

MINUTES

OCTOBER 8, 2013

PLANNING BOARD

LONG HILL TOWNSHIP

CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Vice-Chairman, Mr. Arentowicz, called the meeting to order at 8:02 P.M. He then read the following statement: Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board, by sending a copy to the Courier News and Echoes Sentinel and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk, all in January, 2012.

MEETING CUT-OFF

Vice-Chairman Arentowicz read the following statement: Announcement is made that as a matter of procedure, it is the intention of the Planning Board not to continue any matter past 11:00 P.M. at any Regular or Special Meeting of the Board unless a motion is passed by the members present to extend the meeting to a later specified cut-off time.

CELL PHONES AND PAGERS

Vice-Chairman Arentowicz read the following statement: All in attendance are requested to turn off cell phones and pagers as they interfere with the court room taping mechanism.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

On a call of the roll, the following were present:
Charles Arentowicz, Vice-Chairman
Brendan Rae, Mayor’s Designee (arrived at 8:07 p.m.)
Suzanne Dapkins, Member
Ashish Moholkar, Member
J. Alan Pfeil, Member
Guy Roshto, Member
Gregory Aroneo, 1st Alternate (arrived 8:08 p.m.)

EXCUSED

Christopher Connor, Chairman
Guy Piserchia, Mayor
Tim Wallisch, 2nd Alternate
Dawn Wolfe, Planning & Zoning Administrator

Barry Hoffman, Bd. Attorney
Kevin O’Brien, Twp. Planner
Thomas Lemanowicz, Bd. Engineer

Mr. O’Brien advised Mr. Arentowicz that he had a quorum and could proceed.

X X X X X X X X X X X

EXECUTIVE SESSION - It was determined that there was no need to hold an executive session.

PUBLIC QUESTION OR COMMENT PERIOD

The meeting was opened to the public for questions or comments. There being none, the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Arentowicz wanted to describe how the public hearing was going to be handled before the hearing about Restore Meyersville actually began. The planner, Mr. O’Brien would be giving an update on the process of status of the application and then the Board would hear testimony from the Applicant’s witnesses. He further explained that after each witness, the Planning Board would be able to ask questions of that witness. Then the professionals—the planner, the attorney, and the engineer—would be able to ask questions of that witness. Mr. Arentowicz said then he would open up the meeting for the public to ask questions of that witness. He asked that the questions be focused *only* on that testimony and at the end, after all the testimony has been heard, the Planning Board would be able to ask questions along with the professionals. Mr. Arentowicz stated that at that time he would open it up again to the public for any other questions that weren’t covered in the testimony provided. He emphasized that he wanted everyone to have the opportunity to speak because this was a matter that was critical to everyone. He requested everyone’s help and guidance.

PUBLIC HEARING

RESTORE MEYERSVILLE, LLC

596 Meyersville Road
Block 14701, Lot 27

#13-07P
Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan
Bulk Variances

Mr. Arentowicz advised the Planning Board that they should have received the following: a packet from the Planning Board Administrator, an email of the letter from the Long Hill Township Historic Preservation Advisory Committee dated October 4, 2013, an email from the Planning Board engineer commenting on the application on October 7, 2013, and one final email from the Planning Board planner commenting on the application also on October 7, 2013. To begin, Mr. Arentowicz invited the planner to give an overview of the process and the status of where the application stands.

Mr. O'Brien asked that the engineer and the planner be sworn in. The court reporter swore both in. Mr. O'Brien stated the Applicant is Restore Meyersville LLC located at 596 Meyersville Road also known as Morris County Route 638. He stated that the Applicant had appeared before the Application Review Committee in the past for comment and guidance and the Applicant had also appeared before the Checklist Completeness Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee over the last few months for completeness issues. The application was deemed complete in September. (Dr. Rae arrived at 8:07 P.M.) Mr. O'Brien said that the application before the Planning Board was for Preliminary and Final Site Plan to allow "...an indoor recreation/health club/fitness training center..." at this location. Variances for lot coverage, building coverage, buffer, parking, and signage were requested. He then asked the Planning Board if there were any questions. There were none.

Mr. Arentowicz said that testimony by Restore Meyersville LLC would begin. He asked for a basic outline on what was submitted, who would be speaking, and who the witnesses would be. (Mr. Aroneo arrived at 8:08 P.M.)

John J. DeLaney Jr., with the law firm of Lindabury, McCormick, Estabrook, and Cooper in Summit and Westfield, New Jersey stated that he and his firm were representing Restore Meyersville LLC. He advised that, for jurisdiction purposes, he had submitted to the Planning Board office the Affidavit of Service and Publication. He said that the first witness would be Kimberly Mottern; the Club Director of Central Jersey Volleyball Academy, to give the Board a general outline of what activities would take place at the site. He indicated that this club would be the tenant of this site.

Mr. DeLaney stated that the second witness would be William Kaufman, the owner and landlord of the property who would reaffirm the testimony of Ms Mottern as well relate in greater detail the history of the property and what would be occurring in terms of construction and how it would be monitored.

The third witness, according to Mr. DeLaney, would be Christian M. Kastrud, a licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey and he would testify to the normal issues heard during engineering testimony.

The fourth witness, according to Mr. DeLaney, would be Mr. Kaufman, a New Jersey licensed architect, who would discuss the architecture and also reaffirm the cumulative testimony that was given earlier.

Mr. DeLaney indicated that the final witness would be Justin Auciello, a New Jersey licensed planner who would sum up the "C" variances that Mr. O'Brien already discussed and provide the basic justification as to why those variances are appropriate and why the application should be approved.

Mr. DeLaney then asked Mr. Arentowicz if he could proceed with his first witness. Mr. Arentowicz gave his permission to begin.

Kimberly Mottern was seated at the Applicant's table. Mr. DeLaney advised her not to be nervous and to speak up into the microphone. He reminded her not to make gestures such as shaking her head but to articulate clearly and loudly so everyone could hear her. He also advised her that, if she didn't understand his question, to ask him to repeat the question.

Mr. DeLaney first asked Ms Mottern to give her name and address for the record. She responded that her name was Kim Mottern; her address was 515 East Union Avenue in Bound Brook, New Jersey. She also affirmed his statement that she was testifying to what activities would occur on the site.

Mr. DeLaney asked what organization she was with and Ms Mottern replied that she was with the Central Jersey Volleyball Academy. He then asked her to describe to the Board what the Academy was. She explained that it was a non-profit organization which does volleyball instruction. She stated that they work with children from the ages of seven (7) through eighteen (18). She indicated that Club Volleyball is competitive and that the girls must try out and that they work with schools from all over the area. She noted that a lot of the children are from the Watchung area even though their existing facility of 15,000 square feet is located in Flemington. She noted that William Kaufman's children are members of the club. She had been looking for two (2) years for another site for expansion since their current facility was full. She stated they wanted to move into another area to offer volleyball to more people which she felt was especially needed in this area.

Mr. DeLaney asked Ms Mottern about hours of operation. She replied that during the school year they are 4:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M. which are after school hours and then on weekends from 9:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.

Mr. DeLaney asked when the organization was started. Ms Mottern stated it was started nine (9) years ago.

Mr. DeLaney asked how long the organization had been at the Flemington site. Ms Mottern replied that they had been there six (6) years, going into the seventh year.

Mr. DeLaney asked how many students were in the program. Ms Mottern said that she had never done a head count but that there were sixteen (16) girls' teams with between ten (10) and twelve (12) players. She also indicated there were three (3) boys' teams and a youth development program that had approximately 150 children in it. Mr. DeLaney asked Ms Mottern to describe a typical day when the program is in operation. She stated she arrives at the facility at 4:00 P.M. and that the younger children arrive at the facility in the afternoon to do youth programs with our coaches who are all certified and trained. She indicated that most of the coaches are either college or high school

coaches from the area. She said that parents drop off their children around 4 and they are there anywhere from one (1) to two (2) hours. There are three (3) courts, each with a team of 10 to 12 players. They train for between one (1) to two (2) hours and then the parents pick them up.

Mr. DeLaney asked how many days a week was the Flemington site in operation. Ms Mottern replied that it was seven (7) days a week.

Mr. DeLaney asked what time did that facility normally close. Ms Mottern replied at 10:00 P.M. during the week.

Mr. DeLaney then asked about weekend hours. Ms Mottern stated that depending on the program, the facility closed somewhere between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M.

Mr. DeLaney asked her to describe the parking situation on the current site. Ms Mottern replied that in the existing site, there were three (3) courts and approximately 15,000 square feet in a building that was much larger. There is a dance studio in another part of the building. She stated that her organization had 54 parking spaces currently they were shared with two (2) other businesses in the front of the building.

Ms Mottern affirmed to Mr. DeLaney that she had had a chance to review the proposed plans and proposed parking. Mr. DeLaney asked her if she thought it was adequate and she replied definitely yes since it was basically a drop-off business and that she had never had a problem with the 54 spots currently shared.

Ms Mottern also affirmed to Mr. DeLaney that there have been no problems with the municipality where the current facility is located.

Mr. DeLaney asked her if the organization wanted to come to this municipality because it's closer to many of the players. Ms Mottern stated that it's closer to *a lot* of her players and that there are still a lot in the Flemington area. She felt that since there was no other option for volleyball in this area, it seemed like a great area for the sport because of the schools. She stated that volleyball is not offered in the recreation departments; it's strictly club and is played in the high schools and some of the middle schools.

Ms Mottern stated that although the club is predominantly female right now, she was working on a board which covers New Jersey and New York as the boys' representative, doing outreach programs to encourage boys to get involved with volleyball.

Ms Mottern affirmed that, assuming the building was approved, she would be on-site smoothly along with three (3) or four (4) other management staff members ensuring that the program ran smoothly.

Mr. DeLaney asked Ms Mottern to tell the Board about her professional background. Ms Mottern responded that her background was in non-profit and outreach. After being a stay-at-home mom, she went back to Girl Scouts for fifteen (15) years doing outreach in underserved areas. She implemented a program that introduced girls to non-traditional sports, sports that recreation departments did not offer, predominately lacrosse, volleyball, and tennis. She responded further that she left Girl Scouts three (3) years ago because of the growth of the business and so that she could operate it full time.

Mr. DeLaney asked if there would be a restaurant on the site. Ms Mottern replied no, but they did want to have vending machines and possibly a snack bar. Mr. DeLaney clarified that the food would be very light and Ms Mottern responded that it would be predominately protein bars and possibly sandwiches if there were an event in progress. She said that each year they kick off the season with a boot camp for the girls and lunch is served, but for the most part it would be vending machines and small items, no grills or cooking.

Mr. DeLaney asked Ms Mottern to tell the Board what positive aspects her organization brings to a community and its youth. Ms Mottern responded that in addition to the skills learned within the sport, the children learn leadership skills, teamwork, working with adults and coaches. She added that after Irene, she donated space to those high schools (Watchung Hills Regional High School, North Hunterdon High School, and Hunterdon Central High School) that were without electrical power and could not use their own facilities. She also stated that they have worked with different organizations that sponsor the Academy by putting banners up. At times her organization will advertise local restaurants or shopping areas in the community. As an example, she noted that in Flemington they are located near large shopping areas and the Academy provides a map of the different shopping areas that parents could visit while their children were at the facility.

Mr. DeLaney asked what controls were in place to keep order on the site. Ms Mottern responded that the adults maintain order---each team has two (2) adults. The ratio is typically ten (10) children to one (1) adult so there is always enough supervision. She added that there is a conduct contract and any rules or policies for the facility are listed on their liability waiver. She added that there had never been a problem.

Mr. DeLaney asked Ms Mottern if there was anything she wanted to tell the Board about her organization and proposed use of this new site. Ms Mottern discussed other programs run by the organization like summer camps for kids, before and after care, and some evening camps. She stated that the summer program was very full. College coaches were brought in to run these summer camps. The organization ran clinics for high school and club coaches. There were also fall and spring programs, nutrition programs, and conditioning programs for children. She stated it

was not a health club. There was no equipment other than jump ropes and ladders used for conditioning and speed and agility, but no heavy weights.

Mr. DeLaney asked if Ms Mottern would be willing to offer the facility to the community and she replied, "of course." She indicated she has helped with fundraisers such as the "Spike for Carly" event for a girl with leukemia. From her Girls Scout background, she was used to working with the community, organizations, and recreation departments.

Mr. DeLaney told Mr. Arentowicz that the witness was available for questioning by the Board.

Mr. Arentowicz asked the Board members if there were any questions. One Board member asked to review the number of children who would be at the site at any one time.

Ms Mottern stated that, at the most, it would 30 to 35 kids per two (2) hour period or per program unless there was an event. In addition, there would be two (2) coaches and any management staff that might be there.

The board member asked if most of them would be dropped off and Ms Mottern affirmed that that was the case. She added that until they get to be 18, the children are not driving or don't have a car.

The board member asked about the peak times such as during an event which would attract spectators. Ms Mottern responded that there are not many big events that attract spectators. There are no regional tournaments however there are youth development tournaments involving other clubs in the area like Pennsylvania. It usually consisted of five (5) teams of young children that come and that there had never been a problem with parking in the past. She noted that when the teams come long distances, most people carpool or use vans.

Mrs. Dapkins asked if there would be any outside activities. Mr. Arentowicz clarified the term "outside activities" to mean such things as outdoor courts, barbecues, and big events outside. Ms Mottern stated, no, it would all be contained inside.

A Board member asked for review of the hours of operation, questioning whether they typically close earlier on weekends. Ms Mottern replied that because they arrive earlier on the weekends, they typically close earlier. During the summer, there are also day hours—9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

Ms Mottern stated she would be there and along with a few others doing administrative work during the day. She further stated that she was looking forward to having an office outside of her home. She also affirmed that summer hours would be different because there is no school and they run the summer camps. They are typically 9 in the morning to 4 in the afternoon. There is also before and after care but not every week depending on the need and the parents' schedules.

The Board member asked about the total number of children at the summer camps. Ms Mottern indicated that the number is smaller than during the regular year. The largest camp they have had had 35 children.

A Board member asked for clarification on what was meant by "day care". Ms Mottern responded that it wasn't "day care" but "before and after care" for parents who have to work and drop their children off a half hour earlier than the camp starts. There will an adult there to supervise. She stated that this is not a nursery.

Ms Mottern also affirmed that there were roughly 35 to 40 children playing on the courts at any given time and that this was the maximum number. She said the idea was not to fill the facility but to run a good program which would be compromised if the courts were overfilled.

Ms Mottern also reiterated that she would continue at the existing facility in Flemington and that this would be an expansion.

After being questioned as to what was the biggest headache at the Flemington site, Ms Mottern replied that the parents and the competitive nature of those parents for their children.

Ms Mottern was asked about problems that have confronted her leadership team. She stated that on two occasions she had had to ban high school boys from attending adult open court night on Friday nights. One of those boys is now become a coach for the Academy and has become an asset.

When asked if there were any issues with drinking, Ms Mottern replied that there had been no issues at the Flemington site however one girl put up a picture taken of herself and a friend drinking while in their uniforms at a tournament and that was addressed.

She stated that there have never been any instances where the police had to be called to the facility.

Ms Mottern was asked if music would be played during these volleyball sessions and she replied that at times the teams would put together musical tapes but that it was never loud. There was no central music, just small boom boxes on each of the three (3) courts. She went on to say that in Flemington, when the gym door is open it was

possible to hear the music outside the facility, however there is no insulation in that building. Even with that, she could not hear music outside the building with the door closed.

Ms Mottern reiterated that there would not be a PA system outside.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if the professionals had any questions for the witness.

Mr. Hoffman asked Ms Mottern to talk about the Academy. Specifically he wanted to know if this was part of a league such as in baseball with playoffs.

Ms Mottern replied that the Academy is a member of U. S. Volleyball and that their region was New Jersey and New York. Central Jersey Volleyball Academy is just the name of the business. Their teams play teams both within and outside of their region. There are regional playoffs and the top two teams go to Nationals in places like Orlando.

Mr. Hoffman said this was not just children gathering for recreational purposes but there was a competitive aspect that ultimately led to a championship.

Ms Mottern said that was true of the club volleyball which is very competitive. The youth development aspect was for instruction. Leagues would only play other league teams or schools.

Mr. Hoffman asked if the Academy, as the tenant of the proposed building, currently had a signed lease or agreement or would it be pursued once there is approval.

Ms Mottern said that they do have a signed lease agreement for ten (10) years with an option to buy in five (5).

Mr. Hoffman asked if there were any showers or locker rooms proposed in the facility.

Ms Mottern replied there were be a locker room but no showers.

Mr. Hoffman stated that he had no further questions.

In response to a question from Mr. Lemanowicz, Ms Mottern stated that when parents drop off their children, at times they walk them inside and at other times the children walk in on their own and then the parent leaves. The Academy has no procedure for getting them out of the car and into the facility.

Ms Mottern further stated that all equipment is provided on site so there is no need for the children to bring anything except a gym bag with a change of clothes.

Mr. Lemanowicz indicated that he had no further questions.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the application filed for this matter described the proposed use as being "...an indoor recreation/health club/fitness training center..." He asked if any of those labels apply to the volleyball facility and operations she testified to or would that be for some type of other intended use.

Ms Mottern stated that a health club would not be her intended use. It would be recreational and training. Volleyball would be the primary, if not the only focus. She would not rule out such things as yoga and Pilates so long as it didn't interfere with the volleyball portion.

Mr. O'Brien wanted to clarify the hours of operation as being 4:00 to 10:00 P.M. during the school year and 9:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. on weekends.

Ms Mottern indicated that that was correct although they were not typically there that late on weekends.

Mr. O'Brien asked if during the summer there were evening camps.

Ms Mottern replied yes. These camps typically ran 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M. however it might be possible to go beyond 8:00 P.M. however it was not her intention at this point to go beyond 8:00 P.M. Weekends would be the same day hours, until 5:00 P.M. unless something came up at night so weekends would be 9 to 5.

Mr. O'Brien asked if Ms Mottern considered it a fitness center.

Ms Mottern said no, but that would depend on what that term meant. To her, a health club/fitness center meant exercise equipment and treadmills. She reiterated that there would be no equipment other than volleyball equipment. She would have speed and agility equipment such as jump ropes, rubber bands, and ladders, all portable items.

Mr. O'Brien stated that at the conclusion of the meeting there would be a resolution will be drawn up that laid out what the Planning Board had found and what they had decided so whatever uses and hours that are anticipated should be on the record because the Planning Board should consider them as part of the totality of the application. A year from now if Ms Mottern wanted to expand to summer nights, it would also have to be approved by the Planning Board depending on a lot of circumstances. Rather than have her come back for each and every thing she wanted to do, it would be best to put on the record what she had in mind for the future.

Ms Mottern agreed.

Mr. DeLaney agreed also.

Ms Mottern wanted the operating hours to go on record as 9:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. seven (7) days a week so there would be no problem if she wanted to hold a Saturday night program, for example. She added she did not see it extending beyond 10:00 P.M.

Mr. O'Brien indicated he was finished and Mr. Arentowicz opened the floor to the public.

Dennis Taylor, 588 Meyersville Road, asked if there would be any competition performances at the site.

Ms Mottern stated typically no since she didn't want to be in the tournament business but she would not rule it out. She would consider a Youth Development Tournament which was small groups of younger children, first grade through eighth grade. This was not something that she currently does.

Mr. Taylor asked if there would be any school buses on the premises.

Ms Mottern replied there would not.

Madeline Taylor, 588 Meyersville Road, adjacent to the property, asked what the total enrollment was. How many girls were on each of the 16 teams?

Ms Mottern replied that there were between ten (10) to twelve (12) however they were not all there at one time.

Mrs. Taylor then asked since Ms Mottern mentioned Friday Night Open Gym for the older children, how was the parking lot handled since at that age, some of the children were driving? How long do the children remain after 10:00 P.M.?

Ms Mottern stated that she and her staff leave with the children at 10:00 and they are required to exit the premises at that time.

Mrs. Taylor asked if there was practice running outside at any time.

Ms Mottern replied no.

Mrs. Taylor asked if Ms Mottern had any intention of sharing this facility.

Ms Mottern stated no.

Mrs. Taylor asked if the summer camps held from 6 to 8 at night are for older children.

Ms Mottern answered that Youth Development is done from 6 to 8 and there could be leagues. There are tune-up programs for middle school and high school so it's all ages.

Mrs. Taylor asked how quickly the parents leave once they pick up their children at night.

Ms Mottern stated that they leave very quickly.

Mrs. Taylor asked how late the after care program runs.

Ms Mottern stated 5:00 P.M.

Mrs. Taylor stated she had no further questions.

Mr. O'Brien asked where the regional tournaments occurred.

Ms Mottern replied that they are held throughout the region at different colleges or high schools but that they are never held at her location.

In response to a question pertaining to activities held between 6 and 8, Ms Mottern stated she never had to turn participants away because of lack of capacity since there is pre-registration which is capped. On a normal camp day, there are twelve (12) to twenty-five (25) children.

In answer to a question from Committeeman Roshto about total enrollment, Ms Mottern stated that it was probably over 200 because some of the leagues come in on other nights but they were not all there at the same time.

Committeeman Roshto then asked if that was the total membership between the two facilities or would there be 200 members using just this facility. She replied it was each facility.

Committeeman Roshto then reiterated that this would mean roughly 200 in this facility.

Ms Mottern affirmed that.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked if there was any space between each two (2) hour shift.

Ms Mottern said there was probably about 20 to 25 minutes between the children coming in early for their shift and the children leaving after their shift.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that during that changeover time, there might be potentially 35 drop-offs and 35 pick-ups.

Ms Mottern affirmed that but stated that that has never been a problem at the existing facility.

Helena Tielmann, 795 Meyersville Road, indicated that she has a home on Meyersville Road and also owns the property next to the proposed facility. She was very familiar with volleyball since her daughters played. She was concerned about sound and asked if there would be air conditioning.

Ms Mottern stated that the offices would be air conditioned but the gym would not.

Mrs. Tielmann expressed concern about open doors since she was aware of how enthusiastic the players can be, cheering and screaming after each play. Would the doors be open?

Ms Mottern stated no. Because of the insulation in this facility, the temperature should be fine so there would be no need to open the doors. In the Flemington facility, there was no insulation and it got hot. That was why the doors were opened. They were not open all the time. She hoped open doors would not be needed at the new facility. She indicated that the architect would have to discuss how the soundproofing of the building works.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if there were any further questions for this witness. There being none, he asked for the next witness.

Mr. DeLaney indicated that the next witness would be William Kaufman as the owner of the property. He indicated that Mr. Kaufman would subsequently testify after the engineer as the architect unless this was not acceptable to the Chair.

Mr. Arentowicz indicated that it was fine.

Mr. DeLaney asked Mr. Kaufman if he was the owner of the property. Mr. Kaufman replied yes and that he had owned the property since November 2006.

Mr. DeLaney asked Mr. Kaufman if there was anything in Ms. Mottern's testimony that was inaccurate.

Mr. Kaufman said no. He added that he felt that Ms Mottern's experience, the outreach program, and the work she does with children make her a good future business partner in Long Hill Township. He had first hand experience with her since his children were in her organization. When discussions began, he stated he hadn't considered Long Hill Township when she indicated she was looking for a space. Once he looked at it closer, he realized that Long Hill Township would be an ideal location. He further stated that the more familiar he became with this organization, the more he felt that this would be a good low impact use for this community which is very sensitive to development. He said that Meyersville has become a hub for recreation and although there was a lot of vehicular traffic, it was not a prime retail or other type of commercial use location. He noted there was a lot of biking, an equestrian facility, Copper Court where there was organized swimming and racket sports along with a travelling lacrosse program, the Long Hill Township Little League field, and the Great Swamp which attracted tourists who enjoy hiking and observing wildlife. He felt that the Academy was an appropriate use. He also noted that he looked at the Master Plan which supported recreation in Meyersville Hamlet. He apologized for the confusion caused by listing multiple uses in the application. He stated he took the words "fitness", "health club", and "recreation" directly from the ordinance. He felt they were similar uses, not compound uses because it was all centered on volleyball. He stated that these uses cover multiple activities consistent with the facility.

Mr. Kaufman also felt that Ms Mottern accurately depicted everything that would be done there. He did state that there are showers located on the plan, despite the fact that Ms Mottern stated in her testimony that there would be no showers. He thought that that was a building code requirement and he would be happy to eliminate them if they were not required by code.

Mr. Kaufman indicated that it has been a long search to find the appropriate use for the property. After reviewing dozens of opportunities, he felt that given the feedback throughout the years, the Master Plan development, and community, this would be the most perfect fit. He felt it might not be the highest and best use in terms of a developer's investment property but in terms of what he felt was appropriate, supporting the spirit of Meyersville, this was the ideal situation.

Mr. Kaufman indicated that he was willing to work with any conditions set by the Planning Board as long as it satisfied the user. He stated that it would become apparent through the testimony of the professionals that a lot of

work was done to sculpt this property into the requirements of the ordinance, with minor deviations from the bulk standards and other requirements that are not imposed by some sort of hardship.

Mr. Kaufman wanted to add as the Owner, Landlord of the property, this application was consistent with the new Master Plan and its intent to improve properties within the Meyersville Hamlet District. He felt that cleaning up the property and developing a low impact use was long overdue. By taking away a residence, this was a project that would reduce the density.

Mr. Kaufman indicated that he would oversee all the construction himself along with his team of construction managers and architects.

Mr. DeLaney asked if he lived locally.

Mr. Kaufman affirmed that he did.

Mr. DeLaney indicated to the Chair that he had no further questions.

Mr. Arentowicz asked for questions from the Board.

A Board member asked if there were any environmental restrictions or issues which would preclude any other type of development on this property.

Mr. Kaufman answered that other opportunities have been explored. He stated the DEP has recommended in the past that no residences be placed on the first floor of the property. Testimony will indicate that many other properties in Meyersville contain construction debris, mostly shingles, used to fill properties years ago. He presumed the previous owner, Mr. Stiles, had some fill which came from the old U. S. Gypsum plant some 50 years ago so some of that debris is contained in that soil. He stated he has worked closely with the DEP and the EPA to devise a plan which contains a LSRP. He will be following state guidelines on how to keep the debris contained throughout the entire process. The DEP wants more permanent capping on any type of contaminant especially a non-groundwater contaminant such as asbestos which doesn't migrate through groundwater. The DEP's intent is to prevent it from becoming airborne so encapsulating it is the best way to prevent that. He stated that the DEP prefers parking and concrete slabs over the asbestos—the bigger the building, the better for them even though it conflicts with stormwater management and other issues.

In answer to a Board member, Mr. Kaufman stated that he had recently placed a temporary cap over some of the driveway areas because the EPA asked him to put a filter fabric over the existing driveways and then cap it with gravel. He indicated that that was done within the last year. The EPA monitored air samples during the process via an independent agency as well as an EPA agent on site during the construction. They found no airborne asbestos. He stated that since this time, the EPA has given him clearance to raze buildings and move things around. He discussed with the EPA agent the order in which this property should be developed. Until the areas were capped, no existing buildings could be demolished. Debris from that could be safely removed from the site. Mr. Kaufman stated the site has been deemed stable and not a health risk.

Mr. Kaufman indicated that he is now working with the DEP because they want to manage the stormwater issue and the site no longer poses an imminent risk to the public (in which case the EPA would still have jurisdiction).

Mr. Kaufman explained that the DEP no longer assigned a single representative to each project. There is now an LSRP program for remediation. Because the reporting process has been privatized, he has engaged a private LSRP which has the responsibility to report directly to the DEP and to the EPA for final approval. The LSRP develops all the plans and submits them to the DEP.

Mr. Arentowicz asked whether what was done to temporarily stabilize the asbestos will stay in place.

Mr. Kaufman stated that since the exact footprint of the building isn't finalized, the plan is not in place yet. Generally, all the temporary capping would remain in place until the foundation is dug. The emphasis is on dust control so there will be measures taken to control that. Mr. Kaufman stated that the ground may be disturbed but not "dug up" since there are plans to grade over that. He stated that typically 18 to 24 inches of fill are brought in over the top of this ground. Nothing will be dug deeper other than what is required by code and grading will be done with new fill, not existing fill. Removal of existing building will manipulate the soil a little but the air testings show that to the east of the site there was no asbestos found in the borings. The center, west, and rear were the main contaminated areas and that is where the new building will be contained. Fill will be brought in over the entire site. Mr. Kaufman stated that this constitutes a double barrier by comparison to what would normally be required to be a single barrier.

Mr. DeLaney asked if it was correct that Mr. Kaufman's LSRP would be working with him to make sure he is in compliance with law.

Mr. Kaufman affirmed that this was true.

Mr. DeLaney asked if what Mr. Kaufman put in place with the EPA is going to stay in place except for when a footing is put in and then there will material placed on top of what has already there.

Mr. Kaufman stated that that was correct. There would be no reason to deviate from that other than to salvage some of the gravel. There will be some utility trenches but that would be monitored with as a trench as opposed to open site grading.

Mr. DeLaney asked if the asbestos found during the testing is located where Mr. Kaufman thought it would be.

Mr. Kaufman explained that the test borings are random in placement and depth and in the areas to the east where there is lower elevation and closer proximity to the Swamp, nothing was found. Even if there was a fragment there, Mr. Kaufman stated it wouldn't matter since they are treating the entire site as if it were contaminated and hence, capping the whole area.

Mr. Kaufman also stated that there was a deed that goes in along with the process so that future property owners are noticed that they can't dig below a certain depth. It would not mean that it could never be dug up; it just means it must be dealt with properly. He said there would be a layer of high color fabric so that when someone digs two (2) or three (3) feet down, the colored fabric would alert the contractor to contact the appropriate authorities.

Mrs. Dapkins asked if there were any oil, gasoline, or kerosene tanks on site.

Mr. Kaufman answered that there were no known UST's on the property.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that the issue of asbestos came up during the completeness meetings and how that affected the stormwater. He indicated there was a discussion of a stormwater document which was not included in the application hence that completeness item is missing along with all the paperwork, studies, and testing that Mr. Kaufman had been discussing earlier. He felt that information should be part of the application so that when the township engineer has to inspect the site, he would know what safety precautions should be taken. If the capping precautions affect the design such that what is in the current application is not ultimately what is proposed, Mr. Lemanowicz indicated that Mr. Kaufman would have to come back for amended site plan.

Mr. Kaufman indicated that the documentation he (Mr. Kaufman) referred to was his due diligence documentation as to what existed on the property site. It was not part of the application because the LSRP would be taking that information and developing a full report which would be part of whatever construction document the State is reviewing and he would be happy to submit that. But since the work doesn't exist yet, he felt the Planning Board must make a ruling on exactly what the building would be and what the parameters would be before the work plan could be put in place. Once this is approved, the LSRP will develop a full work plan which will be on file for construction officials.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the stormwater overview document was submitted by his engineer to Mr. Lemanowicz and Mr. O'Brien and never made it back into the original file. He did not realize that it was to be part of the application and would be happy to submit the documentation and correspondence to the Planning Board to fulfill the completeness requirement.

Mr. Kaufman felt there would not be any major changes coming from this proceeding but that he was aware that he would have to return if there were any major changes.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that the project is required to have stormwater management. Although he hadn't done the numbers, this might be a major development requiring rate reduction, groundwater recharge, and water quality features. He could not recommend to the Planning Board to waive this unless the asbestos issues, etc. are shown in the application. It is not being shown why it should be waived.

Mr. DeLaney felt that this testimony was more appropriate for the engineer.

Mr. Arentowicz agreed to defer to the engineer but pointed out that the application should have the stormwater management report submitted based on the Application Review and it wasn't there so the Board members could not see it.

Mr. Arentowicz opened the floor to the public.

Dennis Taylor, 588 Meyersville Road, asked if Mr. Kaufman if he was aware that he (Mr. Taylor) had an easement with his property—the property and Mr. Taylor's driveway were together.

Mr. Kaufman replied that he was aware of this. He had it confirmed with the title company that Mr. Taylor's driveway has a filed easement.

Mr. Taylor stated that when Mr. Kaufman spoke to Mrs. Taylor earlier in the day, Mr. Kaufman stated he was unaware of the easement.

Mr. DeLaney stated that he advised Mr. Kaufman to look at the title report. It was pulled and noted that there was an easement filed and that it was also on the survey as well.

Mr. Taylor then asked how far Mr. Kaufman would be from his property and that easement.

Mr. Kaufman deferred to the engineer.

Since there were no further questions from the Planning Board, the professionals, or the public, Mr. Arentowicz requested that the next witness begin.

Mr. Arentowicz suggested a five (5) break at 9:25 P.M.

X X X X X X X RECESS X X X X X X X

Mr. Arentowicz brought the meeting back into session at 9:30 and requested the third witness begin testimony.

Mr. DeLaney requested that Christian M. Kastrud be sworn in.

The court reporter swore Mr. Kastrud in.

Mr. DeLaney asked Mr. Kastrud by whom he was employed.

Mr. Kastrud replied he was employed by Kastrud Engineering LLC. He affirmed that he was a licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. He stated that he graduated with a B.S. in Civil Engineering from Tufts University and that he has twelve (12) credits towards a Water Resources Masters Degree from Rutgers University. He also stated that he is a certified Municipal Engineer and that he represents both the Warren Township Planning Board and Board of Adjustment. He is the Warren Township engineer and has also been a Conflict Engineer for Bedminster and soon to be Green Brook. He added that he has testified before dozens of boards throughout New Jersey.

Mr. Hoffman asked if Mr. Kastrud had previously testified before any board in Long Hill Township.

Mr. Kastrud affirmed that he had.

Mr. Hoffman asked on which matters.

Mr. Kastrud indicated that twelve (12) years ago there was a subdivision on Western Blvd. Most recently he was involved with a site plan for what is now a seafood restaurant.

Mr. Hoffman acknowledged the witness's credentials.

Mr. DeLaney asked Mr. Arentowicz if he would accept Mr. Kastrud as an engineer.

Mr. Arentowicz replied that he would.

Mr. DeLaney asked if Mr. Kastrud was engaged by the owner to perform engineering services.

Mr. Kastrud replied that he was. He stated that he was contacted approximately five (5) years ago by the property owner to come up with concepts to develop the site. During the past four (4) years his involvement has been minimal but now that the Central Jersey Volleyball Academy is an interested tenant, Mr. Kastrud was engaged again to develop civil engineering designs for the Academy.

Mr. Kastrud stated that he had three (3) exhibits. #1 was an aerial photograph taken in 2012 by the New Jersey Image Warehouse, blown up to 20 scale which is what the civil engineering plans were prepared at with a red line...(inaudible).

Mr. Arentowicz asked if the Planning Board had received copies of that.

Mr. Kastrud replied they had not. This was new. The plan was prepared October 5, 2013. This was marked Exhibit A1.

Mr. Kastrud stated the second exhibit was the same existing aerial photography with an overlay of a colorized rendering of the actual site on top of the aerial image. This was marked A2.

Mr. Kastrud stated that the last exhibit would not be marked because it was merely a colorized rendering without the aerial image behind it.

Mr. Kastrud recited the address and lot and block number of the site. From the aerial photo, he showed that the site was currently covered with gravel, buildings, and compacted fill. He said that five (5) years ago when they were working with the DEP and with the Wetland expert, they had obtained an LOI which has expired. It is another application fee back to the DEP but assuming nothing has changed, Mr. Kastrud felt there was no additional endangered or threatened species so the buffers will remain the same. He anticipates that the Wetlands line would be approved again in the same exact location as it stands. Five years ago there were two (2) different permits that could

have been obtained from the DEP. The Wetlands expert chose to pursue a Statewide General Permit #27 because of the existing conditions on the site, the compacted fill, the contamination, the gravel, and the building coverage. He pointed out on Exhibit A1 that the majority of the front, with the exception of a small portion in the southeast corner where there is some grass, the southwest corner where there is gravel, the middle which is occupied by buildings, the back majority, and the northern end of the property were classified as compacted fill and that allowed him to explore the possibilities of the Statewide General Permit #27 for redevelopment of a disturbed area within wetland buffers.

Mr. Kastrud indicated that there was 57% impervious coverage existing on the site. He stated it drains from south to north, from Meyersville Road out towards the north and eventually into the Great Swamp. There is an existing storm sewer system on Meyersville Road. Along the easterly property line there is an outlet. There is a pipe that runs onto the site and outlets approximately half way back along the easterly property line.

Mr. Kastrud stated there are two (2) portions of actual wetland proper on the site: at the northeast corner and at the northwest corner there is another extremely small portion. On the plan (distributed to the Planning Board in their packet) these areas are shown top and bottom left. There are two separate buffers based on the wetlands classifications both 150 feet and 50 feet. In their entirety, they will be part of the Statewide General Permit #27 for the redevelopment of the site. Some of the disturbance that is required is for the cleanup so there is a multi-pronged attack of this site. Not only did it need to be developed from an economic standpoint and a viability standpoint, it also had to be maintained and cleaned up as it proceeded. Mr. Kastrud stated that he could minimize the amount of disturbance from a development standpoint, however from an environmental cleanup standpoint he needed to disturb the area that was shown and that that would all fall under the Statewide General Permit #27.

Mr. Kastrud stated that the proposal is to construct a 13,144 square foot facility. The footprint is based on the basement, first floor, and mezzanine level. He said the actual square footage of the building is slightly larger. The footprint is show on Sheet 3 of the plans.

Mr. Kastrud stated that because of the specific needs of the Academy (drop off was noted), an entrance was provided on the easterly end of the property off Meyersville Road which abuts the Taylor property. The driveway is shown on Sheet 3. He was unaware of an easement at the time the plans were prepared and had actually proposed an easement in order for the driveway to remain. The existing driveway would come into the site not affecting the neighbor's driveway. Traffic flow would be in a westerly direction where parents could pull into one of the nine (9) spaces that front on Meyersville Road before the small island or the nine (9) after or the six (6) spaces to the west of the building. There are three (3) handicapped and four (4) regular spaces on the westerly side of the building. Traffic would come in on the east and flow to the west and leave. He felt this worked the best for the tenant rather than having any dead end aisles. Overflow parking would have a dead end aisle and is on the easterly side of the site extending back towards the northerly property line which would be utilized only during special events. The exact details of the construction components hadn't been chosen as of yet but it would be a plastic paver buried on a bed of gravel with grass growing on top so it wouldn't be a paved system.

Mr. Kastrud indicated there was discussion about the buffer on the easterly side of the property. The proposed curb is fourteen-and-one-half-feet to the property line. The driveway itself is roughly five (5) feet at the northerly end to approximately seven (7) feet at the right-of-way line extending onto the Applicant's property. Although he did not have the exact measurements of the existing easement, he imagined it encompassed something similar to what he was going to propose—37 feet by 8 feet. There would be landscaping which would be shown later on Sheet 5 which would buffer the area between the residential property and this site.

Mr. Kastrud stated the property sloped generally from south to north. A portion of the property would be filled to cap the property although the exact volume of contaminated material on the site has not been determined. Unusable material will be box trucked and shipped to an appropriate disposal facility. Usable material will be used on site as fill material and then capped either by the building or by the parking lot. Mr. Kastrud indicated that there would be minimal grading for the grass parking lot, approximately 5%.

Mr. Kastrud stated that there is an existing water service and sanitary sewer lateral that goes to the existing home although he did not know the exact location of the latter. He noted that Mr. Lemanowicz had pointed out there is a water valve located in the southeasterly corner along Meyersville Road and if that connection was still viable, it would be used. The building would be serviced by electric, gas, water, and sewer, all public. There would be no tanks, propane tanks, underground tanks proposed, no septic systems proposed for the site.

Mr. Kastrud pointed out the Lighting and Landscaping Plan on Sheet 5 shows the buffering along the easterly side on the entrance drive coming in,. He acknowledged that he would adhere to local ordinances pertaining to native plantings. He noted along the front of the property there are three (3) existing pear trees which would be left. Six (6) more pears trees towards the easterly direction would be added. There was some question about the viability of the existing trees however he felt they could be saved. Along the westerly property line he would supplement the existing landscaping with evergreens for screening and buffering.

Mr. Kastrud stated that the lighting is an open lens fixture and even if it were shielded there might still be a glow from the side. The light would be contained on the site. Despite a comment from Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Kastrud felt that this design was in keeping with the style of the downtown lighting however he would be sensitive to any glare that a resident or neighbor may feel in the evening hours.

Mr. Kastrud stated that was the extent of the testimony he had to offer. He noted that there was discussion about stormwater at the end of the last witness' testimony. He said that during the five (5) years he had been working with this property, the DEP had always said that they would review the stormwater for the site. He indicated that he was reducing the amount of impervious coverage by 25%. He would be going from 57% existing impervious coverage to less than 42% which alone would have a positive effect on the amount of stormwater runoff from this property. Mr. Kastrud stated that the DEP's triggers for major stormwater development are one (1) acre of disturbance which this project is definitely above. With the contamination on the property, the disturbance area could not be reduced and therefore pushes the project into the Major Development. The project does not trigger the water quality or groundwater recharge aspects because of the reduction in impervious coverage. However, the DEP acknowledges that, "you're more likely than not, to have to provide some of stormwater presented to us." (verbatim from recording). In light of that, the wetlands expert recommends that the roof runoff be controlled and directed towards the rear of the property and then to any of the grading along the side of the property. If water quality can be provided, the expert believes that the water quality off the parking lot would satisfy the DEP as far as their stormwater. Mr. Kastrud indicated that he did not have that in writing or from the DEP—it was solely from the conversations with the wetlands scientist. He expected to have to provide for the DEP a small water quality area in the back of the property. If more is required such as underground detention and recharge, it will have to be addressed and the property may not be economically viable to develop. He emphasized that this is not what is anticipated and is not being discussed with the DEP at this time.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if Mr. Kastrud would comment on some of the issues outlined in the township engineer's letter dated October 7, 2013.

Mr. Hoffman said the report was lengthy and items that Mr. Kastrud felt he could satisfy need not be discussed and if not cited, the Planning Board would assume that was the case. However, any points that Mr. Kastrud questioned or differed with should be addressed.

Mr. Kastrud noted the loading space requirement (#6, page 3) in the letter which Mr. Kastrud felt was unnecessary.

Mr. Hoffman felt the loading spec issue was something that should be addressed by either Ms Mottern or Mr. Kaufman since they could best describe if the nature of the usage proposed would generate a need for deliveries, etc. He didn't feel the engineer was the right person to deal with that subject.

Mr. Arentowicz asked Mr. Kastrud to comment.

Mr. Kastrud stated that after lengthy discussions with the proposed tenant and the architect, he felt a loading space was not required. Small cars and vans are anticipated but not food trucks, etc.

Mr. Kastrud addressed Item #7 and stated that the common path for any of the parking spaces is to walk down the aisle out to the front door on the southerly side of the building and then enter the building. In front of the building between the curb and the building, landscaping would be added instead of more concrete to address another comment in the report. This would soften the front of the building.

Mr. Lemanowicz noted that he had asked Ms Mottern about the entire drop off procedure. He made a comment that it appeared that the aisle width is not the required 24 feet in front of the building.

Mr. Kastrud stated that Mr. Lemanowicz was correct. He noted that it was an oversight that it was not dimensioned on the plans. It was a one way aisle in front of the building. The aisle where he had double-stacked parking is 24 feet so both on the easterly side of the building and the westerly side of the building it was 24 feet. He stated it was reduced and could be enlarged again, however it had been reduced in the center to provide more area for landscaping between the building and the curb. If it is enlarged to 24 feet, some of the landscaping area would be reduced. It would not be an issue with the Applicant and he would be more than willing to comply with the 24 feet since it is an issue with the requirements of the ordinance. It is currently 22 feet.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that assuming it was widened; there would be four (4) feet from the face of the building to the travelled way of the aisle. He noted there were no sidewalks, there would be landscaping, and there would be two (2) groups of 35 people being dropped off over a period of 25 minutes. There is no place for them to stand since once the door is opened, people will be standing in the drive aisle as they go in. Mr. Lemanowicz stated there would be some parents who would stop in front of the door regardless of whether it was marked as "No Parking". Other people would be walking children to the door as well as children running by themselves and there didn't seem, to Mr. Lemanowicz, to be a lot of room for people and cars to stay away from each other.

Mr. Kastrud noted that that is why they have a vestibule inside the building, hence there is an area *inside* the building for the exchange.

Mr. Lemanowicz felt that there would be a lot of activity going on at the door without a place of refuge for someone to stand.

Mr. Kastrud acknowledged the point and offered to discuss this with the architect.

Mr. Kastrud went onto Item #11 pertaining to the most northeasterly parking space. As soon as one exits off Meyersville Road onto the site, there is a proposed parking space immediately ahead of the entrance. He felt whether it was the first, second, or third space from that, any car maneuvering in that area would be backing up into the area where the entrance is located. He felt that that one space could be eliminated but he didn't see it as an issue to the flow of the parking lot because there is adequate room to turn off Meyersville Road and stop between the parking lot and the road itself without interfering with any of the maneuvering ability of that parking area.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated normally he would agree but there is a house just to the east, right on the edge of the pavement. Mr. Kastrud stated that if that spot were eliminated, it would allow him to buffer more in that nine (9) foot space.

A Board member asked if the easement discussed earlier was in this area.

Mr. Kastrud replied yes and referred to Sheets 3 and 4 and stated that in the southeasterly corner, it is shown with dimensions on Sheet 3. He said that the survey was prepared in the absence of a title search so they were not aware of an easement around this existing driveway. He stated that during the proposed development plans, he worked with both the tenant and owner of the property in order to propose an easement around the existing driveway so that it could remain. The proposed easement is shown on Sheet 3. It was 37 feet long in the north-south direction and by 8 foot wide in the east-west direction. The *existing* is different, probably similar, but he couldn't state that for sure.

The Board member then stated that the existing easement is not where Mr. Kastrud was proposing the landscaping. It was the existing driveway that is shown on the plan.

Mr. Kastrud responded that on Sheet 5, the existing driveway which straddles the property line is shown. In addition to that, between the existing driveway and the proposed access aisle, proposed evergreen trees are shown.

Mr. Lemanowicz noted that there is a pipe that comes from the inlet near the common property line and goes back into the property about 75 feet. He questioned if there was an easement there also.

Mr. Kastrud indicated that he did not know since he had not seen the title report yet.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that if there was an easement, the overflow parking lot was located right on the headwall and by Mr. Kastrud's comment earlier about trying to maintain 5% cross slope, this would require fill around that headwall of about three (3) feet. Mr. Lemanowicz indicated that that would have to be reviewed.

Mr. Kastrud responded affirmatively.

Mr. Kastrud indicated that Item #12 was acceptable along with 13, 14, and 15. Item #16 dealt with the trash enclosure. Mr. Kastrud noted that this plan did not contain the updated version which is proposed to be up against the building, giving more than adequate room in front of the trash enclosure for the doors to be opened. He acknowledged that a car could block it during the normal hours of operation and that trash pick up would have to occur outside of those hours.

Mr. Kastrud stated that there were no other problems for him on page 4. He addressed the discrepancies between the architect's plans and the engineer's plans by eliminating the elevations of the mezzanine level on his plan. He indicated that basement floor would remain the same and that was consistent with the basement floor, the finished floor, and the first floor of the actual volleyball courts. He indicated that it was almost a split level and that it would be shown in the architectural testimony. The areas in the front of the building will be office areas, lobby, locker rooms in the basement, and then there is a split level between the basement and the first floor and that that would be the elevation where all the volleyball courts would be, at the back of the building.

Mr. Kastrud felt that Item #28 should be discussed by the architect along with 29 through 31. He stated that the other items on the sheet were acceptable.

Mr. Kastrud moved to Item #36 which involved the pear trees located at the front, southeasterly corner. He proposed to extend that pattern with six (6) trees to the east. He suggested an arborist could decide if the existing trees are worth saving.

Mr. Lemanowicz advised the Board that several years ago, the Bradford Pear was the ornamental tree that was going to save the world and it was placed everywhere. Years later they realized that as it branched and formed a "V", it broke. That is why he was concerned about using the species. He also noticed that while walking the site, there were pears all over the ground and that there could be an issue with rotting pears, etc. Mr. Lemanowicz indicated that there are new flowering pears that were developed to address the issues of the older species.

Mr. Kastrud stated that they were open to making attempts to save the existing trees using cabling for support however, if they were not worth saving, this would be the appropriate time to remove them.

Mr. DeLaney discussed Item #42 which refers to the clean up and cap. He reiterated that there would be no detailed plan for the clean up until there was a positive action by the Planning Board for this application. At that point, they would move forward with the elevations and calculate the volumes. The LSRP will review the depths of all the

contamination in comparison to the elevations that are on the plan and whether any excavation is required to meet the proper cap depth. This would not be an issue where the concrete slabs or pavement is located.

Mr. Kastrud moved to #43 and felt that he had already described that clearly, however if there were more questions about stormwater development, he was open. He noted that they did need to add the roof leaders that Mr. Lemanowicz discussed and also provide the calculations to show that downspouts would be stable.

At that point Mr. Arentowicz asked if there was any additional information Mr. Kastrud would like to provide for the Planning Board and he said there was none.

Mr. Arentowicz asked for questions from the Board.

Mr. Aroneo asked Mr. Lemanowicz to discuss the impact that the entrance and exit would have on the Meyersville Road traffic during peak times.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that since Meyersville Road is a county road, the county would have jurisdiction. The impact would be discussed in the County's Planning Board Review.

Mr. Kastrud stated that, as of yet, they had not heard back from the County or from Soil Conservation however both applications had been submitted.

Mr. Kastrud further stated that they would share any information provided by the County's review however, at this point he felt it would fit in with the Master Plan.

A Board member asked, pertaining to Point #7 and Point #8, if it would make more sense to move the building back four (4) feet from Meyersville Road to give them the extra space.

Mr. Kastrud stated it could be done however; it may affect the impervious coverage if it is moved back and concrete is added in front of it.

The Board member stated that if it was filled with grass and landscaping as opposed to concrete, it would not affect the impervious coverage.

Mr. Kastrud agreed that it would be minimal.

Another Board member referred to the fill over the areas where there was no impervious coverage and asked if that affected drainage.

Mr. Kastrud stated that instead of just putting fill on top and creating a mound, some material may be removed and replaced with fill so that the original grading remains the same.

Another Board member noted that one plan shows a door on the easterly side facing the residential property and another set of plans shows another set of doors. He asked if those doors could be moved to an area not adjacent to the residential property.

Mr. Kastrud deferred to the architect however he noted that emergency egress was an issue.

Mr. Hoffman referred to Mr. Lemanowicz's comments on Item #44 which indicated the need for a flood plain development permit and asked if there was additional risk to neighboring properties.

Mr. Kastrud noted that through the various preceding meetings, it was indicated that the Applicant needed to comply with Flood Prevention Section 143.7 of the ordinance. He stated that the property is *not* within the 100 year flood as shown on the FEMA maps. Those maps show a flood plain behind this property to the north, the Great Swamp, and scaling their maps, the property is 600 feet from the closest point to the actual FEMA flood line as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate maps of September 2001.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that Note #8 would have to be redone because it sounded like the property is within that zone.

Mr. Kastrud preferred to remove the note completely because there had to be a way to address Section 143.7 presumably because there are wetlands located on the property.

Both Mr. Lemanowicz and Mr. Hoffman said that Mr. Kastrud should state that the property is not located in a flood damage area.

Mr. O'Brien indicated that since there are wetlands located on the property, a development permit is required per Section 143.7.

Mr. Kastrud stated that he would work with Mr. Lemanowicz and Mr. O'Brien to get the proper phrasing for the note.

Mr. Hoffman reiterated it was his understanding that the Applicant was open to changing the plantings anywhere on the site to better buffer and make more attractive the construction of the facility.

Mr. Kastrud felt he thought that was a fair assessment according to his testimony which was based on his discussions with the Applicant.

Mr. Hoffman asked is the same would hold true regarding the height and shielding and intensity of exterior lighting.

Mr. Kastrud affirmed that.

Mr. Hoffman asked in reference to several residents' concerns about noise, if any special measures would be undertaken by way of soundproofing insulation or things of that sort.

Mr. Kastrud said there were none to his knowledge. He deferred to the architect.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that his only outstanding issue was the stormwater management. Because the Applicant had not submitted anything on this for him to review from the standpoint of the DEP, the depth of contamination, etc. Mr. Lemanowicz could not offer the Board any suggestions as far as where to go with stormwater on the property. He noted that there was an expired LOI and that Long Hill Township is not subject to the Permit Extension Act which extends permits because of the economy since the Township is located in an environmentally sensitive zone.

Mr. Arentowicz asked how long that approval would take.

Mr. Lemanowicz referred back to Mr. Kastrud. Mr. Kastrud indicated that he could not speak for the DEP.

Mr. Lemanowicz felt that there were still some issues on the environmental and LSRP end of the application. He felt the biggest issue was the drainage and at this point he had no advice for the Board,

Mr. Lemanowicz explained that LSRPs are relatively new and created because the DEP could not keep up with inspections. The LSRP, while hired by the Applicant, is actually an agent of the DEP and is personally responsible. There are significant issues if the DEP finds that something has been certified incorrectly. LSRPs were created in an effort to facilitate the process.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if an LSRP had been engaged.

Mr. Kastrud responded that the owner had done so.

Dr. Rae asked if Mr. Lemanowicz had had any other experience with drop off area issues.

Mr. Lemanowicz indicated that his wife was the director of a daycare and while the children at this facility would be older than daycare, it's the concept of a lot of potentially unsupervised children running through the area with or without parents. It could be an issue without having some room for all that to happen.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the lights were shown on the architectural plans but not on the engineer's plans. He asked if Mr. Kastrud knew what they were.

Mr. Kastrud state he did not however, it did need to be coordinated with the architect so that it became a part of the modeling program.

Mr. O'Brien asked how the 40 parking spaces on the turf would be delineated, how that area would be lit, and how it would be accessed.

Mr. Kastrud stated that those spaces would not be delineated in order to maintain that grassy area especially since it would not be used very often. It would be lit by the building mounted lights. He noted that that area would be used for overflow parking primarily during the day.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the excavation required for the locker room/restroom area of the basement impacted the cap or the contamination of the ground.

Mr. Kastrud affirmed that it did. He stated that for any excavation on the site, he has to take into account what the contamination is and where, how deep, what are the limits, etc. He had not gone through the detailed plan yet with the LSRP to ascertain whether, in that area, what volume of contaminated soil there was.

Mr. O'Brien asked if there was a possibility that there could be no lower basement level.

Mr. Kastrud said that they would dig down, and if necessary, remove the material from the site, to the proper disposal area in order to ensure that there would be a lower basement level.

Mr. O'Brien stated there were bollards shown on Sheet 7 of 7 in the details which he could not find on the site plan.

Mr. Kastrud stated that they were left over from a previous drawing and affirmed that there are none in this location.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if there were any questions from the public.

Dennis Taylor, 588 Meyersville Road, asked how much distance would his driveway and the facility's driveway have apart.

Mr. Kastrud stated approximately seven (7) feet. He stated Mr. Taylor's driveway extended onto the Applicant's property between five (5) and seven (7) feet. The proposed driveway is 14.5 feet from the property line.

Mr. Taylor asked how many people would turn into his driveway thinking it was the facility's driveway.

Mr. Kastrud hoped there would be none give the detailed signage.

Given there were no further questions for the engineer, Mr. Arentowicz called the next witness.

Mr. DeLaney thanked the Chairman and stated that the next witness would be William Kaufman as the architect.

Mr. Hoffman reminded Mr. Kaufman that he was still under oath.

Mr. Arentowicz questioned, given the current time of 10:40 p.m. and given that there were two (2) more witnesses, how did the Board want to proceed.

A Board member commented that the public had taken the time to attend the meeting and wondered if it were possible for them to have an opportunity to speak at this time.

Mr. Hoffman noted that this was out of the norm and that the public would be making comments without having heard all the witnesses however he did feel it was desirable to give the public the opportunity to make comments.

Mr. Arentowicz asked the Applicant if that would be alright.

Mr. Kaufman suggested that the Board allow him, as the architect, to testify. After that, all the experts with testimony to factual data would have been heard and then the public could address that testimony. The last witness, the planner, would be discussing the issues with the C Variance and wrapping up the entire application which may or may not be of interest to the public.

Mr. Arentowicz then indicated that he felt the consensus was to proceed but that the Board would also want to hear from the public so the meeting might have to be extended.

Mr. Hoffman indicated that Mr. Kaufman had appeared before the Board before and been accepted as an architect.

Mr. Kaufman indicated he had two exhibits, A3 and A4 to mark into the record. He indicated that they were only very slightly different than the plans submitted earlier.

Mr. Kaufman stated A3 was drawing A201 on the sheet in the packet.

Mr. Arentowicz asked Mr. Kaufman to point out the differences between what the Board looked at and what was there when he reached that point and Mr. Kaufman affirmed that he would.

Mr. Kaufman stated that A4 would be sheet 101 of the packet.

Mr. Hoffman asked if these were revised sheets from the sheets of the architect's plans. Mr. Kaufman affirmed that this was the case.

Mr. Kaufman indicated that the revisions were as of 10/08/2013. The revisions simply dimension the trash and recycling area of the plan which has been brought up in both the planner's and the engineer's reports. The 12 by 15 dimensions are now consistent with the other plan and locates where that piece is on the plan. Nothing was changed or relocated. There was just an addition of numbers.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the proposed structure is 13,143 square feet of footprint on the first floor. Referring to Sheet A101 Exhibit A4, the total area of all floors, including the volleyball court floor proper, the entry level floor which has a few other rooms associated with it, and an upper mezzanine level which is one floor above the main floor, is 15,827 square feet. On Sheet A01 which is also Exhibit A4, the entry on the main floor is through the double doors which are depicted on drawing A1. It enters into a large vestibule area. There are two rooms labeled to the left: a snack bar and a pro shop. The snack bar is to be used as a storage space for snack bars and snacks of that nature, and to serve pizza that might be ordered locally. The pro shop will have an area to make T-shirts for their teams and to distribute volleyballs, sneakers, but nothing retail. To the right of the plan as one enters, is an office and a small reception area for the operations and business of the facility. In the back corner, is the egress that would take you to the second floor. The second floor is a mezzanine classified by the UCC. It is not an enclosed space and it is just a continued use of the space for volleyball activities. There will be team meetings there and possibly chalk-talks.

The courts are the largest area of the composition of the plan. They are roughly 84 feet by 134 feet in size. USA Volleyball has specific standards for court sizes and standards for the space around the courts. This building was carefully designed and engineered to accommodate those sizes and has been minimized in terms of its overall footprint, to the absolute bare minimum it could be and still be useful in the sport of volleyball. On the lowest level, there are 1737 square feet of basement for mostly storage and locker rooms and bathrooms. The entry level is the main floor of the building and the volleyball court is a sunken area towards the rear of the building. This was specifically designed to coordinate with the contour of the site which slopes from south to north, allowing minimal grading. Another benefit is the presentation to the street. The front elevation (referring to Exhibit A3 Sheet 201), Drawing F9, the dimension from grade to the peak of the roof is 30 feet 2 inches. By making it a split level situation, north elevation has a dimension of 35 feet which is well within the bulk standards of the ordinance but faces the Swamp, not the street. The building elevation has been designed to minimize the elevation against the street. In the section that describes the separation of floor to floor, Drawing A1, there's a cross-section and in A9, another cross-section showing to the right side of the plan a large open volume of space which is the volleyball courts. To the left of that space there is the main entry level space. Immediately above that dimension line is the mezzanine level. The box on the bottom represents the basement. Mr. Kaufman stated that that constituted the entire use and function of the space depicted in one cross-section to give the Board an idea of the comparative volume from volleyball to the other activities.

Mr. Kaufman then referred to the building materials and he returned to the rendering A202. He stated that the concept behind the building was intended to enhance the rural character of the community which is part of the Master Plan goals. He felt that the normal "industrial look" of gym-like facilities such as this one was inappropriate. The gambrel roof lends itself to an agricultural building. He felt it was a very familiar and iconic roof style associated with "Barn roof" or "barn style". A gambrel roof has a steeply pitched roof from the plate of the top of the wall. As it rises up towards the peak of the roof, there is a change in pitch and it flattens out. He felt it softened the mass of the building. He indicated that he added some features to enhance that "barn" look. On the front there are barn doors and a small shed roof which is in the spirit of décor. There is no functionality. They are decorative elements. Above that on the second floor, and above the second floor, other architectural features were added to enhance that type of character. Since there is minimal penetration, very little light will be emitted from the building at night. There are no windows other than the ones that face the south and they are there to break down the scale and give it more of a street scale. They are not required by the occupant of the space but are there merely to add character. There are no other windows to emit light from any other direction.

Mr. Kaufman referenced Mr. O'Brien's question about color selection and stated that the roof was cottage red which is a standard roof color for this type of building. He stated the painted brown vertical siding was reminiscent of the vertical siding often seen in the type of building. He also noted that the trim was off white. He stated it was a two colored façade with a roof which is the same three part color scheme used in numerous buildings throughout town. He hoped most people would accept this as a very familiar looking color scheme. He felt the muted darker color tones made the building look smaller.

Mr. Kaufman indicated that this was the entire overview of the building and that he had no further testimony.

A Board member asked Mr. Kaufman to comment on the doors and the air conditioning.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the air conditioning would only service the office areas of the building. Hence, there would not be extensive exterior units making noise. There would be a small unit, wall mounted, and the size of a window unit.

Mr. Kaufman stated the first door was an egress door located on Sheet A101 Drawing A1 on the first floor plan. There was a single door located at the bottom of a stair immediately behind the first floor power room which is a building code requirement. There must be direct access from an egress to the exterior. It must be in that location. On the site plan (Engineer's Sheet 3 in the southeast corner) there is a dimension line that runs from the corner of the building to the property line which is 74.6 feet. This door does not open onto a neighbor's property. It is substantial distance away from the property line. Referring to the Existing Conditions Drawing, there are doors and windows that are much closer to the property line than that. The closest one is 5.2 feet along that property line and then the existing house is—there's no dimension there—within five (5) feet. The only time that door will be in operation is during an emergency.

Mr. Kaufman moved on to the second set of doors located further back on the same east wall. Those are both egress requirements for that space as well as access in case something needs to be brought in and out of the building. There is no need for it to face that way however it is more convenient. It could face towards the rear. It is not an egress or access door that has to be open for any reason. Referring back to the site plan, he noted that the door is well back in the site. He said that the Taylor's property is 282 feet deep from Meyersville Road from south up to north and the door is at least another 100 feet beyond their property line therefore it really doesn't face anything but the Swamp.

Mr. Arentowicz interrupted Mr. Kaufman to ask for a motion to extend the meeting since it was close to 11:00 P.M.

Mr. Pfeil moved and Mr. Moholkar seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Arentowicz asked for questions from the Board.

Dr. Rae if there were any other examples of buildings such as this where there was no air conditioning in the summer months to show that the children were still able to be active. He also questioned how the facility would be heated.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the building is being built by today's standards for this use. There are requirements for insulation that don't exist in warehouses and other facilities that are usually retrofit for this type of use. The facility the Academy is now using has been retrofit so there is no such insulation. Since it is being built from the ground up, there are building codes that dictate the type of insulation, and the type of thermal barriers needed. Doors, windows, everything has to conform to those code standards. Significant sound insulation comes with that. He noted that the tenant testified that in their current facility nothing can be heard outside of the doors which have very thin steel siding walls. This building has an entire wall system including insulation, wall padding on the inside for their activities, and steel siding on the exterior. He does not anticipate any noise emittance whatsoever. There was some concern about screaming and yelling, but this is not a competitive environment especially not at 10 at night when they are practicing.

Mr. Kaufman stated that heating the large space would be addressed by two corner units called Moline Units. They are portable heaters, gas-fired, and will probably never be used. There are no exterior properties since they are self-contained. They're three (3) foot by three (3) foot box with louvers on the front, with a fan blowing warm air into the space. The rest of the building would have a traditional forced air system.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked for clarification as to whether it was gasoline or natural gas.

Mr. Kaufman replied that it was natural gas.

Dr. Rae asked for examples of buildings like this in the general area so that members of the public could visit.

Mr. Kaufman stated that the closest facility is called the "Power Zone" and located in Denville. It is a converted warehouse facility, not a "ground-up" facility like this one. He added that the only "ground-up" facility like this one that he is aware of is in Peekskill, NY. That facility is dimensionally very comparable to this one in many ways. During the design research phase of this project, Mr. Kaufman interviewed the personnel from Peekskill. From these interviews, he got the dimensional and heating characteristics. He noted that Peekskill facility doesn't use the heat in the winter since the children prefer a cooler temperature when they arrive. By 11:00 A.M. facility is more than warm enough. The Peekskill facility also has no need for air conditioning since it is an insulated structure. He also noted that Peekskill has a similar climate.

A Board member told Mr. Kaufman that the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee felt that the colorful metal barn was inconsistent with the character of the hamlet. He asked Mr. Kaufman what criteria were used to choose metal material for the siding.

Mr. Kaufman said there were a couple of different things but primarily it was a maintenance issue. A building of this size clad in wood would pose a problem with maintaining the paint so it would be impractical to do that scale of a building in wood regardless of budget. Typically those structures are not natural since the natural wood is painted. Most of the barns in the area are painted with an opaque color, not translucent, so no one would really be able to discern what material was underneath the paint. Mr. Kaufman stated that they picked up on the styles and shadow lines of those buildings, using the vertical board and batten ribbing to get that shadow and texture and depth that traditionally would be found in those types of structures. He said the color was picked to be the least aggressive color, looking at brown and muted off white as opposed to red and bright white. The background of the Swamp is made of darker colors so he felt using colors closer to tree bark kept the building less obvious given its size.

The Board member asked if Mr. Kaufman would consider putting a front façade on the building that would be more in keeping with the hamlet.

Mr. Kaufman stated he would have to understand what that meant but he would be amenable to taking suggestions from the Board.

The Board member commented that since the hamlet was all wood, they would want to be consistent with that.

Mr. Kaufman stated that they would be open to treatment if that was an issue for the Board.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if there were any other questions from the Board. He stated that he did want to give the public an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. O'Brien indicated that that would require a time extension.

Mr. Arentowicz asked the audience, by a show of hands, whether they wanted to speak tonight. Three (3) or four (4) residents raised their hands.

Mr. Hoffman questioned whether it would be more appropriate to wait for a better time since it was already 11:15 P.M.

Mr. Arentowicz felt that since the public had been there throughout the duration of the meeting, they should be heard. He asked for a motion to extend the meeting to 11:30 P.M. Dr. Rae moved and it was seconded by Committeeman Roshto. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Hoffman suggested that the Board skip over any remaining testimony from Mr. Kaufman since he would be present at future meetings, and to directly to the public comments.

Mr. Arentowicz deferred future questioning of Mr. Kaufman as the architect for another meeting and invited the public to come forward with comments.

Mr. Hoffman stated that pursuant to the requirements of the M.L.U.L., they must be sworn.

Mary Mayer, 273 High St., Stirling was sworn in. Her business address is 1801 Long Hill Road in Millington. As a business owner and homeowner, she supports this proposal. She said, "This type of facility will have a positive impact on the Long Hill business community. I know many parents who drive their kids to sport facilities and wait in that area until a game or a lesson is over spending their time and money in those towns. The proposed facility will support business in Long Hill Township by keeping consumer dollars in our town with the opportunity to buy locally grown produce at Hillview and Lombardo Farms and plants and garden supplies at Great Swamp Greenhouse. They can participate in activities that make the area rural to begin with and help keep our farms and greenhouse in business. And I would just like to remind you that the Long Hill Township business community has a long history of supporting the town through donations and sponsorships and as the business community prospers and grows, our ability to support the local and civic organizations will also increase. Your approval of this project will show that Long Hill Township really does support the business community as much as the business community supports Long Hill Township. Thank you."

Helena Tielmann, 795 Meyersville Road, Meyersville was sworn in. She felt there was a lot of detail to consider after tonight. Her property is next door to the proposed facility in addition to owning the land behind the subject property. She asked if there would be any windows on the west side facing her property.

Mr. Kaufman said no.

Mrs. Tielmann reiterated that there are no windows proposed. She acknowledged that she did want the property cleaned up and renovated in some way but she and her husband want the opportunity to look at all the details and what would transpire with that land. Her property next door is a mixed use property with approximately four (4) acres which wrap around the subject property. She stated that there is residential use as well as commercial use. She wants careful consideration given to the seven (7) day proposition because of noise and traffic.

Lisa Nelson resides at 24 Vickys Place, Millington and has a business at 53 Division Avenue in Millington. She wanted to reiterate what Ms Mayer stated about supporting the local businesses. She told the Board that her daughter is involved in this organization and that it is very well run. She said the girls are dedicated to the sport and they are hard workers. There are never any problems. She pointed out that she drops off her daughter and spends a lot of time in Flemington shopping and eating. She brings her family there also. She felt that this organization would bring in families and encourage them to utilize local businesses here.

Andrea Strong, of 1358 Whitebridge Road, Millington, stated that she feels it's a wonderful opportunity and she is in favor of the development of this property with something like this which will benefit the community.

Mr. Hoffman suggested that if no one else wished to comment tonight, the potential public comment period open until the applicants conclude its entire presentation which will be at a later meeting.

Mr. Arentowicz agreed.

Mr. Arentowicz gave his list of items he felt were needed to move this application forward. He felt the Board needed to see the stormwater plan, more information on the individual that is being used for the LSRP, more information on the grading and capping plan, a survey to resolve the issue of easement or easements, and written responses to the letters from our engineer and planner. He then asked the Board if there were any other additions or deletions to his suggested list.

Dr. Rae wanted more detail to the pick up and drop off area dilemma. He also wanted to see the County report on traffic.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked Mr. Kaufman when the request for the traffic report was sent to the County.

Mr. Kaufman responded approximately two (2) to three (3) weeks ago, the week that they last met.

Mr. O'Brien stated that was September 24th.

Dr. Rae did not feel that the traffic report was as important as some of the other issues.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the County will not be issuing a traffic report. The Planning Board will issue a letter outlining their concerns are about the suggested changes.

Mr. Lemanowicz explained that they ask that the driveway be moved or widened, change the radius of curve or something similar but not an actual traffic report. However, if Dr. Rae wanted that type of information, it could be obtained.

Dr. Rae said he would like to see the impact of the proposed traffic on the road.

Mr. Lemanowicz clarified that Dr. Rae wanted the Applicant to prepare a report on how the driveways would affect the flow of traffic on Meyersville Road.

Dr. Rae affirmed that he was essentially interested in the impact of the premises on the traffic patterns and safety in that general area.

Another Board member agreed with Dr. Rae on this. He could envision a car coming from the west on Meyersville Road trying to make a left into the volley barn and potentially create a backlog of cars in the drop off line

Mrs. Dapkins expressed an interest in seeing how the additional traffic would impact Meyersville Circle.

Mr. O'Brien stated that any traffic impact statement that the Board would be looking for would have to address the immediate roadways and the traffic that is generated by any proposed use.

Mr. Hoffman felt that the Board was saying that they wanted the application supported by a traffic engineering study to demonstrate that the sight distance, the radii for turning movements, and entry points to the site were safe and functional.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that was basically what was being described.

Mr. Arentowicz questioned as to where to obtain that information.

Mr. O'Brien indicated that it was up to the Applicant to provide that information to the Board.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that the Applicant had already agreed to a lot of the items in the letters so doing this, "cleaning up" some of these things, would make it easier to follow. Grading on the overflow parking specifically the area that of the headwall since they can't raise that, must be addressed, along with the easements and the drop off issue.

Mr. O'Brien wanted the Applicant to clean up the discrepancies between the architect's plan and the engineer's plan.

Mr. Hoffman had a procedural suggestion. Rather than the Board setting a date, when did the Applicant feel he would be able to present the data and pieces of information requested. This would avoid a situation where the information is submitted a couple days before a scheduled meeting and there is inadequate time for the Board consultants to comment on it. A meeting date should be scheduled when the material arrives. He indicated that material should be submitted two (2) weeks prior to the meeting.

Mr. Kaufman preferred that the Board continue the agenda for the meeting one month from now and that he would make the effort to get the information to the Board within the next two (2) weeks. If he could not meet that deadline, the Board would "kick him back" a meeting. He indicated that this is bit of a "time of the essence" project insofar as this is a seasonal business. This tenant has to be in by November of next year or she will miss the entire season. Another year will go by during which time this project will probably go by the wayside.

Dr. Rae asked the Board, given that fact, could the standard be relaxed and go to one (1) week lead time instead of two (2).

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that he would then receive his report the day before as was done the last time.

Another Board member was not in favor of fast-tracking this.

Dr. Rae did not feel this was fast-tracking.

Mr. Hoffman interjected that this application was deemed complete only two (2) weeks ago and is already on the schedule for public hearing so he felt the Board was not holding up the Applicant.

Mr. Arentowicz interrupted and stated that to continue, they would have to extend the time once again since it was 11:30 P.M.

Mrs. Dapkins stated she was not in favor of that.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the next available meeting was November 12, 2013. He also stated that the schedule called for discussion this evening of the Master Plan Draft Items A, B, and E and to finish C and D. Hence, the Board is one meeting behind.

Mr. Arentowicz called for a motion to extend the meeting for five (5) minutes. Motion was made and seconded. Voice vote: 5 in favor, 2 opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. Arentowicz asked, based on the agenda, was it possible to get the application on the calendar possibly in a month or a month-and-a-half.

Mr. O'Brien explained that should the Board adjourn the application to a date certain, it preserves the notice of application and another date could be scheduled if one party was not ready.

After conferring with Mr. O'Brien and the Board, Mr. Arentowicz announced that they would schedule the next hearing for November 12, 2013.

Mr. Kaufman stated that he and his team would make themselves available.

Mr. DeLaney also stated that for the record, they would grant an extension to November 30, 2013 and if necessary, he would send a formal letter.

Mr. Hoffman clarified that the application would be carried to November 12, without further notice but upon the understanding that information requested would be in the consultants' hands no later than October 29, 2013.

Mr. Arentowicz asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 11:38 P.M.

CYNTHIA KIEFER
Planning and Zoning Secretary