

Borough of Dunellen
Planning Board
355 North Avenue, Dunellen, New Jersey 08812

Meeting Minutes
Planning Board Meeting
September 29th, 2020

Call to Order:

Mr. Dornbierer called a Special Go2meeting (virtual meeting) to order at 7:00 pm

Open Public Meeting Act Statement:

Mr. Dornbierer read the Statement of Compliance.

Roll Call:	Present	Absent
Ken Bayer	X	
Jason Cilento (Mayor)	X	
Tom D'Amico	X	
Adam Gordon	X	
Julie Grof (Alternate)	X	
Robert Krause (2 nd Alternate)		X
Michael Mullin		X
Theresa Ratner	X	
Barbara Seif		X
Chairman- Roger Dornbierer	X	
Board Attorney- Matthew Moench	X	
Lou Ploskonka (CME Eng)	X	

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from the February meeting were not discussed.

Old Business:

No old business to discuss

New Business:

Mr. Dornbierer introduced the new business:

Communipaw Associates

Application# PB 20-02

150 North Avenue Block 1 Lot 14

Waiver and Application Hearing

Mr. Dornbierer- for the benefit of the new Board Members and public present, Mr. Dornbierer explained the process of the waiver hearing and the second phase of the meeting which is the presentation hearing.

Mr. Dornbierer asked who would be representing Communipaw Associates.

Mr. Paparo- announced that he was representing the applicants. He thanked the Board and others for setting up this virtual meeting. He then mentioned one housekeeping item – this application does require a D5 variance, this planning board is joint board, acting as the planning board in some occasions and the zoning board in others- tonight this board will be acting as a zoning board- therefore some members in attendance would not be able to consider this application- we ask that we address that issue so that those members can be excused and the remaining board members can hear the completeness application and if we are granted completion the merits of the underlying application.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked Mr. Bayer and Mayor Cilento to disconnect.

Mr. Moench- wanted to be sure there was a full compliment in order to proceed with the D variance vote.

Mr. Dornbierer- counted the members and alternates (total of 6)

Mr. Moench- Mr. Mullen- zoning officer- needs to recues himself also.

Mr. Paparo- decided to proceed. Mr. Mullen disconnected from the meeting.

Mr. Gordon- zoning issue- members that recused themselves- can they proceed in voting for the application?

Mr. Moench- precluded remains precluded.

Mr. Paparo- addressed the completion of the application. He called Mr. Seckler to give testimony.

Mr. Dornbierer- put up the checklist to be seen.

Mr. Moench – swore in the witness

Mr. Paparo introduced Mr. Seckler and Mr. Seckler put forward his credentials. Mr. Paparo recommended Mr. Seckler as an expert in both the field of civil engineering as well as professional planning.

Mr. Dornbierer- accepted the witness

Mr. Seckler- proceeded to present the waivers- NJDEP regulations, DOT regulations, Natural features,

Mr. Dornbierer asked Mr. Ploskonka if he had any objections and he responded that there were none.

Mr. Seckler- continued down the checklist to present all the waivers.

Mr. Ploskonka had no objections.

Mr. Seckler- continued through the checklist till the end and there were no objections.

Mr. Dornbierer- does the board have any questions? No questions.

Motion made by Mr. Wahba and seconded by Mr. D'Amico

To grant the waivers- with access permits from the NJDOT and every other appropriate authority as necessary.

	<u>YEA</u>	<u>NEY</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>
Thomas D'Amico	X		
Adam Gordon	X		
Julie Grof	X		
Theresa Ratner	X		
Tim Wahba	X		
Roger Dornbierer	X		

Mr. Dornbierer- application has been deemed complete

Mr. Paparo – thanked the board members and stated that they would start the presentation of the underlying project.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked about materials that would be presented.

Mr. Moench- asked if the public had any waiver related questions.

Mr. Dornbierer asked the public and there were no questions.

Mr. Paparo- asked that Mr. Seckler be the presenter.

Mr. Paparo presented the overview of the application.

Mr. Paparo introduced Mr. Feld

Mr. Moench- swore in Mr. Feld

Mr. Paparo – asked Mr. Feld for his credentials

Mr. Feld –Presented his credentials

Mr. Paparo- offered Mr. Feld as an expert witness in the field of architecture

Mr. Dornbierer- accepted the witness

Mr. Paparo asked Mr. Seckler to bring up the floor plans and asked Mr. Feld to provide an overview of this building.

Mr. Feld- presented the plans starting with the first floor and parking area and proceeded with the second floor layout and apartment units.

Mr. Paparo asked Mr. Feld to describe the elevation plans dated March 10, 2020

Mr. Feld- proceeded to describe the colors and building materials that will be used for the building.

Mr. Paparo- asked if Mr. Feld was aware of the design standards recommended by the redevelopment plan and did he consult with there standards in designing this building.

Mr. Feld – responded with an affirmative response to Mr. Paparo's questions.

Mr. Paparo- concluded that he had no other questions for Mr. Feld at this time.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked who would be responsible to answer the questions about the number of parking spots.

Mr. Paparo- said that Mr. Seckler would answer those questions

Mr. Dornbierer- asked about laundry facilities

Mr. Feld- checked the design for the laundry facilities and pointed out the common laundry facilities on each floor.

Mr. Dornbierer-Jackson Avenue view-on ground floor- give greater detail of the three openings? Traffic flow?

Mr. Feld- proceeded to answer Mr. Dornbierer – center space entrance to parking area with two other openings – no screening at this point.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked the board members for questions.

Mr. D'amico – driving on North Ave from Plainfield to Dunellen- the right side elevation that is most visible view- can you give the same treatment as the Jackson Ave elevation as far as textures and materials?

Mr. Feld- yes that is possible.

Mr. D'Amico- right side should be given more aesthetic treatment than just aluminum siding.

Mr. Paparo- no objection to putting a matching façade on that side of the building, it will be carried around to the right side including the embellishments on the top of the building. Also there will be screening on the parking openings.

Steve Gottlieb- CME planner- had questions about architecture. Expressed concerns after reviewing plans- Train Station feel to the architecture- not sure that this complies with the façade materials. Maybe spruce up the façade with clapboard, stone. Rooftop equipment- flat roofs- decorative features along the roof line- such as false dormers and peaks.

Mr. Ploskonka- the redevelopment plan speaks to the use of awnings, wrought iron railing, and specific requirements for transparency in a detailed section in the plan and hoping that Mr. Feld could discuss compliance to all of the requirements in the redevelopment plan.

Mr. Feld- we can take another look at the plan and resubmit some revised drawings Rooftop units would be concealed, shielded.

Mr. Dornbierer- Mr. Paparo we will have to put that on the side for further discussion – possibility of embellishing the design- modifying what is presented.

Mr. Dornbierer- Mr. Ploskonka- any more questions?

Mr. Ploskonka- specific requirements in the redevelopment plan- materials- façade- window and doors, awnings etc. - I think it would be helpful if the applicants professional could explain how they are meeting those requirements or not so that you can make an informed decision.

Mr. D'Amico- I thinks the design is somewhat similar to the Dunellen Station project- stucco on second floor brick on the first- not a bad looking building- don't object to having more brick work- somewhat consistent with that building. Each of us should look at that and see if it is acceptable.

Mr. Dornbierer- it terms of the items Mr. Ploskonka is discussing do you have anything at this time to address those?

Mr. Paparo- redevelopment plan has building architectural recommendations and I would be interested in what Mr. Ploskonka is taking an issue with so that we can address them.

Mr. Gottlieb- responded with his thoughts on what should be considered.

Mr. Paparo- suggested that we move on to the presentation of Mr. Seckler, and have Mr. Feld review section 8 of the redevelopment plan and see if he can identify the elements that could be incorporated into this design. I think we would be able to get something accomplished that way while we continue the presentation.

Mr. Dornbierer-any other discussion before I go to the Board Members for comments or questions?

Mr. Gordon- questioned the refuse area on the first floor adjacent to the lobby and the 9x9 ft concrete pad on the northwest corner of the first floor north of the parking can you explain how these will be used by inhabitants and services?

Mr. Paparo asked Mr. Feld to explain the uses of these spaces.

Mr. Feld- explained the usage of these spaces.

Mr. Paparo- explained how and where the super works and lives.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked more questions about the dumpster and how that is accessed by a garbage service.

Mr. Paparo- explained that Mr. Seckler would discuss the access and circulation of refuse.

Mr. Gordon- one other question; about the two stores on the ground floor and access for the employees or rear entrances.

Mr. Feld- no access from the rear of the building.

Mr. Ploskonka-how do the retail owners address the refuse from the retail and how that is accessed.

Mr. Feld- same and the residents

Mr. Dornbierer- so the retail would have to leave the front of the business and go into the entrance to access the refuse, just through the front door?

Mr. Feld- yes that is correct.

Mr. Dornbierer- any questions from the Board.

Mr. Damico- are the three bins for recycling and will they be handled by a private hauler?

Mr. Feld- the engineer can answer those questions.

Mr. Paparo- conforming signage will be put up later to comply with the code.

Ms. Ratner- one question, about the garage entrance. How do you get in and out of the garage area?

Mr. Paparo- Mr. Seckler will answer those questions.

Mr. Dornbierer opened the question period to the public.

Public architectural questions:

Mr. Tremayne L. Reid-721 Walnut Street, Dunellen- is there a possible addition of a rear door for the storefronts to gain access for garbage disposal through the back of the stores instead of the front? A lot of issues with a lot of tenants in the business district leaving garbage in front on the street. Try to rectify this issue by adding a rear door.

Mr. Paparo- because of the site, that type of access might impact the site and garage and it may be best to have Mr. Seckler answer that question after his testimony.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked for more questions?

Mr. Moench- asked Mr. Feld about adding a door for garbage removal.

Mr. Feld – it might be feasible but the engineer must answer that question.

Ms. Rita Donato-Edwards- 126 Dunellen Ave. – likes idea of dormers on the top of the building- the false balcony also- question about corbels, what are they made out of.

Mr. Feld- wood or inaudible.

Mr. James Lester-217 Madison Ave, Dunellen-can you clarify where the dumpster or recycling is being placed?

How many feet is the building off the property line? Mr. Feld-10 feet off the property line.

Is there a curb cut for the garbage truck to get in? Mr. Feld -No curb cut

But it is a dumpster right? Mr. Feld- yes it is

Mr. Paparo- Mr. Seckler will address all of these things in his presentation

Mr. Tremayne L. Reid-721 Walnut Street, Dunellen-parking that is there for the store front is there any public parking for the stores or is there street parking only.

Mr. Paparo- sorry to repeat myself but Mr. Seckler will answer all those questions.

Ms. Rita Donato-Edwards- 126 Dunellen Ave- there are a lot of Victorian homes in the area and that is in keeping with the dormers and the embellishment of the façade and the third floor of the building, I think it should be in keeping with some of the other residential homes.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked for any other questions from the public- no more remarks.

Mr. Paparo-thanked the board and introduced Mr. Seckler to present the exhibits for the engineering testimony.

Mr. Seckler- described the exhibit and marked it A-3--an Aerial exhibit of the property. He described the property to the board, and the surrounding area and businesses. He described the site- generally flat, existing conditions of the site. He put up pictures of the site for all to see. Four images from August 2019- marked as A-4, he went through all images and described them to the Board.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked about the previous site and any remediation that needs to be done.

Mr. Paparo- A no further action letter dated July 12, 2002, was issued by the State of NJ DEP, which identified the removal of underground storage tanks for the site therefore the site has been remediated. He would be happy to supply that to the Board as a condition of approval.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked for the further action letter as a condition. He then opened the discussion back to Mr. Seckler.

Mr. Seckler- brought up the site plan- dated 9/4/2020- which was marked as A-5 and continued to describe the site plan- highlighting a number of the items with more detail. He spoke of the enhanced improvements to the site. He described the features of the building and parking areas. Open space was discussed, plantings and landscaping. He stated that they are happy to work with the Board on choices of landscaping items. He spoke about the refuse and recycling and the handling of it.

Mr. Ploskonka- asked about times for refuse pick up.

Mr. Seckler- we would be agreeable of the scheduled times decided on. Retail store second access- limited refuse- no objection to adding an additional entrance for refuse handling.

Overall; looking at the redevelopment plan and this project- you see a number of improvements that are exactly what this municipality has been looking for in terms of a transit oriented development- providing mixed uses, providing additional density and when we get to the planning testimony I will speak of the density benefits.

Mr. Seckler- from an engineering standpoint, we have designed this site in accordance with typical design standards. From a traffic engineering standpoint it is a minimalist change from the traffic generated but massive improvements from site access and accessibility in providing a single driveway on Jackson Avenue, he deferred to Mr. Paparo for questions.

Mr. Paparo- asked if he had a chance to go through the 9/24/20 review letter from Mr. Ploskonka. Are there any items or recommendations that require your response, meaning that the applicant cannot comply with them?

Mr. Seckler- answered all the recommendations from the review letter.

Mr. Ploskonka- asked about the retail business deliveries

Mr. Seckler- answered his questions about delivery and hours for those things.

Mr. Moench- mentioned signs and delivery

Mr. Ploskonka asked about street trees.

Mr. Seckler- answered his questions.

Mr. Ploskonka mentioned that street trees are very important in Dunellen. The themes down the corridor are street trees and plantings, flower pots, decorative lighting.

Mr. Seckler- answered that they have tried to add those planters – DOT does not want to be responsible for the maintenance- referred to the Board.

Mr. Ploskonka- made some suggestions about this problem- long process- get this process started quickly.

Mr. Seckler- less root intrusive plantings possibly can be used

Mr. Gottlieb- concurred with Mr. Ploskonka- raised planters etc.; trees don't impact the utilities and pavement.

Mr. Seckler- will work with the Board and DOT and investigate

Mr. Dornbierer- any additional testimony?

Mr. Paparo- just wanted Mr. Seckler to address the items in the report and double checked the report to see if all items were addressed.

Mr. Ploskonka- environmental- what has the site been used for since the tanks were pulled?

Mr. Paparo- solely used as an auto repair facility- environmental analysis was done prior to the redeveloper's purchase of the property – the property has a clean bill of health.

Mr. Ploskonka – asked that the recent information be shared with the board.

Mr. Paparo- I have to check for confidentiality issues, but it should not be an issue.

Mr. Dornbierer- any other items?

Mr. Ploskonka- just to close, Mr. Seckler, all other items in the report are agreeable to you from an engineers prospective?

Mr. Seckler- absolutely

Mr. Dornbierer- stopped the meeting for 15 minutes for a break.

Mr. Dornbierer- waited for all to be back and continued the meeting at 9:15pm. Based on testimony what questions do the Board Members have?

Mr. Gordon- had a question on the page 3 of site plan- along the street in the brick paver strip there are four dark circles- are they the typical Dunellen decorative street lights.

Mr. Seckler- yes those are the typical called for lighting.

Mr. D'Amico- Street trees question- should be at least one street tree installed in front of the building. Also, the parking lot layout –looks like a difficult turn to pull into the parking space.

Mr. Seckler- we will work with your Board experts to follow their suggestions. We can change from 19 to 17 stalls in the parking lot to make it easier for parking. Should benefit the parking.

Mr. Ploskonka- good suggestion from Mr. Seckler to sacrifice two spaces

Mr. Dornbierer- any safety issues as it is currently configured? And would there be a lessening of that safety issue if we go down to 17?

Mr. Ploskonka- providing room for turning movement where we can lessen that.

Mr. Gordon- is the applicants engineer correct in the assertion that the Dunellen downtown redevelopment plan does not require any parking for this site?

Mr. Ploskonka- yes he is.

Mr. Dornbierer- is this Based on the characteristics of having a transit village where you are trying to reduce the amount of vehicular traffic.

Mr. Ploskonka- yes that is correct

Mr. Dornbierer- any more questions.

Ms. Groff- Are spaces big enough to open doors? Agrees with the street tree issue. Concurs with the idea about speaking with planners for suggestions of the landscaping plans. Finally, a question about the parking lot and sidewalks between the spaces and retail stores? Can you walk right out to the sidewalk?

Mr. Seckler answered all of her questions

Mr. Dornbierer- asked about the management of the trash receptacles. Is the super responsible for the trash bins? Will super only be checking them as per an established schedule?

Mr. Seckler- trash receptacles on Route 28? On the street? I would have to defer to someone at the municipality as to how the receptacles are handled throughout the downtown, is there an organization that handles that or the property owners? At this point we would contemplate whatever is being done currently with the municipality but we would be open to hearing any member that has the answer to that question.

Mr. Dornbierer – had questions about the bike racks. Inside or outside, exposed or contained.

Mr. Seckler- enclosed if we do lose the two parking spots, the one in the street would be uncovered.

Mr. Dornbierer- talked about locating the bike rack to the front of the building. I would propose considering locating it there.

Are any of the parking spaces dedicated to the commercial or shared?

Mr. Seckler- during weekday hours the spaces are sharable, not to be used as a park and ride.

Mr. Dornbierer- details of the enclosure for the rubbish containers. What's going to be on the three sides? And what is going to be on the front that will open up.

Mr. Seckler- we will match the materials of the building, along the frontage of the building. Along the front will be a metal frame and a wood gate.

Mr. Dornbierer- my questions have been answered

Ms. Ratner- just wondering about the parking- can spaces be designated for workers in the retail stores?

Mr. Seckler- that is what my preference would be. Applicant should be left to manage that.

Mr. Wahba- who would be responsible for regulating the policy for parking?

Mr. Seckler- the applicant would be responsible.

Mr. Dornbierer- any more questions?

Mr. Gordon- regarding the building columns inside the parking area, will they be in the way of cars pulling in and out of the spots?

Mr. Seckler- we measure the spaces, you would have greater than 9 feet. No impediment to get into or out of your vehicle.

Mr. Gordon- questioned maintenance of the landscaping plan.

Mr. Seckler- it would probably be more of a stone base in that area.

Mr. Dornbierer- knee wall, is it included in these plans?

Mr. Seckler-not shown in detail on the plans- the grading plan shows the wall changes in height, but not detail. That is something that we would be happy to work with your engineer.

Mr. Dornbierer- I would like to see that included.

Mr. Gottlieb- the room behind the stairway just off the lobby could that be used for bike storage?

Mr. Seckler- I'm not sure but the applicant has expressed interest in promoting bike usage, so if it's possible he would be happy to include it.

Mr. Dornbierer- opened up discussion to the public. No questions from the public.

Mr. Dornbierer- we will move on to the planning testimony.

Mr. Paparo- asked Mr. Seckler that the applicant requires a deviation from the redevelopment plan for density, I mentioned in my opening that is a D5 variance according to the municipal land use law. Can you speak briefly to the requirements for the grant of that deviation in your professional opinion as a planner how the density can be accommodated at this location?

Mr. Seckler- absolutely, you are correct that we are seeking a D5 variance and that is why some members were unable to participate because we are before the zoning board. He continued to explain the D5 variance requirements
The burden is on the applicant to show whether or not the site can support the density.
Mr. Seckler- continued to state all the facts as to why this site could support the density variance and that they are in line with the redevelopment plan from a land use and plan prospective.

Mr. Paparo- no further direct in support of the D5 variance.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked if Mr. Speckler had statistics on what the density of his other buildings in the town are.

Mr. Speckler- I can't speak to the density I do know that 528 North Ave. is more dense maybe 39 or 40 units. Slightly more dense than here I think this site can support this density.

Mr. Dornbierer- spoke of a property which is heading into Middlesex with 63 units that was approved so your request is not uncommon.

Mr. Dornbierer- opened up to the public for questions on testimony on the planning only.

No public questions.

Mr. Dornbierer closed that portion of the meeting. He spoke to Mr. Moench about all the conditions that were mentioned.

Mr. Moench- went over his list of all conditions that were mentioned in the testimony and discussion.

Mr. Paparo- added one additional condition that Mr. Moench agreed with.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked about the procedure ahead.

Mr. Moench- suggested that there should be a discussion of the
D variance first

Discussion generally about whether the board is supportive or not presuming the board has no issues with the D variance portion

Have general discussion with exception of delivery hours and parking spaces-some of this stuff that is designed.

Mr. Dornbierer – this building is an anchor building that is delineating the start of the Dunellen downtown- it is imperative that there be a meeting of the minds on the design on the sides of the building. How is that handled? How do you nail down the agreement on the design of it so that the applicant says it's approved so lets get started they didn't specify the design that they want so we don't have to worry about that?

How do we get that put into words?

Mr. Moench – You have two options:

1. The Board could decide they are not satisfied with the current renderings and ask the applicant to come back with different renderings at the next meeting.
2. The other option is if the board is willing to allow the professional to handle that issue, then you can let them say “as long as your professional is happy with their discussions following this meeting then they can proceed as long as your professionals are satisfied.”

If there is not a meeting of the minds before your professionals, then in that case the applicant would have to come back to hear testimony at the next meeting on the disagreements. Then the board could issue a ruling.

Mr. Paparo- agreed with those options, no objection to working with the Boards' professionals about the façade improvements. We would defer to your judgment. Many issues can be worked out from professional to professional to make sure things can be accomplished.

We are talking about minor adjustments. We are requesting preliminary and final, the option of granting the variance and the preliminary and having us return with the revised elevations for final. Certainly we would understand if the Board were inclined to do that, we just ask that Mr. Seckler would not be needed at that meeting.

No objections to proceeding in any of those avenues.

Mr. Dornbierer- not proposing or suggesting an overhaul to what your proposal is, just making sure that comments made by the Board can be implemented into the plans so that they are documented and not fall by the wayside.

Mr. Dornbierer- asked Lou and Steve they could play a role in, conferring with the board or a representative of the board and making sure that these things are incorporated ultimately?

Mr. Ploskonka- I think if we had some guidance of what the board wanted incorporated then maybe we could go forth with the applicants' professionals and accomplish that. Right now I would feel uncomfortable with that. Certain things that we could look at, but the building façade improvements we would need some guidance from the board on that before we could move forward. Do you give us guidance tonight or give the applicants professionals a chance to amend the plan and resubmit it. We need input from the Board in any case.

Mr. Dornbierer- positions or opinions on the density proposal?

Mr. Gottlieb- can the applicant provide quick testimony on the affordable housing aspect of this project?

Mr. Paparo- saw the comment in the report- 14 units , 2 units would be set aside for affordable housing.

Mr. Dornbierer- opened to the public for general statements regarding the application.
Public statements- none

Mr. Paparo- this is an exciting redevelopment project, a long journey – a building that will do all the things that Mr. Seckler described. We appreciate the feedback.
This site can handle the density, you don't see any issues. We feel this is an exciting project to continue the redevelopment that's occurring throughout Dunellen

Mr. Dornbierer- Board members a general discussion about the agreement of what we think about the density issue? Personally I'm in favor of it.

Mr. D'Amico- no objection to the density, it seems consistent to some of the other approvals along this corridor.

Ms. Groff- was concerned at first since it was such a huge jump on the accepted amount of density but I think there were some good arguments and eased my mind to the benefits that this density could bring. In favor of this.

Mr. Dornbierer- consensus is that the density issue is approved. He asked questions about the parking being reduced- in favor of it.

Ms. Ratner- in favor of it, a good idea.

Mr. D'Amico- also agreed- in favor of idea.

Mr. Moench- went through the items of discussion.

Mr. Dornbierer- any questions or opinions

Mr. D'Amico- no objections

Mr. Moench- continued with items on list of discussion items.

Mr. Dornbierer- if the board has no objections , I have full trust with CME working with a representative of shade tree commission and they will work with the applicant to come to an agreement.

Mr. Moench- one item of discussion- location of the access to pulling in and out of the parking lot- that issue got resolved in the testimony- just wanted to mention it because I had a note

Mr. Dornbierer- also like to include the design above the knee wall- design to be determined- will work with the engineer and the borough.

Last item- based upon the guidance given to CME- will come up with final requirement for the facades on either side of the building if approved.

Mr. Moench- will bike parking be a condition?

Mr. Dornbierer- comments on bike rack?

Ms. Groff- I think it should be an external bike rack

Mr. D'Amico- there should be adequate space on the sidewalk.

Mr. Dornbierer- anything else?

Mr. Moench- last minor one – vinyl fence or wood board fence.

Mr. Dornbierer- preference to vinyl?

Mr. D'Amico- doesn't matter to me- what is better for maintenance?
What lasts longer and stands up to time.

Mr. Gottlieb- vinyl is more durable than the wood fence and less of a tendency to deteriorate.

Mr. Ploskonka- recommends vinyl fencing.

Mr. Moench- best thing to do is to vote on the variance issue, vote on the preliminary site plan approval and carry the final site plan approval to the next meeting.

Mr. Paparo- agreed to carry the final site plan approval to the next meeting. To get revised elevations to the Board for their review.

Mr. Moench- so the motion we are looking for is to grant the D5 variance as well as preliminary site plan approval subject to the conditions we discussed. The final site plan approval will be carried to the next meeting.

Ms. Groff- we discussed the secondary entrance- rear entrance to the retail.

Mr. Paparo it will be added to the revised plan.

Mr. Ploskonka- refuse pick up between 9 and 11am?

Mr. Dornbierer- can the applicant commit to that?

Mr. Dornbierer- thank you for your patience to everyone.

Mr. Paparo- those pick up times would be between 8 and 4

Mr. Dornbierer- no objections to that. The details have been laid out in terms of a motion, would anyone like to make a motion?

Mr. Damico made a motion and Ms. Ratner seconded

Vote to approve the D-Variance and the preliminary site plan:

	<u>YEA</u>	<u>NEY</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>
Thomas D'Amico	X		
Adam Gordon	X		
Julie Grof	X		
Theresa Ratner	X		
Tim Wahba	X		
Roger Dornbierer	X		

Motion to carry the Final Approval to the next meeting (Oct 26th, 2020)

	<u>YEA</u>	<u>NEY</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>
Thomas D'Amico	X		
Adam Gordon	X		
Julie Grof	X		
Theresa Ratner	X		
Tim Wahba	X		
Roger Dornbierer	X		

Board Member Comments:

Mr. D'Amico- couldn't get drop-box to work on his phone- ended up working when he set it up on the computer.

Mr. Dornbierer- any other comments?

Mr. D'Amico- any word on the beginning of the Art Color Project?

Mr. Bayer- we got county approval yesterday so that's one big milestone.

Mr. Moench- still a laundry of outstanding issues, no specific time period as of yet.

Mr. Gordon- we started at 7pm it's now 10:45pm- in the past we had a three hour time limit. I think we should keep that in mind in the future.

Mr. Dornbierer-Board rules say that we cannot accept any new testimony after 10 pm with completion by 10:30pm; I cannot address this special meeting but I believe that for General meetings those are the guidelines.

Mr. Bayer: the go-to meeting invite said from 7 to 9

Mr. Gordon- I don't think that it said in the meeting notice that was published it had to end at a certain time it just said starting at 7pm but what Ken just said about the invite is correct.

Mr. Moench- I advise boards to keep to their general time frame. Once you go three or four hours the decision making starts to not be as crisp. Board rules are your own rules so you can waive your own rules. I don't recommend it.

Public Comments:

No Public comments

Adjournment:

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Wahba and seconded by Mr. D'Amico
The meeting was adjourned at 10:48 PM


Chairman


Secretary


Date of Approval