

BOROUGH OF RARITAN
Planning Board Reorganization & Meeting
MINUTES
January 25, 2023

CALL TO ORDER & FLAG SALUTE

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Borough of Raritan Municipal Building. Ms. Probst read the open public meetings statement into the record.

REORGANIZATION MEETING

OATHS OF OFFICE

Mayor Bray swore in all members who were reappointed simultaneously.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

• **CHAIRPERSON**

Motion by Mr. Cunningham, **seconded** by Councilman Carra and unanimously carried to nominate Debra Thomas. Seeing no further nominations, a single ballot was cast and Ms. Thomas was designated Chairperson.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

• **VICE CHAIRPERSON**

Motion by Ms. Thomas, **seconded** by Ms. Goetsch to nominate Bill Cunningham. Seeing no further nominations, a single ballot was cast and Mr. Cunningham was designated Vice Chairperson.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

ROLL CALL

Present

Debra Thomas
Mayor Bray
Councilman Carra
Mr. Cunningham
Ms. Carra
Mr. DeCicco
Ms. Goetsch
Ms. Windrem
Mr. Delacruz
Ms. Sherwin
Mr. Brown

Also Present

Larry Cohen, Board Attorney
Stan Schrek, Board Engineer
Lou Gara, Zoning/Construction Official
Joe Bronson, Van Cleef Engineering

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

• **TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE ("TRC")**

Ms. Thomas announced that the following Board members would be reappointed to the TRC: Ms. Goetsch, Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Brown. She advised that she would continue to serve as well.

- **PEDESTRIAN BIKE & SAFETY COMMITTEE**

Ms. Thomas advised that she and Ms. Sherwin would continue to serve. Councilman Carra volunteered as well.

RESOLUTIONS

- **PB-2023-01 (MEETING DATES)**

Ms. Thomas read the proposed meeting dates into the record. The November and December meeting dates were discussed and left intact. **Motion** by Mayor Bray, **seconded** by Mr. DeCicco and unanimously carried to adopt the resolution, as presented.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

- **PB-2023-02 (OFFICIAL NEWSPAPERS)**

Motion by Ms. Goetsch, **seconded** by Ms. Sherwin and unanimously carried to designate the Courier News of Bridgewater and the Star Ledger as the official newspapers of the Planning Board for 2023 and adopt the resolution, as presented. Mr. Cohen explained the purpose of having two official newspapers.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

- **PB-2023-03 (PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS)**

Motion by Councilman Carra, **seconded** by Ms. Windrem and unanimously carried to adopt a resolution, as presented reappointing Van Cleef Engineering & Lavery, Salvaggi, Abromitis & Cohen as Board Engineer and Board Attorney.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

- **PB-2023-04 (BOARD SECRETARY)**

Motion by Mr. Delacruz, **seconded** by Mayor Bray and unanimously carried to adopt a resolution, as presented, reappointing Nancy Probst as Board Secretary.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. Decicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

PUBLIC COMMENT & ADJOURNMENT TO REGULAR MEETING

Seeing as there was no public comment, a **Motion** was made by Mr. Cunningham, seconded by Mayor Bray and unanimously carried to adjourn the Reorganization Meeting at 6:14.

REGULAR MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present

Debra Thomas
Mayor Bray
Councilman Carra
Mr. Cunningham
Ms. Carra
Mr. DeCicco
Ms. Goetsch
Ms. Windrem
Mr. Delacruz
Ms. Sherwin
Mr. Brown

Also Present

Larry Cohen, Board Attorney
Stan Schrek, Board Engineer
Lou Gara, Zoning/Construction Official
Joe Bronson, Assistant Planner/Engineer

MINUTES

- **10/26/22 Minutes**

Motion by Councilman Carra, **seconded** by Ms. Carra to adopt the Minutes, as presented.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Sherwin

NAY:

ABSTAIN: Mayor Bray, Mr. DeCicco, Mr. Delacruz, Ms. Windrem

- **11/30/22 Minutes**

Motion by Ms. Goetsch, **seconded** by Mr. Brown to adopt the Minutes, as presented.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Mr. Delacruz, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin

NAY:

ABSTAIN: Mr. DeCicco

RESOLUTION

- **Trading Post Realty #2, LLC
Block 107, Lot 15 (28-30 Doughty Street)
Minor Subdivision**

Motion by Councilman Carra, **seconded** by Ms. Goetsch to adopt the memorializing resolution, as presented.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin

NAY:

ABSTAIN: Mr. Decicco

APPLICATION/HEARING

- **Char Steakhouse
Block 33, Lot 1 (777 Route 202)
Minor Site Plan**

Ms. Thomas announced that this [completeness] hearing would be carried to the February meeting.

ENGINEERING/PLANNING REPORT

Mr. Shreck deferred his update to the Area in Need of Redevelopment portion of the meeting.

CONSTRUCTION/ZONING OFFICIAL REPORT

Mr. Gara provided updates on the following matters:

- Janssen – moving quickly.
- Nik's – permits issued; have revised plans.
- Rick's (1st St & 5th) – no application yet.

TRC MEETING UPDATE

Ms. Thomas proposed they meet on February 8 at 9am for the Valley Wellness and LaGrange Street matters and on a month to month basis, thereafter.

PUBLIC HEARING (AREA IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT)

- **Block 53, Lots 1 & 2 (Tillman Street between Quick Avenue & First Avenue)**

Mr. Cohen provided an overview of the process/legal procedures. He advised that this area was included as part of the Borough's affordable housing obligations and that it meets three of the statutory criteria.

Joe Bronson, Assistant Planner/Engineer provided an overview of the Preliminary Investigation Report prepared by Van Cleef Engineering Associates, dated August 22, 2022. He explained that the site was found eligible for redevelopment under criteria A, D and H which he read aloud.

Chairwoman Thomas solicited questions from the Board. She asked Mr. Bronson to confirm that this was a non-condemnation project, which he did. He also confirmed that a developer had yet to be designated and responded to a question from Mr. Brown about permitted uses, which he referenced on page 5 of the report. Mr. Bronson confirmed that if developed, the site would be subject to current zoning regulations and that this would be discussed during the Redevelopment Plan process. Mr. Cohen affirmed and reiterated that this is part of the Fair Share Housing Agreement. He spoke at length about the obligations in response to a request from Mr. Brown for him to expound on what the agreement says.

Mr. Schrek advised that Tillman Street was identified as part of the Fair Share Plan and proceeded to read the statutory requirements of same. He explained that the Borough has until February of 2024 to decide what to do with the property and that the Redevelopment Plan would establish zoning.

Mr. Cunningham asked why so many are being developed. Mr. Schrek explained that it was part of the state mandate to meet affordable housing.

Ms. Thomas responded to a question from **Irma Mooney of 34 Glaser Ave.** about whether the renters who replaced people who left are part of the affordable housing. She responded to a question/comment from **Nancy Raab of 49 Quick Ave.**, explaining that typically 15% of new construction is slated for affordable housing, making reference to The Lena and Orlando Drive. Mr. Cohen explained that Orlando Drive had a lesser requirement because it predated the settlement.

Susan Mosca Grosso commented that the overgrowth mentioned earlier is from the dog park. She clarified that the lot in the back is Lot 1; not Lot 2 and asserted that it was not untidy/dilapidated. Ms. Mosca Grosso asked what affordable is, mentioning senior citizen housing. She read a prepared statement into the record. Ms.

Thomas spoke about Stonebridge. Ms. Mosca Grosso commented that there have been drainage issues since Stonebridge was built. Ms. Thomas suggested that she reach out to Mr. Gara about this. Mr. Schrek offered that the problem the Borough had was with easements that were not taken back.

Hugo Simoes of 15 Brentwood Road asked about the total number of units owed. Referencing the Fair Share Housing Plan, Mr. Schrek verified that the number was 221 and advised that the Plan mandates the numbers.

Michael Gradone of 11 Avon Ridge asked how they come up with the numbers and commented that this is a disaster waiting to happen on Orlando Drive as a result of more water coming in due to negligence. Comparing it to Somerville, he suggested that the Board think out of the box and opined that the Police cannot accommodate it.

Sonny Maines of 99 Thompson Street asked about/commented on the number of units. Mr. Cohen spoke about existing units and about deed restrictions on rehab properties.

Jason Beatrice identified himself as the owner of Lots 1 and 1.01. He commented on trees being part of the plan. He stated that they are mixing the two properties together and spoke about a chain link fence approved by the Board in 1988.

Victor Lucini asked how the Borough keeps taking on housing in a 2.3 square mile area. He asked whether the State considers traffic/allows a traffic study. Ms. Thomas explained that they do not take traffic into consideration and that the burden is on the applicant. She explained that the Fair Share Housing Center took over COAH.

The public question/comment portion of the Hearing was closed at 7:28.

Motion by Mr. Brown, **seconded** by Mr. DeCicco to accept the recommendation of the Planner and declare Block 53, Lots 1 & 2 area in need of redevelopment based on Van Cleef's August 22 report.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Chairwoman Thomas, Mayor Bray, Councilman Carra, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Carra, Mr. Delacruz, Mr. Brown, Ms. Goetsch, Ms. Windrem, Ms. Sherwin, Mr. DeCicco

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

APPLICATION/HEARING

- **Raritan Crossing, LLC**
Block 116.01, Lots 25, 26, 26.01, 27 & 27.01 AND Block 112, Lot 3 (90 East Somerset Street)
Minor Subdivision and Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan

Susan Rubright, Esq. entered her appearance on behalf of the applicant. She explained that the proposal includes 5 tax lots and provided an overview of the process. Ms. Rubright explained that the site would be redeveloped in accordance with a Redevelopment Plan adopted in accordance with the following timeline:

3/23/21 – Council resolution for Board to conduct Preliminary Investigation

5/21/21 – Planning Board referred back to Council

9/22/21 – Public Hearing held; resolution declaring area in need of redevelopment adopted

 /22 – Council directed the Board to prepare a redevelopment plan which would not include condemnation

7/12/22 – Redevelopment Plan adopted by Council. (Approval subject to Section 8a of the Redevelopment Plan).

Ms. Rubright offered that the plan went through a lengthy redevelopment process which was vetted at public hearings by the Planning Board and Council and is conforming/meets the criteria/standards given the permitted

uses in the zone.

Ms. Rubright explained that the existing three story commercial building would be demolished and replaced with a four story residential apartment building which would include 12 affordable housing units. She explained that the application was for Preliminary and Final Site Plan with a waiver of EIS and the request for subdivision withdrawn. She explained that they would be providing a storm water management plan and spoke about variances associated with pre-existing non-conforming conditions such as front yard, parking and impervious coverage. She explained that there will be a reduction in impervious coverage.

Referencing his January 23 amended report (page 4 in particular), Mr. Schrek outlined the temporary and permanent waivers. Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Brown mentioned Granetz Place and Glaser Ave in particular. Mr. Schrek advised that since storm water was a big part of the plan and since they were still waiting on questions/comments from the utilities, PD, Fire and DEP, he would recommend hearing Preliminary only.

As to completeness:

Motion by Ms. Carra, **seconded** by Ms. Windrem to deem the application complete for hearing (Preliminary only with respect to Site Plan) and grant the waivers, as outlined by Mr. Schrek.

Mr. Cohen explained that the use is permitted and that the Redevelopment Plan governs zoning. He related that of the 75 units proposed, 12 would be affordable. Mr. Cunningham commented on limits to configurations.

President & CEO of Larken Associates, David Gardner was sworn in. Mr. Gardner related that the property was always rented until he and his investors purchased it in 2014 at which time they proceeded to spend millions of dollars on renovations/site improvements and brought in Retro Fitness. He related that the site was always short on parking and façade renovations were challenging due to the façade material. Citing retail challenges and flooding, Mr. Gardner advised that the property has never done well/is struggling. He advised that the flooding issue will be better managed because of the way it is being built.

Mr. Gardner spoke about his experience in redeveloping the Henderson Building and offered that failing retail supports a case for lowering taxes. Referencing a lack of replacement for the Tanning Salon, temporary month to month rentals and lack of payment from Retro for 8 months, Mr. Gardner responded to a question from Mayor Bray about whether the challenges were in the last three years specifically.

Mr. Brown asked which tenants would be moving into the strip mall. Mr. Gardner explained that Bagels 4 U will stay and that they are in talks with Dollar Tree, Hunterdon Urgent Care and the Karate business.

Architect Rob Larsen, AIA, AICP was sworn and qualified.

Exhibit A1 was marked into testimony and identified as “3 perspective renderings of the site plan.” Mr. Larsen spoke to his vision for the property/building referencing the 3d rendering dated 3/22/22. He identified parking as well as the building and strip mall.

Exhibit A2 was marked into testimony and identified a “colored rendering of the Site Plan, entitled “Rendering Project Overview.” Mr. Larsen identified and discussed the access points and underground parking for the proposed 75 unit residential structure with 63 market rate and 12 affordable units. He provided a breakdown of the unit types and details on the use of space, including amenities, green roof without gas service and 85 under cover parking spaces.

Mr. Larsen advised that trash would be handled via a chute system and then compacted. He identified an access point on the south side for containers, all of which he related, would be kept inside of the sprinklered building.

Mr. Larsen testified that all units meet ADA requirements and that the building will have two elevators.

Materials were discussed as Mr. Larsen spoke about the difficulty they encountered with same. Mr. Larsen testified that the residential development is above flood level. He talked about elevator operations in a flooding scenario and clean up after same. He related that he did not know where the cars would go in a flood situation, in response to a question from Mr. Cunningham. Mr. Shrek offered that this needs to be discussed and may need to be part of a developer's agreement.

A discussion ensued about whether the parking lot would be governed by the new DEP regulations in response to a question from Mr. Cohen. Ms. Rubright offered that George Folk would address this. Mr. Shrek advised that they are looking at shared parking.

Mr. Larsen responded to a question from Ms. Sherwin about elevator size/accessibility for EMS then resumed his testimony with a discussion on HVAC. He advised that the units would be outfitted with magic-paks and that central areas would be handled with small units or split systems.

Returning to the elevations, Mr. Larsen explained that the mechanicals would be on the roof. Mr. Schrek addressed the green building checklist and it was established that while they would not have an LEED certification, there would be high efficiency appliances.

Mr. Shrek provided Mr. Larsen with a list of questions. Mr. Larsen responded that there would be bike storage and that lighting would be compliant. He confirmed that while they meet many of the initiatives in the green checklist, they would not meet certain standards such as a 20% water reduction, providing a collection system for water capture/reuse or onsite energy generation. He testified that there would be a reduction in energy use via high efficiency heating/cooling systems, natural ventilation, partial reuse of existing building materials and use of an experienced contractor as well as local building materials. He testified that the building would meet new Code requirements in effect as of March. Mr. Schrek clarified that the checklist does not obligate but rather, encourages green initiatives.

A discussion ensued about enhanced Fire Code regulations in response to a comment about same from Mr. Schrek. He also spoke about will serve letters; NJ American Water in particular, with respect to fire flows. He spoke about the design standard waivers relative to window penetration and about the 60' height. He advised that they would be complaint even for the appurtenances. Mr. Brown commented on the height as it correlates to the neighborhood. Mr. Larsen confirmed that it was 4 stories as opposed to 1.5. Mr. Brown commented that it exceeds the 2 story limit at a height of 60.' Ms. Rubright explained that when Mr. Larsen provides Planning testimony, it will include information on shadowing.

Setbacks were discussed. Mr. Larsen explained that the redevelopment plan allows for 4 stories and testified that he is prepared to provide Planning testimony substantiating that they will meet requirements for the zone.

Mr. Cunningham asked about the vacation of Granetz Place because the strip mall needed more parking for employees, not so that a bigger project could be built. Mr. Larsen responded in saying that the lower level would accommodate 85 cars which is not the total number of spaces. He added that requirements for low, very low and moderate housing would be in coordination with the Redevelopment Plan.

Exhibit A3 (identified as elevations) was marked into testimony. Colors, materials and textures were discussed in addition to signage, which Mr. Larsen explained is proposed to be building mounted on two corners.

Exhibit A4 (identified as elevations including 2 photos and a view of the rooftop) was marked into testimony and

discussed. Mr. Schrek asked about noise impacts from the mechanicals and asked whether their MEP would consider proximity/additional screening and/or sound walls. Mr. Larsen related that the intent for the commercial building would be to upgrade the façade to match. He testified that all fixtures would be LED.

Mr. Brown asked about access to Glaser Ave. Ms. Thomas asked about renovations to the strip mall façade, asking whether the lack of a main walkway could be fixed. Mr. Gardner stated that it is their intent to collaborate through the architect. Mr. Schrek offered that there is a dimensional issue.

Ms. Thomas opened the floor to questions of the public at 9:00.

Catherine Mastes of 5 Granetz Place commented that she watched flooding inundate the entire area and was concerned about the height for Granetz Place. Referencing Exhibit A2, Mr. Larsen identified the façade on the site plan then referred to the elevations on Exhibit A3.

Irma Mooney commented on the need for a redevelopment plan as it relates to a lack of rental potential. Calling it a “traffic hazard, she offered that it is too close to home, congested, floods and will lower home values.

Ms. Rubright suggested that this is not the appropriate time for comments. Mr. Gardner addressed the rent issues, and reiterated that there was a public hearing. He suggested that she took his comments out of context.

Mike Patente of 30 Glaser Ave. suggested that the building butts up against the tree line and asked whether the yellow area on the plan was street level. When he asked Mr. Larsen who would be paying for garbage, Mr. Larsen responded that there would be a private collector which Mr. Cohen explained is governed by the Kelly Bill.

Mr. Patente asked whether there is access onto Glaser Ave. in the plan. Mr. Larsen spoke to a prior approval regarding access. Mr. Patente asked why it was being done under Redevelopment rather than just by the Planning Board. Ms. Rubright indicated that she would like to get information on the prior approval. Addressing Mr. Patente, she related that there was public notice on the hearings for the Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Cohen affirmed this and explained that as such, the function of the Board at this time is not to decide whether the use is appropriate. Ms. Rubright offered that it was not a random/frivolous request and asserted that if Council had found that the area did not meet the criteria, they would not have moved forward with the Redevelopment Plan. Ms. Thomas offered that most of Mr. Patente’s concerns were for the engineer.

Jenny Rosa asked how they determined that the EIS was not appropriate. Her question was deferred to the engineer; however, Ms. Rubright explained that when the application was filed, a waiver for EIS was sought because it is a developed site and most EIS are relative to partial or undeveloped sites. She clarified that it was waived for completeness purposes.

Ms. Rosa asked about distance from the neighborhood and whether they were aware of what the use was 30-40 years ago. She asked whether they were aware of the water table and made a comment about shadowing. Ms. Rubright reminded that she must phrase her comments in the form of questions.

Mr. Schrek suggested that they return with a cross section through the properties.

George Folk, P.E. was sworn and qualified.

Exhibit A5 was entered into testimony and identified as a colored rendering of the total tract/entire property, dated 1/25/23. Mr. Folk spoke about existing conditions on the site.

Exhibit A6 was entered into testimony and identified as sheet 2 of 12 of the plan set, dated 10/10/22. Mr. Folk continued his review of existing conditions, advising that there would be a reduction in impervious coverage (proposed at 125,426 s.f.) where 135,924 s.f. exists currently. Ms. Rubright asserted that there would be no need for a variance but then corrected her statement as the maximum allowed is 84.4 s.f.

Mr. Folk spoke about signage. He advised that there would be no change to the existing pylon on the north end of the driveway and that they used the redevelopment plan to lay out the signage. He spoke about access from 206 for the proposed 4 story building which would replace the 3 story building slated for demolition.

With respect to parking, Mr. Folk testified that it would be at grade north, east and south and that there would be 85 internal spaces. He spoke about the RSIS requirement of 144 for the apartments and 242 for the site, explaining that the 133 surface spaces would be combined with 85 underground for a total of 218. He mentioned 8 being relocated for the healthcare facility and 90 for commercial.

Mr. Folk identified Busky Lane at the behest of Ms. Mooney. He explained that 218 spaces would meet requirements given an EV credit, negating the need for a parking variance.

Mr. Folk testified that there would be no change in access and that the underground garage would be accessible from Route 206. He provided testimony on Fire/Emergency access. Mr. Shreck reminded that there was no final memo from Police or Fire. Mr. Gara advised that the Chief and Fire Prevention met with Mr. Folk and advised as to their needs/wants. A ramp for workers was discussed.

Mr. Brown asked about trash location and access for garbage trucks/frequency of pickups. Calling the truck noise "oppressive," he asked whether it could be moved to 206, reminding that the prior approval had garbage located to the other side. Mr. Folk indicated that this would result in a loss of vacant spaces and advised that they would be picking up at 2 locations. Ms. Thomas offered that this should be taken in consideration for March.

Mr. Folk mentioned that vegetation and landscaping had been covered as well as lighting (to be LED/down lit) as well as signage to include way finding signs. Mr. Cohen asked him to compare current lighting conditions to proposed and speak to lighting hours. Mr. Folk testified that it would be similar and would not go off.

Mr. Schrek advised that storm water discussions should be held off as he did not have the report.

Mr. Schrek advised that comments from a resident on the municipal landfill are part of the EIS but suggested that the proximity of the subject property to the landfill should be discussed. Mr. Gardner explained that the Phase 1 was done and offered to provide it.

Mr. Cohen suggested that while Mr. Folk's testimony was not complete, questions could be entertained on what he had provided thus far.

Ms. Sherwin asked about the building height. Mr. Folk initially said he did not know but then said three stories. He testified that underground parking is above grade and that the floor is at 50.' He advised that the current garbage services the strip mall. Mr. Folk interacted with a couple who did not identify themselves about the location.

The Chairwoman opened the floor to questions of the witness at 10:03.

John Hudak of 67 LaGrange St. asked about where water is going with respect to the garages when it is pumped out. Mr. Larsen responded about parking in a flood scenario. Ms. Thomas asked about a condition to any

resolution about not charging tenants extra for parking.

Irma Mooney asked about the date this agreement on redevelopment was made and commented that it seemed like “a deal” had been made. She related that she wanted to understand circulation and pedestrian crossing issues. She then asked what the plan was for Shop n Stop and spoke about storm sewers being maxed with respect to infrastructure. She offered that the issue was not just flooding but seepage, etc. She also expressed concerns about traffic with respect to Busky Lane and impacts on Glaser Ave. Mayor Bray offered that there was access to the hearings.

Addressing Mr. Gardner directly, **Bonnie Allen of 11 Granetz Place** related that they have all suffered economic hardship and commented that while his income soars, hers will plummet. She called the beautification of Granetz Place “a joke” and commented on the alarm system. She also commented that rodent traps were not there prior to 2016 and that garbage is not far from her property. Referencing plan A2, Mr. Folk replied to her comments. Ms. Allen spoke about the noise ordinance being affected due to dumpsters being picked up between 4:30-6am. She asked whether the lot is being “lifted” to meet the hill. Mr. Folk testified that it is. He spoke about the area between the lot, curb line/sidewalk, fire area maintenance, privacy and parking.

A discussion ensued about who the primary point of contact for developers is in response to a comment about same from Mr. Cunningham. Mayor Bray explained that it is different each time.

Ms. Mooney commented that the Minutes are not current.

Mr. Patente asked Mr. Folk to identify the fence on the plan and commented on default on the agreement for affordable units.

Bill Iovino identified himself as the owner of Retro Fitness. Reading from a prepared statement, which included information on a deal he made with the owner with respect to back rent, he concluded in saying that he felt that he had made “a deal with the devil.”

The Chairwoman closed the public question period. The applicant consented/Board concluded to carry the matter to February 22 without further Notice, given the time.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairwoman Thomas opened the floor to general public comment at 10:39.

Ms. Goetsch made a **motion** to adjourn which was **seconded** by several members and unanimously carried to adjourn at 10:40.

Approved: ___/___/___