you -- is it something that would be feasible? It certainly wasn't -- I wasn't presenting it as -- as a -- as a -- as

1 a -- as necessarily a condition that had to be 2 complied with. It was more just is it 3 something that would help? So, you know, that 4 was -- I hope you didn't take that --

12 of the -- of the buildings on that

22 know, I think Board members feel -- as I said
23 before, do have strong -- strong opinions on certain subjects. And it's, like, well, if we want to have a better product at the end of

1 it, where everybody feels -- feels more
2 ownership, then perhaps we move forward with
3 the -- with the subcommittee idea.

5 of it -- I'm not looking for 11 hearings,
6 right. That's -- that -- that doesn't serve
7 any of us. What I'm looking for here is that
8 at the end of it, we can -- we can -- we can
9 present. This is -- this is -- this is -- the
10 conditions were all met. This is how they
11 were met. We're all happy with that.
12 And as I said, I think Dennis, you
13 know, was the first one to make the point. I
14 think we do have a very engaged group of
15 residents here and it -- it -- it allows them
16 to see what the final product looks like. And
17 that's -- and that's -- that inures to the
18 benefit of both the Town and you as well
19 because, again, you don't -- you don't have a group of suspicious residents who are, you

21 know, looking at everything you do and
22 wondering what it all means.
It's -- it really just goes to what
24 you had -- what you had spoken about in prior
25 hearings and I kind of warmed to, that you do

1 want to be, you know, a good kind of corporate
2 citizen here in -- here in Long Hill, and I
3 think you have been, right? I've been
4 impressed by how much you've been willing to
5 work with us. And this is all I'm really
6 looking for. It's just an extension of that,
7 of what I've seen before. It's not trying to
8 make your life or Prism's life any more
9 difficult.

11 aside, Prism will become the largest taxpayer
12 in town and that can only work to reduce my sidewalk, subcommittee. Is that something that Bob is supportive of, a subcommittee working with the professionals?

MR. FOURNIADIS: I'm supportive of Dennis.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jolanta, are we --
okay. Let's just go a little bit further from -- the discussion about setbacks is off the table now. So design, fill, must be a that as a condition of final. CHAIRMAN HANDS: I understand.

MR. FOURNIADIS: A subcommittee of as many people as you like. We'll meet with them as often as they can stand us. I'm going to get to work on the revised plans starting tomorrow, maybe even tonight. I'm going to wake up the architect and the engineer. But as a condition of final, a subcommittee, professionals, the more the merrier.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Right.
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: I suggest we go
down that route. We already -- we already -I think we already agreed that we trust our professionals. Let's -- let's get -- let's get three members of the current Planning Board and those who will be around next year to form a committee to work with them and proceed to final site plan approval tonight.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Anybody dis -anybody else, comments on that? I think that's essentially a given at this point, a subcommittee. It's a question of final versus not final tonight, if -- if -- if as a condition of approval.

Anybody else, comments?
So, Tom, without putting words in

1 your mouth, you sound like you have final and 2 preliminary tonight.

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Say again, David.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: I think without putting words in your mouth, you are along the lines of Alan of final and preliminary at the same time?

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: I would tend to agree, yes.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Victor, which side are you? Final and preliminary at one time or is it preliminary and final later?

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I'm preliminary and final later.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Okay. Brendan, which way are you still?

MAYOR RAE: I'm still the same. Preliminary with final.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Dennis?
BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Preliminary and final later.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah. John.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: Well, I think
if you only did a preliminary, I think

1 Mr. Fourniadis is going to go to court and
2 then you're going to get stuck with something
3 disgusting.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Amen. Amen.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: I don't like to think that. That's what $I$ think.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: You're preliminary and final.

BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: And to be fair, it's probably the right thing for his company. Maybe not the right thing for Millington.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Tom, where would you be on this?

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Preliminary and final later.

Was this a pre-vote?
MS. MAZIARZ: No, just polling the Board.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Just to be clear, I just want to get -- I think I do have my head wrapped around this. It's been explained enough. If we give preliminary approval with final approval later, we are giving an approval. It just has to come up

1 with -- we just get to see it one more time
2 before the final approval.

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Yes.
MS. MAZIARZ: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: So it's not going to -- it's not going to put a halt to the process. It's not going to slow down Mr. Fourniadis and his process of getting the site developed. He can give us one last look at it before we get to final approval, but he is getting an approval.

MS. MAZIARZ: Right.
MR. FOURNIADIS: And if you disagree with what your professionals recommend, then I'm back to the drawing board until the next time you disagree with what the professionals recommend.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Is that
true? Is that true?
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jolanta?
MS. MAZIARZ: Is what true?
BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: In other words, I thought -- I'm under the impression if we grant a preliminary approval tonight, it's an approval. It comes up in front of us

1 one more time, we take a look at it, the
2 public gets to take a look at it, and he gets
3 his final approval. I'm not under the
4 impression that the applicant risks going to
5 the drawing board all over again. That I
6 wouldn't be okay with.
VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Yeah, I'm not
under that impression either.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Go ahead, John.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: I was under
the impression -- let's say we give
preliminary approval pending issues with the
fill, pending, you know, setback requests,
pending architecture which you seem to be
willing to work with the Town on architecture.
So let's say he doesn't do that, he comes back
in four years and the Board then says, well,
we're not granting you final approval because
you didn't remove $X$ amount of yards of fill,
you didn't set it back. I mean, is that what
preliminary means? Like, you can start work,
but you still have to comply with a few more
things we threw in?
MS. MAZIARZ: Well, that goes -- the
same is true for final. The only difference

1 is -- you still have to comply with everything 2 for final as well. I mean, not for final, but 3 after final. You still have to comply with 4 everything that you'll have to comply with 5 after preliminary. The only difference is if 6 preliminary and final is granted today, then 7 the applicant simply doesn't have to come back 8 later.

10 concern. The applicant's concern -- and I
11 hear Mr. Falvey's concern and also Mr. Pfeil's
12 concern, is that the applicant comes back,
13 these conditions, as I mentioned before, you
14 know, the parameters of some of the conditions
15 are -- you know, they're a little bit open
16 ended, like the architecturals, the
17 architectural design. What is acceptable to
18 one person or beautiful to one person may not
19 be the same as to another person. But I think
20 that the architectural design criteria is
21 tight enough, you know, and with the change
22 from HardiePlank to something else, that, you
23 know, I think it's good enough that we have a pretty good guide.

But the fear is that the applicant

1 comes back for final sometime in the future, 2 it could be three years from now if that's 3 what the applicant chooses, it could be two 4 months from now if that's what the applicant 5 chooses, and that we are going to have many 6 hearings again and that the Board might be 7 persuaded by members of the public at that 8 point to completely change the plan.

10 happen. I can't tell you that that will not
11 happen. I will try to advise the Board at
12 that time, if the Board should grant

16 have been complied with, then final approval time, because final should not be a confused. -after --
regurgitation of everything that happened in preliminary. So, in other words, the public isn't going to get an opportunity to come out and say, no, no, no, now we're going to object, we're going to give you plans, we're going to change the whole thing. No, we're all working within whatever was imposed in preliminary. That's it.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: But that's not what you just said.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I know. I'm

MS. MAZIARZ: No. Wait. What did I

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: What you just said, I think what I heard, was that the Board could entertain other -- other points from the public and require significant changes again

MS. MAZIARZ: No, no, no. I said -I shouldn't have said "could." I said it

> BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Well, I is --

MS. MAZIARZ: Might is --
(Indiscernible cross talk; reporter

1 requests one speaker.)

MS. MAZIARZ: Sorry.
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: But "might" is risk to the applicant when the applicant -when the application he's submitted is conforming. That's what I don't get.

MS. MAZIARZ: If that's what the applicant is concerned with, then that's what the Board has to grapple with at this time, is that, yes, certainly if the applicant comes in for final in a couple of months, if the Board declines to grant final right now, might the public show up and try to redo the entire plan? Yes, they might. Might the Board allow them? Hopefully not. But might, yes, that's what the applicant is afraid of. But what I'm trying to tell the Board is that should not happen.

And the Board is going to have to review this application not like it's coming to you anew, only to the extent that the plans had to be amended in accordance with those conditions that we are fashioning for if it's preliminary, it's preliminary.

If final is granted tonight, if

1 there is an approval and it's for preliminary
2 and final, the applicant is still going to
3 have to comply with those conditions before
4 they're going to be able to do any
5 construction on the site, before they're going
6 to be able to build anything.
7
8 come back before the Board. It goes directly
9 to the professionals and then the
10 professionals sign off.
11
12 what a condition means, you know, or whether

15 choices. Either the applicant comes back
16 before the Board, the applicant goes to court.
17 The applicant has -- you know, has their
18 remedies at law and they're going to have to
19 decide what they're going to do about that. I mean, I'm not going to advise the applicant at this point. But the applicant is concerned and I think the Board should consider the applicant's concerns, obviously, and I think it's a reasonable concern given that we've been doing this for 12 hearings. So

1 understood.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
MR. FOURNIADIS: I'm not concerned about the Board reopening the entire application no matter how much the public comes in and pleads. My concern is I spend three months working with your professionals to come up with a plan, elevations that everybody loves. We bring it in front of the Board. Half of the Board members, including the new member, no, $I$ don't like it.

Then the public stands up. I don't like it either. I don't like it either. Nineteen people have been showing up for 11 months, all stand up -- because these aren't stupid people. These are very smart people. They're good people. You know, as I said many times, they're welcome to come rent apartments if we ever build this thing. Yeah, we're going to come in and complain that we don't like it. It's destroying the character of Millington Village. Okay, Mr. Fourniadis, Mr. Lanzafama, Ms. Leheny, back to the drawing board, come back in three months and we'll consider it again. And then this happens

1 again and again and again and again.

And that's very difficult to appeal
3 because I agree to it. But if I get final
4 with a condition required to be satisfied, 5 satisfy the professionals and a subcommittee 6 of the Board, that I can live with because 7 eventually you have to be reasonable. But if

8 I just have preliminary, I'm going to be here 9 forever. Actually, I won't be here forever because I'll probably be asked to leave for totally screwing up this application and not getting an approval by agreeing to things that I don't have to agree to.

You don't have an architectural review provision in your ordinance. You can't force it on me. You can't deny me because of it. You can't deny me because of the grading. And I'm agreeing to all these things now. And once I agree to them, I'm stuck with them. And I'm just going to be on a hamster wheel. And I'm not going to do that.

If $I$ don't get preliminary and final tonight, I'm not going -- I'm going to withdraw those conditions that I agreed to and take my chances in court. As you pointed out,

1 we're not getting sewer for three or four 2 years, so I've got plenty of time to go to 3 court and come back and build exactly with 4 what's in front of you today.

5 But I don't want to do that. I want
6 to give you something that you like, even
7 though you're not entitled to it. But you
8 have to be reasonable with me. And I think
9 with yourselves, too, because you don't want
10 to go through this again, but you're going to.
11 And I'm really done for the evening. I'm not
12 going to talk anymore.

22 the subcommittee. He agrees to this -- if we
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| 1 | preliminary and then final, since he agrees to |
| 2 | the conditions that he just mentioned, what's |
| 3 | the real difference? Is there really any |
| 4 | difference other than it prevents the |
| 5 | possibility of this happening another 12 |
| 6 | times? |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN HANDS: Dragging out the -- |
| 8 | MS. MAZIARZ: Yes. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN HANDS: Just so you know, |
| 10 | I'm still leaning towards that way. A |
| 11 | subcommittee, let's get it done, final and |
| 12 | preliminary. |
| 13 | BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Did I hear |
| 14 | yes? I'm sorry, did I hear yes, Jolanta? |
| 15 | MS. MAZIARZ: Yes, you're correct. |
| 16 | I mean, the only difference is granting |
| 17 | preliminary and not final is, you know, for |
| 18 | the Board to be able to review this once again |
| 19 | before you grant final. But if you're |
| 20 | satisfied, if the Board is satisfied to grant |
| 21 | preliminary and final with conditions and a |
| 22 | subcommittee, the Board is perfectly entitled |
| 23 | to do that. That's what the applicant asked |
| 24 | for. |
| 25 | BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Well, then, why |

1 don't we move forward with selecting or
2 getting volunteers for a committee and let's 3 get this to a vote?

MAYOR RAE: I mean, are we really -you know, I've heard all the posturing, right, you know, and I still think there's good reason -- look, we're not going to go through another 11 meetings here with a preliminary. We're just not. It's basically we're going to hear back, this is what it looks like, this is it. There's going to be -- we -- if -- the -the professionals are going to be satisfied, otherwise they wouldn't bring it, that everything's been done, we get to look at it. We get everybody -- the residents get to look at it and that's it. They've complied. There's going to be no more 11 meetings. It will just be -- again, it's just -- it's tying a bow around this application which has gone on for 12 meetings, right. And a lot of people are confused as to, okay, what is the final thing actually going to look like in its entirety? That's all we're doing here, is saying give everybody that last shot at doing that, tie it up in a

1 bow and let that happen.

MR. FOURNIADIS: Not true.
MAYOR RAE: And so I think
that to -- you know, to say, as Mr. Fourniadis said, hey, I'm -- if I don't get it, I'm going to court and I'm going to roll the dice in litigation and all the rest of it, okay, that may very well be what he does, but I don't think it's the prudent thing to do. You have a preliminary approval. You have a path forward. And all we're asking for here is one final. This is -- everybody, this is what it looks like, Board members and public, this is what it looks like at the end of the day. This is what you spent all those 12 meetings sitting about talking. This is it. And then you're done.

So that's what we're -- that's what we're doing. And I think -- I personally think that's important.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I do, too, but what you just said, is there any way of guaranteeing that that's what happens?

MAYOR RAE: Well, first of all, we have --

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I'm not arguing, by the way. I just --

MAYOR RAE: It's all to do with -with -- with the Board and -- and how we conduct our business. And it can be done that way that we get to review it just as I've said. No -- no going back to the drawing board. No tweaks. Nothing else. It's just this is what we have and this is what it looks like in its entirety. Everybody gets to see it. The Board members, public. We're all happy at least that we've seen it.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Okay. MAYOR RAE: And we've seen the fruits of the labor, right, because this has been a long road for us, for us and the residents. And so let's just -- let's just show everybody this is -- this is the final product. And that's all I'm asking for here. And --

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Can we put that in the resolution?

MAYOR RAE: It's just being

```
collegiate.
```

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I agree.
VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Can we put
that in a resolution?
MAYOR RAE: Sorry?
VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Can we put
that in the resolution?
MAYOR RAE: What's that? I'll
ask -- I'll ask Jolanta.
MS. MAZIARZ: Well, you know, what Mayor Rae just said a moment ago is absolutely true. It's a matter of how Board business is conducted. The Board has now heard I think for the last, what, three hours, and you talk about the same thing over and over, that final approval is not for redoing the application or redoing the architectural aspects of the application or anything else.

It is an opportunity for the Board to simply confirm -- all right? I'll use that word -- confirm that the conditions have been complied with. And upon the recommendation of

1 your professionals and perhaps a subcommittee,
2 who will make a recommendation to the Board
3 that we're done, the Board gets it done.

5 stand behind that, Jolanta? There's nothing
6 that's going to hurt -- that's fine from a
7 legal perspective?

9 future Board to, you know, how they're going
10 to behave, you know. If it's still this
11 Board, I mean, I -- you know, we've learned a
12 lot $I$ think over the last 12 hearings, you
13 know, and I think that maybe things would go
14 differently if we had this to do all over
15 again. So, you know, I have that kind of
16 faith, but I don't know what's going to happen in the future.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah, I don't know. That's the problem.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: But if you --
if you have another hearing for final site plan approval, there's nothing to prevent another group of residents hiring another objecting attorney and going through the whole process again. You can't stop that, right?

12 to their -- to their legal remedies. Once an
MS. MAZIARZ: No. Actually, at that point, I don't know what they would be objecting to. At that point, if the Board upon consideration of what it's supposed to be considering for final, that the conditions from preliminary have been complied with, I don't think there's anything to object thereto. I mean, I suppose that someone can put something on the record, but I think that what the Board needs to do at that point and what I would recommend is leave the objectors approval is granted for final, they can go and sue if they like.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: But the same thing could be accomplished by granting preliminary and final tonight.

MS. MAZIARZ: You are correct. And that --

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: And that would
eliminate the risk of potentially having, you know, a greatly expanded, you know, hearing six months, a year, two years from now and meanwhile the applicant is stuck trying to figure out what he can do and what he -- you

1 know, assuming greater risk all the time.

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I as well.
Also, note the time.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah. Can we extend to 11:30?

MAYOR RAE: Second.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: Yes.
(Whereupon, a voice vote was taken; chorus of "ayes" heard.)

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
MAYOR RAE: I mean, David, rather than go round and round, right, why don't we take a straw poll on it now and move on? Because I think we've all said everything that we're going to say on it.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: My feeling is, Jolanta, I don't know how far we can, you
know, limit or we should or should not limit a
4 final approval discussion in the future. I
5 find it difficult, but, Jolanta, unless you've
6 got a way of doing that.
MS. MAZIARZ: I don't think that $I$
do. I mean, it is -- again, as Mayor Rae said, it's part of how the Board conducts its business. Final approval is final approval. The MLUL says what it says about what final approval is. And I've reiterated it a couple of times. Confirmation that conditions of preliminary have been satisfied. That's all it is.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Confirmation. MS. MAZIARZ: It's confirmation. We're not rehearing everything. It's confirmation. It's a review and confirmation that everything's been satisfied from preliminary because preliminary approval is an approval.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Right. So let's -what's the downside? Sorry to belabor this. What's the downside --

MS. MAZIARZ: It's a conditional approval. So the downside from what I'm hearing from the applicant's perspective is reopening a hearing, having objectors and having this drag out for another, you know, six months and also perhaps having Board members themselves unsatisfied with what the professionals have presented as a final product and redoing the whole thing. That is the applicant's -- that is the applicant's concern and it's fair.

And the Board's concern, on the other hand, is not allowing the Board, the full complement of the Board and the public, to have an opportunity to view everything and have, you know, a discussion about whether or not it complies with those parameters that have been established for the applicant before granting final approval.

So that's where you are right now. CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. So let's go back then and let's poll the Board if we can. So between final and -- preliminary and final together or separate?

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Mr. Chairman,

1 maybe I make a recommendation. We go to vote 2 for preliminary, see what that says, and then go to vote for final.

MS. MAZIARZ: I would prefer not to do that. Let's poll the Board and let's come up with a motion and second. Otherwise, this gets way too confusing. Way too confusing.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. Who wants to go first?

MAYOR RAE: You know, I'm still the same. I'm still for preliminary and then final for all the reasons I stated.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yep. Alan, you're the same as you were? Alan, you're on mute. Alan, you're on mute. Alan, unmute.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Preliminary and final tonight.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. Victor?
BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: The same.
BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: From my --
from my position on the Board, I owe it to the public for them to have a final look. So I am preliminary tonight as a -- same as Brendan Rae. Same as the mayor.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Tom M?

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: I'm still

```
the same. Preliminary and final.
```

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Vice Chairman

```
Jones, where are you again on this?
```

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I'm with Mayor Rae and Committeeman Verlezza.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Preliminary tonight. John?

BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: Something's getting built there. Right now we have some say in it. We have some goodwill. You know, my concern -- look, if I was the developer, I'd be concerned having to come back here with all new people. Look, it is what it is. You know, the courts have spoken. This is the best deal the Town could cut. You know, why belabor the point. You know, preliminary and final.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: I don't like it, but it's fair.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Dennis?
BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Separate.
Preliminary now, final later.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: So I have, I think,

1 four for preliminary and three for preliminary 2 and final.

22 kind of consensus because at this point you're
Am I counting that correctly?
MAYOR RAE: I think so, David. You're the -- you're the man.

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: Final vote.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jolanta, what happens if we can't agree on this? Which way does the equation sit?

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. So far from the straw polling, what I'm hearing is the Board seems amenable to approve this application. I think I'm correct, right, in that?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.
MS. MAZIARZ: Denial is totally off the table.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: That's correct.
MS. MAZIARZ: This should be easy
then. If it's simply an approval, you know, the Board is going to have to come to some tied.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Well, we're not tied yet because I haven't voted.

MS. MAZIARZ: Well, no, no, no, no, no. But your straw poll indicates that there is a -- you know, there has to have -- there has to be some common ground in all of this. And I would -- my expectation would be that anyone who makes a motion for approval, regardless what type of approval that is, you know, that it will be supported by the Board because everybody's looking at approval one way or another. That's what the straw poll is looking like. I'm not going to put words in your mouth, because once someone makes a motion, maybe somebody will change their mind at the very last minute. I don't know. That's up to you.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Don't we need five votes of the eight in order to pass anything?

MS. MAZIARZ: Five affirmative votes, yes.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: Okay. And by my count, we can't -- we don't have five affirmative votes for final even regardless of not knowing how Chairman Hands is going to vote.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: That's my read. CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: We have

```
five -- if Chairman Hands voted preliminary
```

and then final I thought, you would have five.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: We would.
BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: One, two,
three, four, five.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Jolanta, do we need
a majority? If it's a four-four tie, it
doesn't serve us any purpose, does it?
MS. MAZIARZ: One, two, three, four,
five. Yeah, you have -- I mean, by my count,
you know, just -- we're straw polling now, so
three people think it should be both and five
people think it should be preliminary, you
know.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Four people think it should be preliminary. Mr. Hands hasn't voted yet.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: What if $I$ went with preliminary and final tonight? What if it's a tie? What's the consequence?

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: You're tied.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: I know. What's the consequence?

MS. MAZIARZ: Wait a second.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: If we're tied, what's the consequence?

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: It doesn't pass.

MS. MAZIARZ: But it's ridiculous because you're all talking about approval. So if you're all talking about approval, you need to agree to some kind of an approval. This is an approval we're talking about. You're not debating a denial versus an approval.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: What's the consequence if we still can't agree on whether to --

MS. MAZIARZ: You know, look --
BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: How about take a vote --
(Indiscernible cross talk; reporter requests one speaker.)

BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: Take a vote. Whatever happens, happens.

MS. MAZIARZ: If you refuse to go forward and a motion doesn't carry because the

1 argument is between an approval and approval, 2 this applicant is going to court. I mean, I 3 don't see any other way. So if you're talking

4 about an approval, I think you should discuss 5 this further.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah.
MAYOR RAE: So, David, what's your vote? I mean, you're the one we're waiting on, right?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: If we vote for
preliminary, then what's the consequence of that? And if that's a road we don't want to go down. That's my only concern about going preliminary.

MAYOR RAE: Then, yeah, I mean, we have a problem, right, if it's preliminary, if you're there, you know, as Jolanta just explained.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yeah.
MAYOR RAE: You know, and it
probably requires more -- somebody -- somebody breaking, right?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: There's only eight of us right now, you know; there's not nine, right? So there's not a full Board. Right

1 now we're leaning towards preliminary only and 2 final later. That's the way it's leaning. At 3 best. Because at best it's going to be four 4 and four. So I think four and four, you have 5 to go towards preliminary first.

MAYOR RAE: They can't change their views. I mean, you know, there's -- maybe this is splitting the baby, right, Jolanta, but --

MS. MAZIARZ: Oh, yes, yes, you're splitting this baby.

MAYOR RAE: Maybe even multiple -but, you know, is there some way -- I mean, I think really all we're looking to do here -or I'm looking to do anyway is to say, hey, I want to see what this final thing looks like. That's all. Right? And then $I$ think the public deserves it, we deserve it, just for doing what we've done.

So, Jolanta, if we went through with a preliminary and final, is there some way that that could be stipulated that that's what happens, that we get that as a --

MS. MAZIARZ: Okay. If you do preliminary and final right now, right, nothing that this applicant is going to do in the future will be done in secret. It's all going to be public record. No, it's not going to come before the Board anymore as a hearing or for a hearing because they're not going to

1 be required unless something happens, unless 2 they want a condition clarified or excised or 3 whatever. Then they might happen to come 4 before the Board again.

5 If something goes wrong and they
6 need to amend their site plan in any way, they
7 will have to come back before the Board for an
8 amended site plan. None of those things are
9 off the table because none of this is really,
10 you know, complete to the -- you know, to the
11 extent that it is absolutely finished and
12 we're going to be signing off on site plan 13 tomorrow.

So any of those things could happen. So, you know, there may still be an opportunity for a hearing even if you grant final now. But if they comply with all of your conditions, then, no, they will not be coming back for any reason before the Board. But there is absolutely no reason for a subcommittee who is working with the professionals not to be able to come back before the Board and report on what's going on. I mean, you can appoint a subcommittee to do pretty much anything, to engage in any work

1 that the Planning Board is doing.

3

And if you have a subcommittee that's working with the professionals and the applicant after a final, for instance, there's nothing that precludes them from coming back and making a report that this is what happened, this is, you know, what the professionals and the subcommittee approved. This is what satisfied the conditions. This is what is happening. And that can be done in public and the public can have an opportunity to take a look at it then.

So, yeah, the Planning Board can still talk about this after the fact. It just won't be an application.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: With that said, Jolanta, is it possible that that approach could be taken before this final site plan is signed, the site plan is signed?

MS. MAZIARZ: Absolutely. Before --
yes. Before the final site plan is signed by the Chairman, yeah, absolutely. The subcommittee can report back to the Planning Board just to tell them how everything is going.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: With that -- then would that at least get it back to the Planning Board without -- would that be satisfactory? Would that be satisfactory to anybody who wants to do preliminary only tonight? The subcommittee works with the professionals, keeps abreast of what's going on, presents a report before the site plan is -- the final site plan is signed by the Chair and the -- and the secretary.

MS. MAZIARZ: I'll make a suggestion. Anyone who's concerned and who is suggesting that it be preliminary only -- and this is just a suggestion -- perhaps should volunteer for the subcommittee and be part of what happens after approval. Post-approval compliance.

MAYOR RAE: I mean, I think that, you know, we're at a deadlock here and it's crazy, you know, really, you know, because we're kind of all saying the same thing. We want to have approval.

MS. MAZIARZ: It's very crazy, yeah.
MAYOR RAE: And, right. And so, you
know, I think that's -- I think that

1 suggestion is probably a good one and the
2 reports back to the -- to the Board so that at
3 least these major pieces can be -- can be, you
4 know, seen by the Board and then also by --
5 you know, most importantly by the -- by the
6 public. You know, I think I would be -- that
7 is something I guess, you know, it's one of
8 those things where, you know, I would
9 compromise on that. I mean, I'm not happy
10 with it necessarily. It's not what I want,
11 but I think I would be -- I could compromise
12 on that. Because it's really kind of
13 achieving what $I$ want, what $I$ think is
14 important here.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Can we have a motion to do that then?

BOARD MEMBER MALINOUSKY: I agree.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Before we do that,
I just want to make sure. I heard Victor say you're okay with Vice-Chair Jones, were you comfortable with that approach?

MR. REGAN: Are you asking us, the applicant?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: No, no. Mr. Tom Jones. I just want to see what your opinion was, if it changed -- again, to clarify, if we do preliminary and final tonight, still with a subcommittee, subcommittee reports back to the Planning Board in public prior to the site plan being signed by the Chairman and the secretary at the time.

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I'm going to be on the subcommittee, so --

MS. MAZIARZ: So you're a yes.
VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: Don't put words in my mouth.

MR. FOURNIADIS: I hate to -VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: I'm still on the preliminary and final later. That's where I'm at.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOW: From our point of view as members of the Board, the subcommittee reports at every meeting, then we get to discuss it at every meeting for the next two years.

MS. MAZIARZ: If that's what you want to do.

BOARD MEMBER VERLEZZA: I think the

1 vote has swayed. I think based on the
2 conditions that we just discussed, that we
3 would go with a preliminary and final based on
4 those conditions. Is that what I'm hearing,
5 Mayor Rae?

6

7

22 the Board vote no? And if they can, then it's
MR. FOURNIADIS: I hate to interrupt this Kumbaya moment after I said I wouldn't talk anymore, but I've been doing this a long time. So the subcommittee comes back to the Board and says here's what we came up with and we strongly recommend it, what happens? Can just like giving me preliminary and I've got to come in for final for a vote.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: I think at this

1 point, my way of taking it is it's presented 2 to the Board and for public review, and it's 3 not -- it's not a change to whatever the 4 subcommittee and the professionals and the 5 applicant agree to.

1 the -- look, if the only reason that this
2 Board is granting preliminary is so that the 3 Board and the public will still get an 4 opportunity to see what is going to be built 5 on that site, then that will be accomplished 6 with this subcommittee idea coming in after 7 final.

9 for the Board to have more input than that,
10 then -- then it's preliminary and not final.
11 But in this case -- and what I've been hearing
12 from the Board for the last hour is that the
13 idea here is to allow others to see what is
14 going to be built on that site. This
15 accomplishes that.
And once the Board votes to grant
final, it's final. The only thing the applicant is going to be required to comply

19 with are these conditions and the conditions
20 are going to have parameters and limits. So
21 it's not going to be where the subcommittee
22 comes back and somebody says push the buildings back 40 feet because that's not in the resolution. That's not a condition. That's not within the parameters, you know,

1 and I don't -- you know, and there has to be a
2 happy medium. It's not one or the other. If
3 the subcommittee comes back and says, look --
4 you know, they're looking at, I don't know,
5 stucco in this one spot and somebody says, no,
6 I'd rather have siding, is it that big of a
7 deal to change that along the way? I don't
8 know.

10 not. Look, I think we've shown that we're
11 willing to work with you.
12 MS. MAZIARZ: Precisely. Precisely. your hand up.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Are we ready for a motion then?

2 to it.

11 or have you got them on record and we're
12 sufficient with that?
MS. MAZIARZ: We have them on
record. And let me just clarify that the suggestions that were made, pushing buildings back were rejected by the balance of the Board. So that will not become a condition. There was a discussion opened about perhaps revisiting the retail building, which was also rejected by the balance of the Board. So that will also not become a condition because the Board is satisfied with what the applicant's last iteration is.

So all of the other conditions that we read into the record, those will be the

1 conditions of any approval if the Board
2 approves this, and I'm thinking that's where
3 we're going. And I will certainly, just so
4 that everybody is comfortable and everyone
5 understands that this is a site plan
6 application, an as-of-right application, based
7 upon an ordinance that was written
8 specifically for this site. It is an
9 affordable housing inclusionary site. And,
10 you know, I understand that the Board -- the
11 straw polling that we've been doing all of
12 this time, the Board is leaning toward second and a majority vote, I think we can move on with this.

And I certainly will collaborate with Mr. Regan and with the Board to make sure that these conditions -- and of course with our Board professionals, to make sure that

1 these conditions are acceptable, make sure 2 they're tight, make sure that they comport 3 exactly with what happened on the record.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Another time.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: All right. So let
me have -- Jolanta, I think the suggestion -or the motion is to grant preliminary and final site plan, conditions noted, subcommittee to work with the applicant and Board professionals until -- prior to the final site plan -- and report back to the Board prior to the site plan being signed by the Chairman and the secretary at the time. Is that the way I'm understanding


```
Jones?
```

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: No.
COORDINATOR COONCE: I'm sorry?
VICE CHAIRMAN JONES: No.
COORDINATOR COONCE: No. Okay.
Chairman Hands?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Yes.
COORDINATOR COONCE: Motion -- the yeses have it. Motion carries.

MR. FOURNIADIS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANDS: Thank you to the Board. Thank you to the public. Everybody who's bared with us for these many hours of meetings. And, Bob, thank you to yourself and --

MR. FOURNIADIS: What -- what do I do now the second and fourth Tuesdays of the month, Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HANDS: Work with the subcommittee.

BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Watch football games.

MR. FOURNIADIS: As soon as they're public again, I will be there. Thank you. I look forward to working with the subcommittee

1 and the professionals.

11 that said, then, I think, John Falvey, this is
12 your last meeting. I appreciate all the work

22 around. I'm going to watch that thing get
BOARD MEMBER PFEIL: Thank you.
MAYOR RAE: John, thank you. And I'll miss you. So thanks for everything.

BOARD MEMBER FALVEY: I'll be built.

CHAIRMAN HANDS: So with that, do we have a motion to adjourn the meeting?
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