

**HIGHLAND PARK PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES  
May 13, 2021 @ 7:30 P.M.  
Council Chambers, Borough Hall  
221 South Fifth Ave. Highland Park, NJ  
Via Zoom**

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Kim Hammond at 7:30 pm. Annual Notice of this meeting was provided to the Star Ledger on December 4, 2020 and to the Home News Tribune on December 4, 2020. In addition, notice of this meeting via zoom was faxed to the Home News Tribune and emailed to The Star Ledger and the Highland Park Planet on May 10, 2021, and was posted on the Borough website at www.hpboro.com and on the bulletin board and doors at Borough Hall, 221 So. Fifth Avenue, Highland Park, NJ on May 10, 2021, and has remained continuously posted as required by law.

**Roll Call:**

Present	Kim Hammond, Scott Brescher, Matthew Hale, Kahalidra Hadhazy arrived at 7:33 pm, Matthew Hale, Rebecca Hand, Alan Kluger, Paul Lanaris, Padraic Millet, Stephen Nolan, Jeffrey Perlman, Allan Williams
Absent	None
<u>Board Professionals</u>	Roger Thomas, Esq., Jim Constantine, Planner, Bruce Koch, Engineer

Roger Thomas, Esq., sworn in Padraic Millet.

**Presentation:**

Consistency Review of Downtown Redevelopment Plan

Mr. Roger Thomas, Esq., said that there has been some correspondence he wanted to address. There are several issues: one is a question of jurisdiction, this matter is being heard by the Planning Board pursuant to Section 26 of the Municipal Land Use Law. The Land Use law that is a referral power that is given to the Planning Board pursuant to that statute and it indicates that in fact there is a referral for any regulation that ends up coming into the Borough and that is what this is all about. This is a regulation that is being reviewed and therefore it is appropriate to be reviewed by the Planning Board. This is a development regulation and the purpose is to determine whether the Board believes as part of their requirement under the Municipal Land Use Law, to determine whether or not there are any inconsistencies with this regulation in relation to the Master Plan of the municipality and if there are to make regulations regarding those inconsistencies. He said that is the Board's charge, it is a fairly limited charge but it is what you are required to do and the public should be aware that is what this hearing is all about. There was also questions that have been raised with regard to communications and as a result of that I have prepared a memo on behalf of the Board. That memo has indicated as he believes appropriate under not only the Municipal Land Use law but also the case law that governs the Municipal Land Use law that in fact any communication that occurs or anything that is preliminary is not part of the record. The records is a term of art, meaning it is what happens at a meeting. This is a meeting, it is a public hearing, and the record is made at a public hearing therefore anything that is going to be considered by a Board in this case, the Planning Board is to be considered only at the public hearing. Any communications that may have been afforded previously they were not distributed to the Board members, they are not made part of the record, they are not now a part of the record. If any member of the public has a desire and this what the memo indicated, if any member of the public has a desire to provide input in regard to a matter that is in front of the Board they have the right to do that and the Board Chair and all the Members of the Board will certainly give an opportunity for that member of the public to be heard in full. However, that has to be done at the meeting and in this particular case as will be done with Mr. Constantine, who will be put under oath, members of the public will also be

given the opportunity and they will be put under oath. There was also a question that's been raised concerning whether or not this jurisdictionally appropriate because of the Resolution that was forwarded to the Board, 2021-01 in particular, it made reference to the referral from the Municipal Council, and there has been some questions raised as to whether or not that is appropriate. It is clear from his understanding of the way this is all set up in the Borough of Highland Park that the governing body, the municipal council is in fact the Redevelopment Entity for the Borough. Therefore, they are one and the same and therefore the Resolution that indicates that you are getting or this referral from, the Municipal Council is the same as though it was referred to the Board by the Redevelopment Entity. The mere fact that it says Borough Council does not negate it, it is not even a ministerial deficiency in his opinion because the Municipal Council is the Redevelopment Entity, they are one and the same and therefore in his opinion it is clear that in fact that document is not deficient and the referral from that viewpoint is appropriate. He said that he does know that there had been some people that had raised some questions and he thought that if anyone from the public would like to raise some points with regard to only the jurisdiction, they should be given an opportunity to be heard and he would be happy to respond to any of those concerns. He asked the public to raise their electronic hands that would like to be heard to please do so.

James Nichols, 232 Harrison Avenue, sworn and affirmed, said by jurisdiction do you include your earlier comments about communications with the Clerk with via electronic transmission of documents. Mr. Thomas said yes they include that. Mr. Nichols said just for the benefit of the public and the members of the Board, it was brought to our attention that the State adopted emergency procedures related to COVID and the regulation is NJAC 5:39-1.4 which basically deals with the procedural impacts of COVID and how they might adjust public meetings and the conveying of documents, so this provision basically seems to require that the Board accept electronic transmissions of documents prior to the meeting. Acknowledging the fact that in the context of COVID it is impossible to physically bring those things to the meeting. That point was raised and he did not know if you reviewed that regulation and if you understand if that affected your statement at all about that particular aspect of the jurisdiction. Mr. Thomas said that he has reviewed the regulation and it does not change his opinion, the Planning Board is governed by the Municipal Land Use Law and yes there are provisions that have been set out by the Governor for this pandemic and emergency declarations and in this particular case, emergency remote meeting protocol for local public bodies and that's the one you've referred to, NJAC 5:39-1 et seq and I have reviewed that it is his opinion that does not supersede the Municipal Land Use Law and the requirement of the Municipal Land Use Law in relation to the hearings that are held by this municipal body which is the Planning Board or Zoning Board which are governed by the Municipal Land Use Law. In fact he has dealt with these types of hearings on numerous occasions over the last year and several months there has been a provision whereby if anyone ends up having documents that they wish to present to the Board there is a mechanism that is available for that purpose and it is something that is presented in advance and then if those documents are then presented to the full Board during the course of the hearing they can either be by a share screen that is given over and the document can be read by the entire Board at the hearing or in fact that individual can ask that that document be shared by the person that is in charge of the meeting so I believe that we are fulfilling not only the spirit but the exact letter of not only the Municipal Land Use law but also the regulation. He continues to believe that what he stated in his memo continues to apply.

Allan Williams, asked if the Environmental Commission had an opinion on an application they would forward to the Board, Jennifer would distribute it, Main Street has a definite opinion on the redevelopment plan that was sent to Kim and the Board and the Board has not seen it. In a sense they are a quasi Board, they are part of the Borough but not part of the Government per se. Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that he is aware and read that document, and Jim Constantine has read that document. It is his understanding that they will be present today to either summarize it, it is a rather lengthy document, he is hopeful that they are not going to read it but nonetheless they have the right to do that or they have the right to put their position in front of the Board tonight and either by a representative and as is done in effect as you well know in terms of

applications or other hearing when the Environmental Commission ends up having either you as an individual representative of the Environmental Commission or another representative to be present to give testimony with regard to their position on a particular matter. If they are here tonight they will be given a full and complete opportunity to be heard and the same applies to that entity and we are treating them exactly the same as we treat others, and you are correct they are quasi governmental agencies like the Environmental Commission although that is a statutory commission.

Mr. Thomas, Esq. said there was one other procedural element he would like to get to and there has been an issue raised by someone from the public with regard to Ms. Hadhazy and asked Ms. Hadhazy to provide some information. It is his understanding at the present time you (Ms. Hadhazy) are involved in Real Estate sales, as a real estate agent and/or broker and currently doing business not only in Highland Park but also in the general area beyond Highland Park. Ms. Hadhazy responded yes. Mr. Thomas Esq. said as a result of that in an effort to try to establish a clientele you sent out some marketing materials, which you have provided to me, and maybe you would be better to describe that marketing material, who you sent it to, what it involved and then I can comment upon it. Ms. Hadhazy shared images of the marketing materials. In 2020 towards the end of the year, she sent out multiple marketing and promotional items, dishtowels were sent to about 200 residents in Highland Park specifically some are past clients, friends, neighbors, friends of past clients and neighbors that she has yet to meet. There are many people on that mailing list that she has never met and do not know but would like to extend her services to as a real estate agent and broker. There were two dishtowels tied with a navy blue sheer bow and the card attached says sometimes finding a great realtor is easier than finding someone to help with the dishes, and the dishtowels were mailed out around Thanksgiving sort of a play on the holiday. They were mailed in navy blue packaging with gold accents, which are the colors she uses for her company. The back of the tag states wishing you a safe happy and healthy holiday season, have any real estate questions call me I'm in town for the holidays and that is all that marketing material consisted of prior to this going out. After she sent these packages out, she followed this up, right before new years with a card that says cheers to 2021 and on the other side wishing a happy new year and again offering my services as a real estate agent. The card reads as changes come with each passing year you can have peace of mind knowing that our crew of professionals will provide you with the highest level of service and support no matter which direction life takes you, your source for residential real estate sales and property management. She noted that this was the former company she worked with last year, she is now a broker and owning her own business and no longer with ReMax. She displayed another promotional item that was sent out at the end of 2020 which is a 2021 calendar, she also sent out a monthly home maintenance reminder that was in with the new year's card wishing everyone a happy new year so that is the extent of the marketing material that she sent in 2020.

Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that this was the exact material she sent to him and he reviewed and it is his understanding that as you have already indicated this was a mass mailing, not particularly targeted, it was just to start to build your new company and this was 200 people you were hoping to get generally in the area. Ms. Hadhazy said that was correct. Mr. Thomas, Esq. indicated that he does not see this as a conflict this is just marketing, it has nothing to do particularly with the areas that are going to be discussed, it was not targeted to those areas, and this was just a generalized marketing effort on the part of a member to build an outside business. He does not see that there is any conflict statutorily or any other way so from his viewpoint Ms. Hadhazy can participate in this matter. He said he does think it is important and it is important to put these items on record so that there is no concern or confusion.

David Copperman, 120 Hill Street, said he was very glad for the presence of Mr. Nichols and his representation of the comments that Main Street has made on the downtown redevelopment vision. He is quite confused now about the purpose of this meeting if you are going to potentially allow the reading of a 19-page document which is a critique of the plan and which I strongly commend to everyone here. He does not understand how that relates to the agenda item which is comparison of the or however you are putting it

of the vision with the Master Plan. The Main Street document is very directly on the downtown development plan to the extent Mr. Nichols can correct him but his reading of it is that to the extent that it is or is not indicative of consistency with the Master Plan that is very much secondary to its purpose. Ms. Hammond said at this moment the Board has not seen or received this document/drawing or presentation that people are referencing that has come from Main Street, so she would feel more comfortable if after Mr. Nichols or someone from Main Street presents that we would then have conversations that revolved around it. The matter before the Board is the consistency review and Mr. Thomas, Esq. wanted to get in front of whether there were some procedural matters and she is not sure that what is being described conforms to a procedural matter. Mr. Copperman said it may not, urged the Board to defer any vote tonight on this document which you only got a few weeks ago until you have read through what a very competent in my engineering and project management opinion, the document from these professionals would perhaps open your eyes to larger questions of the Master Plan. He commended and urged them to take the time before you render anything in the way of an assessment or a decision.

Ms. Hammond gave an overview of what is about to happen, the Planning Board is going to receive a presentation of the draft downtown redevelopment plan and in regards to it is consistency with the Master Plan. There will be time for the Board to ask questions and make comments, which is typical, and then there will be a time when the meeting is opened up to the public for public input.

Jim Constantine, Planner, sworn and affirmed. Mr. Constantine said for many years Highland Park has recognized the need for significant sustained attention to the downtown business district. Over the past 15 years, the revitalization efforts have also focused on attempting to have redevelopment occur as a component of that revitalization and support for a thriving downtown. However, most of those redevelopment efforts as envisions in the 2005 redevelopment plan have not come to fruition so the purpose of this redevelopment plan as sated up front is to take a more focused approach to jump starting the Borough's goal of achieving downtown redevelopment. There was extensive community participation by hundreds of individuals in the 2019 Master Plan through community workshops, and an online survey. One of the survey questions asked people about whether they'd like to see downtown remain the same and then they were given a choice of some changes and enhancements that could occur and only 9% of respondents said they wanted to see downtown remain the same. This specific redevelopment plan focuses on four Tracts: A- the gateway redevelopment area, which includes a phase one that the Planning Board had actually declared an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation; B is 130-134 Raritan Avenue; C – sometimes referred to as the Borough Square or the existing Farmers Market location (entirely a borough owned property); and D-includes the North 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue right of way, the former Blue Horse property at the corner and then some surface parking lots and another building on Raritan Avenue. The Master Plan had extensive community participation there were visions, comments from community members about the desire to see a town square, a public space or daily gathering and special events, wanting us to more specifically address vacant property, empty storefronts, high turnover, unpleasant stretches of the streetscape that present a sense of neglect. On Tracts, A & B included a number of properties that were identified as potential infill redevelopment opportunities in the Master Plan, so there was a very specific conceptual targeting that is trying to address many of the issues that the community identified. The community also indicated while they like green space, they do not like empty storefronts and they felt there was a need to address parking as well with suggestions of one garage somewhere that might help strategically address parking issues. Some of the strategies that were in the Land Use Plan Element specific to downtown are included in the redevelopment plan. Specifically the preparation of a parking management plan that evaluates parking needs in relation to leveraging revitalization, infill and redevelopment by better managing on-street parking, right-sizing parking requirement to actual demand, encouraging cooperative and shared parking arrangement and permitting off-site parking as a strategy to development smaller properties. The essence of one of the strategies that's contained in the redevelopment plan is multi-level parking facility is in fact a centralized parking structure that potentially could allow for

smaller and more land constrained or geometrically constrained properties to push some of their parking into a centralized location consistent with the Master Plan concept. The Borough has issued an RFP at this point to hire a consultant to prepare a more comprehensive downtown parking management plan and look at a variety of issues more holistically including potentially weighing in on some of the parking issues related to this redevelopment plan.

On Tract A, which includes several properties from the vacant parking lot next to the Gun and Board property to Classic Cleaners, down to Ubry's and Bergen Auto fronting on Raritan Avenue. This involves the idea of creating a gateway that would enhance the sense of arrival into the downtown by infilling a new building that would have some selective additional height potentially as way to help mark and denote that. Tract B that is just beyond the Venezuelan restaurant is two properties that sit between that and the former Sunoco. This property has a conditional redevelopment designated, has proposed a building that's similar in massing in scale to the five story buildings that have a four stories along Raritan Avenue that create that bookend sense of arrival into downtown. Enhancing the sense of arrival is one of the overall themes of the Master Plan and the Re-Examination Plan Element in addition to the Land Use Element Plan. The fifth level is terraced back from the street, also suggested in the design standards that there could be belt courses horizontal definitions where you can change the building mass or coloration and materials to lighten it, potentially including a tower element for a little additional accentuation. The ground floor we are very specific in the redevelopment plan to try and limit how much new commercial space is created so that we don't cannibalize what exists however expanding on the range of uses and try to allow for additional and wider range of retail service, entertainment such as boutique hotels, remote working hubs, business incubators, creative maker space. It could also be amenities servicing the upper floor residences, a lobby space, workspace, fitness rooms and other things that create an active street front but do not create additional commercial space which are also goals in the Master Plan. We are trying to add additional customer base with demographic segments who really desire to live, walk, shop, work, ride transit as well as affordable housing to try and activate the street revitalize and add enhancement to all of the businesses in the area and take what we were identified by the community as really the darkest blocks downtown. Tract C takes us beyond South Second, Borough owned, what is proposed here is a building that would act as focal point terminating the vista looking up the Avenue. Part of the sequence of arriving in downtown with a slightly different building massing contained within the zoning and the bulk and design standards, a four story building at the street there with a fifth level that terraces up and back, sort of a courtyard. One of the design requirements for this particular tract is to provide a small public plaza at the street that connects back through a mid-block garden courtyard that is shared with the Reformed Church and the uses they have at the back of their property and sort of connects its way and allows for pedestrian passage and a different experience of spaces between Magnolia and Raritan. At a pedestrian scale there would also include some parking and we know there is parking accommodations that need to be made relative to some the mix of uses at the Reformed Church, has accessing at the rear and all of that is contained within the standards for Tract C within the plan. Tract D at the corner of North 3<sup>rd</sup>, the former Blue House on the left and Provident Bank on the right. What is proposed here are a series of things, creation of a public space on the North 3<sup>rd</sup>, which would involve some texture paving, and continuation of the curb so this it becomes a plane and a shared space concept. Taking streets and making them a shared public space that can be used for vehicular access and pedestrian, vehicles driving in a very different way on them is especially happening right now coming out of the pandemic. More and more towns are moving very quickly to try to take things that were an experiment and the town tables on the South 3<sup>rd</sup> portion of the street, making those permanent in some degree. One of the comments that we did hear from the community was to try to make sure that there was enough permanent public space at this location. The renderings show potential relocated Farmers Market which could occur on this block at certain times, a new building on the corner with a ground floor design standards call for lots of glazing, a food space would be a great activator with outdoor tables. It terraces back at the fourth level, it is a five-story building and the height that is used in these select locations is only being used in the redevelopment plan at these locations this is not a rezoning of downtown to allow greater

height everywhere. This is a very specific and very almost gun shot approach on these in particular only if we are able to provide for some sort of a centralized parking facility, which allows that to occur so there is kind of an interrelationship between those. The renderings showed some kiosks, tents, and banners. The idea would be that you would add some sort of overhead lighting and create a permeable ceiling to the sky and in the background is a multi-level parking structure, which would need further study to be sized. It is not a public structure, it is not serving commuters like in other towns, it is not because you have demand for shoppers there could be provision for a degree and it has been recommended a public parking on the ground floor at least at certain times but the parking structure is primary to support the residential development on the Avenue. Some employment parking for ground floor commercial uses and there could be other uses. The strategy behind that garage and it's just depicted again at three and half levels in the rendering, the final sizing and height needs to be fined tuned and determined. There is another building on the far right of the rendering which is on the property on Raritan Avenue and Tract D where the Bridge Restaurant is located presently. This has been an exposed surface parking lot for probably most of people's lifetime in Highland Park, the notion of parking at this site we believe can be done but done in a much more aesthetically way that reinforces the character of this Northside neighborhood. The end of the parking structure is capped or bookended with a liner building so that you would not see the parking structure with a ground floor use, upper floor residents and the idea is to have that somewhat reflect the professional office across the street, help screen the garage itself. The garage itself would have a ground floor liner use of some kind and we've talked about in the redevelopment plan perhaps art gallery or performance space that might spill over and use part of the ground floor garage liners as a way to basically do something that's very public use. Looking back down Denison to the west is the reminder of the liner so it is a residential scale; it is a three story residential scale using veranda's porches that is prevalent up and down Denison Street and into the Northside neighborhood trying to capture that as best we can in the design standard for Tract D. There are very specific differences on what happens out on Raritan, on each of those sites is a little different parking structure the liner of it and then the Denison Street side of it, which actually has multiple design components. The multi-level parking facility and its distance a thousand feet is about a four-minute walk, we indicated that all the way down to Tract A you are within a five-minute walk of the centralized parking facility. He said he knows that it's one of the components that has brought up a lot of questions and one of the reasons the Borough is at this point going to catch the overall parking management study up is to address issues that we have heard such as people won't park in that location if they are in one of these redevelopment sites. People will park in front of someone's home so we know we need to address that and there is an intent to do that.

Mr. Constantine indicated that he wanted to specifically talk at a high level about the use, bulk and design standards that are permitted across all tracts. We are expanding permitted uses from the existing zoning in and what is permitted in the existing redevelopment plan, which is one of the Master Plan strategies. Expand the variety of active ground core uses to diversity, mix of retail services and entertainment uses including creative maker spaces, artists craftsperson studios and real estate offices better activates the downtown throughout all hours, adds vitality particularly in the challenging age of online retail and e-commerce. This is not only an attempt to create more retail space that is competing but trying to revitalize and maintain the vitalization of the existing retail space. In the bulk standards and setback standards increased some of the front and side yard setbacks from what exists in the current zoning and the redevelopment plan. In many cases and in some cases specifically called for greater setbacks trying to craft and match some of the adjacent buildings and what seemed appropriate at those locations. Reduced building coverage in some locations from the existing zoning and redevelopment plan so we have actually chase the building envelope on these sites at a very high level. The existing zoning does permit multi-level parking structures in the C and PO zones so where we are proposing that multi-level parking structure on Tract D, a majority of that does sit in what is currently zoned PO, where multi-level parking structures are permitted today. We have also added green infrastructure and sustainable design standards that are not contained in the existing ordinance or redevelopment plan to try really achieve a green and sustainable

standard beyond what we can under current zoning. The changes that were incorporated based on community feedback, three stakeholder meetings in October, a Redevelopment Entity meeting where the plan was presented, November we spent probably two months synthesizing a lot of the feedback that we have heard. We have taken the plan to it to be broken into phased flexible development so there can be individual projects that might move forward before all of the particulars of a parking structure or whether we even have a parking structure. There is a commitment to a more permanent public space on Third Avenue some combination of north and south and we know that requires a dialogue and approval with the NJDOT since Raritan Avenue is a State highway. There is limited on-site parking and or reserved on-street short-term parking, loading along Raritan Avenue in front of buildings. There was a concern raised by the community about people carrying groceries two blocks away to get to their building, so there would be a way to address that and that has been built in. The plan recognizes that centralized parking may not be built on Tract D so if that does not happen there is the ability to adjust density and development in the program for redevelopment, some of the height and density may have to be reduced. The plan also allows us to explore alternate locations for centralized parking and could happen in a later phase and the fact that we may not build a multi-level parking structure is recognized in the plan as well. We reduced the height and indicated in design standards to control human orientations on the rear of Tract C, which was in response feedback heard in October from some of the neighbors on Magnolia Street. Section 6.2 the first five things do not exist under existing zoning, the Borough Council is the Redevelopment Entity which gives them the ability and certain powers and certain provisions that you don't have if you are developing under existing zoning. Section 6.3 is they get to select and designate redevelopers; 6.4f indicates that we can have redevelopment agreement, which allows you to use all of the powers and controls, and there is much greater municipal control contractually by using a redevelopment agreement, which does not occur under someone pursuing development as of right under the existing zoning. We recognize that there could be amendments to this approved redevelopment plan and we do anticipate that will occur, there are nearby and adjacent property owners and we would like to see the plan expanded to include other participants, but we had to start somewhere. It is hoped that the parking structure if it occurs on Tract D can have other users that would also help to underwrite it and make it feasible. Section 7.1 provides for a concept plan review by the Borough Council acting as a Redevelopment Entity, so if a redeveloper can move forward into the redeveloper agreement and take advantage of the plan we get a concept plan review that occurs under the powers of redevelopment. Section 7.2 we have the normal application for development and 7.3 the normal Planning Board review for site plan and this Planning Board has reviewed three plans during the past two and a half years. He said that a resolution from the Planning Board they would suggest recognize this in Section 8.1 where we talk about the relationship to the Borough Land Development Ordinance, it indicates its an overlay and actually it was intended that this supersede and so we would like to recommend that the Planning Board make that recommendation to Council that we actually amend that section to indicate that this Ordinance would supersede so it would replace the existing zoning and that would basically only allow these properties that are on these tracts to proceed under the redevelopment plan. Also with the adoption of the redevelopment plan to basically send a message to the development community that we are willing to entertain proposals to respond to this redevelopment plan on some of the tracts, some are controlled by the Borough like Tract C in its entirety, a portion of Tract D and there is an effort to acquire more of Tract D so the Borough is effectively has another layer of control that does not happen under a privately owned property that takes advantage of the existing zoning.

Alan Kluger said normally he would expect a general overview presentation on this plan because it's somewhat narrow as to consistency with the Master Plan except after listening to the Council meeting from a couple of weeks ago. It was specifically stated that you only were only giving an overview presentation at the Council/Redevelopment meeting because you were going to give a much more detailed presentation and which he understood to mean almost going through the plan in much more detail, tract by tract not just for the public's benefit as well as that is what the public was expecting and that was certainly what he understood. Matthew Hale asked Mr. Kluger if there was a specific part of the plan that he would like Mr.

Constantine go into more detail on, or a part he would like discussed in more detail then he did just now. Mr. Kluger said it is not just him and he is just speaking based on what he has heard at the Council meeting and it seems to him that Mr. Constantine has just given the same exact presentation that he gave at the Council meeting. Ordinarily since we are just looking at consistency with the Master Plan he would be okay with it and assume that everyone has read through the 80 pages and we would have our own questions, but the public is entitled to a detailed presentation on the plan. It is up to the Board but that was certainly his expectation going into this meeting. Mr. Constantine said that he did not go into detail in each tract but did add additional content and did speak to some of the provisions that were not addressed at the Council.

Mr. Kluger said that could be the Board's recommendation back to Council to say that there should be a more detailed presentation done at a redevelopment committee meeting or at a Council meeting where in his view is the real appropriate place for there to be a very detailed presentation.

Padraic Millet said he always wants to ask the question of what is the Planning Board's role and try to define that in terms of consistency. You could have multiple plans that would come before the Planning Board that would still be equally consistent. Would that be a fair statement that you know there could be another plan drawn up and judging it consistent doesn't say it is the best plan just that it meets the outlines of the Master Plan. Much of this depends on the parking structure, the actual developer that comes in and he wants to know or define the Board's role so the public does not have false expectations of what we were actually deciding. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said that role of the Planning Board at this stage in his opinion is limited, more of a referral role in terms of its consistency with the Master Plan. I do not doubt that you're absolutely right that we bring in plan, Mr. Constantine would be presenting those plans and you could find that those are consistent with the Master Plan, these could potentially not be the only plans that could be consistent but that's not your charge, your charge is not in a position, you're not being charged with development of the plan, your charge at this stage is to determine whether or not the plan that is in front of you is consistent with the Master Plan. That is a limited function but that is where he see is their function at this point in time. Mr. Millet said let's say we deem it to be consistent what does that allow or not allow the Council to do because it would be the Council that would pass the Ordinance for redevelopment. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said that is correct, that then allows them to meet their concomitant statutory obligation they've referred it to the Board, if they follow Alan Kluger's recommendation, they will have a more elaborate presentation or not, as the case may be at the governing body level, they will presumably pass the plan, that plan presumably will then at some point get merged into an ordinance for one or more of the individual tracts as you have heard from Mr. Constantine was saying. It's been his experience anyway that these plans tend to be overlay's in this particular case it is now the suggestion being made by Mr. Constantine and he assume that's either through his suggestion or at the suggestion of the Council that rather than this be an overlay then in fact for these tracts that is the Ordinance that is the zoning for those tracts so it is a little different from what he has seen in the past, that does not mean it is inappropriate it is just a different method.

Jeffrey Perlman said in terms of the consistency of the redevelopment plan, Mr. Constantine identified a number of Land Use, Master Plan goals but really seems like they are focusing on the Land Use components since what is being proposed is Land Use regulatory changes. He thinks the inclusion of a parking garage and the inclusion of explicit mention of a parking management plan ties in and requires that the plan touch on circulation goals in the Master Plan. What he found missing and potentially in a referral to the Council for revisions is to look at the impacts on pedestrian movements. The bike and pedestrian plan was adopted as part of the Master Plan and there is no mention of that in the redevelopment plan. There is no mention of complete streets or safer streets of which would have to happen with a parking garage and increase in pedestrian activity to and from those other developments that the parking garage is supposed to absorb. He asked that they really look at the circulation goals, circulation recommendations of the Master Plan, the Bike/Pedestrian Plan.



Matthew Hale thanks Mr. Perlman for his comments. He indicated that the complete streets and the Bike and Pedestrian Plan are mentioned in the proposal put out for parking plan and mentioned that they should be considered as part of moving forward and perhaps could be mentioned within the Redevelopment plan as well.

Steve Nolan said a couple visions presented by this plan is completely consistent with what we have been trying to do, not just in this Master Plan but probably in every Master Plan for the past 40 years. He said that Council needs to decide whether they are ready for the downtown to move forward or not and this is an important decision to make. We could bump along and do little things here and there and say why have things not changed or we can be a little more bold and try to move the downtown forward and that is what the Master Plan has been talking about and that is what we should do. In reference to the comment made by Mr. Perlman about looking at how the pedestrian and bicycle flow going to work and the parking, it is a little bit the chicken and the egg. If the deck happens that's one analysis and if the deck doesn't happen that's another analysis and recognizes that is a difficult think to say well we want to study the traffic, well the traffic for what, it depends on what's going to happen. He believes that there are a lot of merchants and even more resident who live in the area who are rightfully concerned about what's going to happen to my traffic situation or my parking situation, this is always the problem with redevelopment. This is a plan it's not an actual project, and suggested asking the Council to think about that carefully in terms of making sure that the people in that area feel included, and at the appropriate time when there is enough to measure that there be a parking study and a traffic study that includes consideration of things like walkers and bicyclists.

Allan Williams said on Tract C there is no constraint on how big the building can be, currently there are 72 parking spots with four of which are handicapped, what will be left if there are no constraint at this point. Mr. Constantine said that the plan recognizes that there is a need for some of the parking to remain on site, the details of that will need further resolution. Concept plans were shown in October and feedback was heard from stakeholders like the Reformed Church that they could use even more parking but there is other potential resolutions of how that might all come together. Parking tends to be a continuously perfected art form in places that do manage it well. What you are doing on year one is different at year five or ten. There is not a specific number called for in the plan but there's a recognition that there is parking there that services the users that needs to retained in some form or potentially expanded. Mr. Williams said probably expanded, merchants across the street on Raritan Avenue, people use that significantly, the church has more than 30 institutions that live in that building and he does not think the Borough wants to minimize the culture and the good works it does. The municipal parking lot there is roughly 27,000 square feet, and North Third would seem to be not big enough for the Farmers Market or many other things such as the Police Department's annual day out, they had the street, parking lot and Blue Horse parking lot and it was not big enough. At this point, there is no real constraint as to how big the building will be on a municipal parking lot. Mr. Constantine said that was correct every site effectively does have some flexibility in the envelope but that also relates to parking and as Steve Nolan said what the parking solution, where and at what level. Mr. Williams said that in his mind there is this myth that everybody wants to walk into town, if you are shopping you probably want to use the car, there are times for walking and there are times for use of an automobile.

Alan Kluger said that he wanted to follow-up on Steve Nolan's comment and as someone who was on the Board back in 2005 and was very involved with the 2005 redevelopment plan and all the attempts at redevelopment, some have gone through, some have not over the years and he wants this to move forward. He said that he does not know that he does a lot of walking through the neighborhoods and through town and it is not a happy walk when you walk through a lot of our downtown. It is not pleasant and not a pleasant site in some areas and something obviously needs to be done. He said the issue regarding traffic and parking, and not that this is something that stops the plan from moving forward but we can find certain

lots, positive Land Use elements to say it is consistent with the Master Plan. How do we know if works from a traffic perspective, how do we know we are not creating additional traffic backups in other areas of town. How do we know the impact on current businesses, what are their current parking needs and use right now versus what's going to be available to them after this plan is put in place. He said that he would like to see some type of traffic analysis, parking analysis that is done as part of the plan now rather than getting consultants later and do traffic studies later to see it works, there is a lot of uncertainty. I don't not want to put a stumbling block, he wants the plan to move forward but needs to feel comfortable that it works and he doesn't know that he can say that it is consistent with the Master Plan, it could be creating circulation problems, pedestrian safety problems, parking issues in other parts of downtown or for existing businesses. He said that they have been talking about doing these studies for a while but we just have not seen them and expressed that he was not asking for a fifty thousand dollar study but at least something to give us some comfort that the plan works.

Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that the last couple of questions lead to maybe a question procedurally, directed towards Jim. The Borough is seeking to contract a parking consultant; the parking consultant based upon what Mr. Hale indicated is also going to be looking at pedestrian issues. Mr. Kluger is suggesting maybe even traffic issues, how procedurally is this plan going to be proceeding, will it be proceeding in advance of the end result of that study, will it be awaiting the end result of that study and modified in accordance with it or will it be modified. He asked if the plan would be advanced and then the study comes out then the expectation or the realization that there will be changes to the plan based upon that study.

Ms. Jover said that the scope of work was issued, they are awaiting proposals and qualifications to come in to see how consultants would approach this dynamic. One of the things we heard loud and clear and are in agreement with was the potential impacts on the neighboring communities and the parking. To Mr. Perlman's point, what that dynamic could do is manage any potential negative impacts and to get input but the way she imagined, and she has not seen the response to the scope yet, is that they may give us a range of recommendations and approaches that we can consider for managing parking and that could range from the ever popular paying for parking in certain locations, resident parking in certain neighborhoods which is an integral tool in implementing this plan and evaluating the proposals that would come in from the development community, especially the ones that we would be soliciting for the properties we control. We do not necessarily have every idea figured out and that we would get some good ideas from the development community including input on whether or not they think the off-site parking works the way we have envisioned it here.

Mr. Baumann said that they would move forward with the plan, it is not contingent on the parking analysis. Mr. Thomas asked at what point does the parking analysis plan fall into the plan if at all. Mr. Baumann said the plan has alternatives, you can have a parking garage, you cannot have a parking garage, and you can have parcels get independently developed or not independently developed. We need to understand the base conditions for parking because, there is anecdotal stories about people parking in front of businesses and now walking to the train station and that does not help Highland Park. This will give us a basis for which we can then make some decisions about the projects that we may implement. He said that they picked these parcels because we have control over them. He knows there is consternation about the Farmers Market for example but if Highland Park want to have development we have to eliminate as many things possible that are out of our control as possible and we do not control the properties downtown, we don't control what property owners decide to do or don't do and that's why the first plan hasn't succeeded. They have identified at least two parcels that the Borough controls, including the Farmers Market and we have developed a plan to try to make those happen, does that require us to replace the Farmers Market and put it somewhere else, yet it does. We cannot build a project a street or we could put a Farmers Marker on the street and building on the Farmers Market but those are all things that we will figure out as we implement the plan. For today, we tried to pick four locations where we think we could have a likelihood of success

and drafted a plan that is flexible. The governing body will decide ultimately whether there is a garage or not a garage, whether we put out into the market one or two parcels or a package, whether we try to work with the property owners and ultimately culminating in a redevelopment agreement and then back to the Planning Board for site plan. The parking analysis will set a base line and will be available to build upon that in terms of analyzing various alternatives.

Mr. Thomas said that the Council is looking to get the plan moved, with the understanding that the parking/pedestrian/bicycle plan will be used to assist in better understanding the flexibility that is necessary to implement the plan with developers but it certainly will not be put onto the shelf and not be referred to but rather be an integral part of figuring out what the parking arrangement is as the developers come through. Mr. Baumann agreed and that person or company will be a partner on the team as we go through the process.

Ms. Hammond said, as part of our recommendation would be that before any parcel was heading towards a redeveloper's agreement that we would have that parking and circulation analysis in place, a cornerstone piece for negotiating some of the first properties that come along. Mr. Baumann said that they would be recommendations coming to the Borough, they anticipate doing fiscal analysis and fiscal impact studies and parking and circulation, and we welcome those recommendations.

Padraic Millet said that the parking is probably the key so sooner than later we should really come to grips with it because the underlying problem in his experience for the last 20 years is a lack of disposable income within close proximity to the downtown to support businesses and that can be created by more density, more people in and around the downtown and that's going to require parking. Parking for people coming from outside of town, parking and how to solve that seems to be that key or foundation for whatever plan that is actually going to work.

Khalidra Hadhazy said that we are assuming that the parking solution that we have presently is adequate and she knows that it isn't because there are many people who live in the apartments above many businesses on Raritan Avenue that have reported having a hard time finding parking and are presently parking blocks away from where they live on Raritan Avenue. Having adequate parking is something that she knows a number of residents are looking for. She said that she would like to refocus on the sort of loss and gain of public space, I know we are discussing replacing the current location of the Farmers Market and relocating it potentially to North Third Avenue and a stretch of North Third Avenue between Raritan and Denison and asked for more information in a future presentation that addresses how much of the space we are losing from the current Farmers Market area. The area is not only used for the Farmers Market but outdoor exercising classes and various other recreational things that happen in that space and the potential of expanding that space across Raritan Avenue to include South Third Avenue.

Ms. Hammond said that she has served on this Board for many years and was present in the early days of the last version of when we did develop our redevelopment plan. Tracts A and B are very much in keeping with the vision and consistency with the Master Plan in terms of density, the look of the building, the mixed uses and it is much simpler to step back and agree that is what we have been seeking for years. As Mr. Baumann indicated the town taking control of those spaces to make that happen wouldn't that be great if we could finally get some of those things going but has a lot more questions about Tract D parcel. She understands that we could do a traffic study, circulation study and parking study but there seems to be a lot of land locked and roads locked and does not compute in terms of closing a street off, yet that's also the access to the only parking lot that your making in town that's supposed to serve the other three tracts. It was not clear to her when she read the plan, the plan is stating North Third would be closed off occasionally so it would be closed off presumably Friday mornings to afternoon for the Farmers Market, maybe when Main Street has there movie night or for some other special event and that then allows people/cars to move down

that street and to access that parking but then you lose the point of having a town square. In terms of how that particular tract meets is consistent with our Master Plan, with a few loose ends there and some questions that in terms of seeking a more specific presentation, and she understands these are concepts that we are talking about, there are our goals but if the goal is to make a landlocked parking lot with a street that people aren't allowed to drive down that in her mind is not an attainable goal. She understands we are not talking nuts and bolts, it is scope, its plan it is sort of the overarching concept but in that particular instance it is a little more than concept.

Mr. Constantine said that the plan would allow some movement to still occur on North Third for instance. There could be ingress from Raritan to the parking garage, he agrees with the concern because his observation of successful parking locations it's more when it is public parking, there needs to be some way to get people to them easily, this is mainly residential parking but we have talked about a component on the ground floor that would be publicly available. An observation that came out of the Master Plan is that there are parking problems with the existing Farmers Market and where it is, and dangerous jaywalking that kind of pulses out across Raritan Avenue with the activity of the Farmers Market. One of the things that we have indicated is if the ground floor of this garage was situated adjacent effectively to the Farmers Market that there could be the ability for the market to extend its months of operation perhaps even into a quasi-indoor situation under a portion of the parking garage which some Farmers Markets use. There is a whole bunch of details on that to be worked out on the size of the market, there are constraints on North Third in terms of the number of stalls that are in the current market and Main Street provided some excellent comparison studies. There is also questions on the use of a portion of South Third and there are pros and cons to that. Some folks do not like the idea of splitting the other side of it, there are markets around the world that do have traffic run through them and part of that is kind of immersive experience, so there is no right or wrong, it is different approached. To Mr. Baumann's point, if you want to develop Tract C effectively, you need to park it and if you want to develop Tract C and you do relocate the Farmers Market, the Borough Square concept shrunk the amount of space available for the Farmers Market to accommodate redevelopment. The challenge is you cannot take Tract C and have it meet all of those things, you cannot expand parking from what exists today; you cannot maintain the same exact footprint for the Farmers Market redevelopment so that is the challenge.

Ms. Hammond indicated that she has lived in town for 25 years and she has seen that big empty parking lot that remains primarily empty, and she is not saying that is not a great place for a parking lot. She asked why would we not make even more parking there and was wondering why we are putting a festival street at the mouth of the only way to get into that parking lot. Why wouldn't the festival street be on South Third, South Third has been closed off as an experiment now for the last eight months to a year. One of the goals in the Master Plan was to reduce curb cuts on Raritan Avenue for pedestrian safety and now we are going to have a 100-200 parking deck which is a concentration of vehicular traffic needing to cross through a place that we are also describing for pedestrians. She said she wished there was other way to access that parking lot. She said that the idea of centralized parking is great, infill on A & B is great, there are just some built in flaws with having that festival street there and again maybe she is not enlightened enough to appreciate how that would all come together.

Mr. Kluger indicated that the photos do not show how the cars are getting in and out of the parking deck. He said that he was involved in the 2005 redevelopment plan but at least there were pictures in the back. It that showed actual traffic, where the parking lots were, exactly where the turning was, the traffic flow onto and out of, so we have an understanding of how the plan would work instead of just well take our word for it, it is going to work.

Mr. Thomas asked if they could have access to the parking off Denison. Mr. Constantine said that had been discussed and came back in some of the public feedback and stakeholders meetings and we think that could

assist. He said to Mr. Kluger that on page seven they did not include the concept plans for the specific tracts within this document but we did incorporate one on page seven of the redevelopment plan on the bottom of the page which does show the parking structure. The access isn't indicated but its effectively on the North side closer to Denison Street versus the liner we are showing the access behind Provident Bank and there were nine spaces on the Provident Bank property that would be relocated with the parking structure that is contained in the redevelopment plan. There is access to Provident, which then continues into the parking lot behind those other three out parcels that Kim was referring to that front on Raritan Avenue. There is also egress through the Provident Bank drive thru to Raritan Avenue as well. In conversations with those, we learned that many of the property owners that the access used for parking for their businesses does egress out the Provident Bank driveway. There are some easements involving some of the properties in there that also are affected here.

Allan Williams said that one of the additional uses of the buildings was axe throwing and that does not seem like something that we really want to have in the Borough. Mr. Constantine said that is situated under the indoor amusement businesses as an example, arcades, axe throwing, virtual reality escape rooms and other activities. He said that axe throwing is one of the fastest growing and most popular indoor amusement trends in North America.

Mr. Baumann said that he wanted to remind everyone the parking garage is currently a private property owner who we have had limited conversations with so even getting into the design of it and what would be around, how its built and what would go on top of it and all efforts between here and actually building a parking garage including getting a private property owner to consent to that parking garage.

Ms. Hammond said that she understands there will be some random order to things in terms of after these properties are declared potentially areas in this redevelopment plan. Developers are going to take an interest and then there's obviously this back and forth work done to determine their plan and that will happen in whatever order people take interest in whatever property. However, the closing off the street is obviously just going to be purely a town initiative, we do not rely on a developer or outside entity to make that happen. She said it seems like there is such a coordination that has to happen between the street and that parking that for you rather say well we have not really talked to the property owner. It is like there is a plan on a piece of paper it could just as easily had the driveway going out to Denison instead we have two outlets one behind the bank and one proposed to go out to the street that we are proposing is going to be closed. Mr. Baumann said that they would actually have to get NJDOT consent and will not be able to just do this and that is part of the process. As we work, our way through this we will maybe have to move, whether it could even be there or whether it has to be somewhere else or whether it has to move back off Raritan Avenue. Many dynamics are part of that and has to work with the garage and the adjacent property owners. Until we have a redevelopment we can only have limited conversations with property owners for example we cannot get into negotiations so we are hamstrung by the lack this foundation to move to the next level. We cannot just decide to close that street; it is more involved than that.

Khalidra Hadhazy said she would like to talk about Tract C, development of Tract C and what will be lost in the development of Tract C. Something that she is not hearing when we talk about the potential of closing off North Third Avenue permanently, occasionally, or regularly for Farmers Market is just understanding what goes into operating a Farmers Market. Vendors coming in for the Farmers Market come in with very large vehicles that they have to have on standby and presently where the Farmers Market is located those vendors are able to bring their vehicles in unload their goods set up their stalls and operate throughout the day. If we move the Farmers Market to another area and relocate it to the other area, we have to take into consideration the accommodations for those vehicles. If the street is lined with stalls for the Farmers Market for the vendors to be able to sell their goods, where are all those vehicles gong.

Ms. Jover said that they have had several conversations with Main Street Highland Park about this very point and actually one of the employees who manages the market indicated he's very aware that there are other markets that have that challenge meaning the large trucks just cannot park there, get in early off load and then move those vehicles elsewhere. We would have to figure that out that location but we are pretty confident we could do that. We did see the schematics that they put together and it may be possible that it would not be the same size Farmers Market, we can make it a good one it just might be different. She said that she is confident that the organization is very creative and would be able to come up with some interesting solutions but it may not be exactly the same. She said that there are numerous Farmers Markets in the state that don't have the ability to park those large vehicles and they have managed to accommodate that and it is her understanding that was not their biggest concern, but the size was a concern. This plan is the juggling of goods that we are trying to find and there are compromises everywhere throughout this but we are all committed to trying to maintain.

Ms. Hadhazy said that our Farmers Market is a magical thing that we have in town and she knows that when the Farmers Market is up and is going, local musicians playing and a lot of families come to just have lunch in the Farmers Market. If you sit at the Farmers Market for the whole day, you will see the entire town pass by. It is a great gathering place and it is also good for the local economy a lot of small business are able to maintain their business by the draw that the Farmers Market brings on Friday's. She has spoken to the vendors, and residents in Highland Park that have considered starting their own business and having the Farmers Market be the jump off for what they think they'd like to produce and to be able to do that in a way that's on a small scale that's economically feasible for someone just starting out. She said that she would hate to see the Borough lose that so whatever the solution that we come with whether it is the Farmers Market staying where it is or relocating to a new location she wants to make sure that we take all of those things into consideration.

Mr. Williams said on Tract B why we are not considering the Sunoco and the BB Big it would make a package that he thinks could have actual parking there. Mr. Baumann indicated that those property owners have not expressed any interest in participating in redevelopment to date. Mr. Williams asked what would be done with the \$100,000 Welkovits pavilion. Ms. Jover said that she does not believe it was \$100,000. When the pavilion went in; the conversation was that this was always a redevelopment location and we would have to find a new location for it. Mr. Williams said that at some point the Farmer's Market area was going to be borough square. Ms. Jover said she was not convinced that the shape of that Welkovits pavilion was exactly how that building was going to lay out, it was a conversation we had with Main Street at the very beginning of that project that it would be something that we would have to face and we are committed to fixing.

Mr. Kluger asked Mr. Baumann and Mr. Thomas how often they see redevelopment plan at least from his view, with so many variables, is it common or is it more usual where everything is a little more set and structured. Mr. Baumann said that he has seen redevelopment plans that are specifically targeted drafted for a project that already is in the works and completely designed on the piece of property, and he has seen scattered site redevelopment plans that compass 50, 60, 150 parcels through the entire city, flexible, not flexible sort of everywhere. Highland Park is challenged because so far adopt a plan and they will come didn't work for 15 years, so we had to come up with a new plan. The best way to succeed at redevelopment is to control as much of the variables as you can so we identified two lots that we own and actually we own them because the governing body had the vision and enforcement to go buy them. The ambitious part of this plan is to build a garage and maximize development on the other parcels that is an ambitious goal because we do not control that private property. That private property owner may or may not work with the Borough and so because we know that's an efficient goal and we did not want to not have it on the table, its in the plan. We also recognize because it is ambitious and we didn't want to have nothing because we shoot for the stars and we come up short, we have allowed flexibility on individual lots that would have parking

on site. The plan has this ambitious plan that admittedly is challenging for all the reason logistically legally cooperation from a third party. All those reasons its ambitious but we still think it is worth pursuing because the value of maximizing density and putting more walls on the street but we also didn't want to have that be our only goal because of how ambitious it is. We have these individual devoted to individual parcels two of which we control and that is sort of the result of this flexibility which he admittedly gives people anxiety. Society has progressed, the confidence you have in your elected officials who will ultimately sign redevelopment agreement will gather all the important information they need from Planners and from consultants to make educated smart decisions that preserve a farmer's market somewhere and get the development that they want to develop, and that is what redevelopment allows us to do that regular zoning does not. At the end of the day you are counting on the Mayor and Council and those professionals to make a lot of hard, careful and thoughtful decisions in order to have this redevelopment realized but it is flexible. Mr. Kluger asked if they spoke to any developers in putting this plan together, get ideas from them or at least say do you think this will work. Do you think in a community setting, not an urban setting people would be willing to walk four or five minutes to a structured deck from their apartments or just speak with the developers to make sure that this you know the plan could work. Mr. Baumann said that you are counting on couple of things, one his 30 years experience, Mr. Constantine's 30 years of experience developing with the development community, representing public bodies in very complicated projects and representing developers. He has spoken to and familiar with developers I would say that's too far to walk if you don't have parking inside, I wouldn't do that project and you will find developers that will say that is manageable and can make that work. He thinks it is going to be the gamut of it and maybe it would be a package deal maybe we would put all the parcels together and have some arrangement with the property to build the garage, the process by which we make this all happen is to be worked out. Until we have, a foundation of a plan there is limits to how much we can go out into with the property owners or otherwise negotiating because we do not have the powers yet to do many of the thinks we want to do.

Mr. Hale said that he wanted to point out that Mr. Baumann said the Mayor and Council would be in the decision-makings process as we move forward and wanted to reiterate the number of steps that have to happen before there is any approved process. Mr. Constantine put all of the steps out 6.2, 6.3 to 8.1 so the number of public comment periods after this plan moves forward is quite significant before anything happens. He also pointed out that its not that the Mayor and Council make the decisions on all decisions hence forward there is still a public participation process that will continue all the way through and wanted to add that to make it was clear.

Ms. Hammond opened the meeting for public comment:

Marc Liebeskind, 223 Raritan Avenue, sworn and affirmed. He indicated that he manages the properties from 233 to 241, they are owned by Julia Im, 233 and 235 is a multi-use facility two retail stores, three apartments and the largest public assembly space in Highland Park capable of holding 247 people spread over two floors. The two retail stores are Covered Girl Clothing and Somewhere in Time, adjacent to that is another building, which is Midori Sushi and Hunan Manor and adjacent to that is currently an empty lot that is 241. He said that the first thing he wanted to talk about was traffic. He sent an email to Kim, Jen and Roger, assuming it was not transmitted to the rest of you but one of the comments that I did mention was that the redevelopment plan has a specific requirement that, NJSA 40a:12a-7 adoption of redevelopment plan, says the redevelopment plan shall include an outlier for the planning development, redevelopment or rehabilitation of the project area is sufficient to indicate one it's relationship to definite local objectives as to appropriate land uses, density population, and improved traffic and public transportations, public utilities, recreational community facilities and other public improvements. The legislature used the word shall include, and that's considered a mandatory term. He cited Harvey vs. Essex County Board of Freeholders 30 NJ381 at 391 392 as a 1959 case, so this plan doesn't include for example anything about improved traffic and he knows some of you have talked about that and thinks that you are clearly aware of the not an

improvement to traffic but the impairment of traffic forcing traffic onto the residential streets creating congestion on Route 27. He said the second thing is that there is significant opposition to many aspects of this plan. If any of you have looked at the stakeholder meetings or any of the other Redevelopment Entity meetings many people have spoken out to opposition to certain elements, one of those is closing North Third and that has been discussed in some detail today. Jim talked about the easements from going through the bank parking lot through the North Third and Dr. Parikh's building, his only access to his property by vehicles is through North Third. Ms. Im has an easement through his property onto North Third. He stated he has raised this question, this issue before and does not see how you can close off North Third when people rely on access to their properties from North Third. He does not think Dr. Parikh is going to agree to that, and it is his understanding that Ballard Hutkin and Dr. Barber and Mia Corbett who owns 311 that they are going to agree to it but you keep talking about it. There has been no mention really of the opposition and then the other issue was that, from what he understands, the DOT would not allow a permanent closure of a street that impacts a state highway such as North Third. These closures on South Third and North Fourth are a series of continuous temporary closures of 90 days and that is how they have managed to keep these streets closed for the length of time that they have. He does not think you can really close off North Third or South Third. There has been a discussion about the loss of public parking, the municipal lot has 70 spots, North Third has about 18 spots and this is used by residents not only just during the day and the businesses use it but for overnight parking which they really have no place to park overnight. Those are adverse impacts that have not been discussed and we rely solely on public parking for our businesses, and our tenants rely on it, I know you've talked about hiring or the administrator's talked about getting a parking study done but this is a significant adverse impact that hasn't been addressed. He said that he does not know why there has not been any provisions in the plan to even preserve any of it.

Hannah Shostack, 146 North Sixth Avenue, sworn and affirmed. She said Tract A, B and C on Raritan Avenue, how do you envision having an alternative of those properties having on-site parking when they would involve curb cuts on Raritan Avenue and NJDOT is no longer allowing curb cuts on state highways. How realistic is it for that to be an alternative to the parking garage, when is the parking study going to be done. When she raised that question before Mr. Baumann said that this was going to cost a lot of taxpayer money and it was not worth it. She is now hearing that there is going to be a parking management study and she is totally confused. Is there going to be one or is not there and if so where is it going to fit into the process. How is it going to be financed and is that going to be part of the study. Tract D why has not it been developed up until now, it is the same owner, so how is it having it be a redevelopment area going to affect its fortunes and has anybody talked to the farmers and other people who would be relocated to the festival street. She watched the fire on Raritan Avenue a few weeks ago, the closed streets are still mapped, and she saw fire trucks and mutual aid coming to being dead-ended because they thought that the streets went through while they were closed. How do you reconcile having closed streets that are not maps for other municipalities when we rely on mutual aid for fire.

Dan Stern Cardinale, 221 Harper Street, sworn and affirmed. He said that from his reading in some detail of the redevelopment plan and the Master Plan it seems that the redevelopment plan is pretty well in line with the Master Plan and aside from that, it seems like a very strong framework to build on. It seems like the right thing for Highland Park to try to get something changed in terms of the situation on Raritan. He said that he thinks the key thing, as stated by Padraic earlier, to have a vibrant downtown we need more people that are not there, not just living, working, spending money something we need more people in that area and we now know after decades of kind of getting it wrong collectively as a country that the best way to do that is to build around people rather than cars. This plan mostly does that which is one of the main things that puts it in line with the Master Plan. He said for that reason alone it should move forward. The relationship between roads and parking infrastructure and things, it's paradoxical but it is true that the more car infrastructure in terms of more lanes to the roads or more parking, paradoxically the more congestion you actually have, people end up kind of taking the signal that while we are building more parking we're



building more lanes therefore inviting more people to drive and makes the problem worse in terms of congestion rather than better. He said less parking is actually an affirmative good in terms of the goals that we want to achieve. He said he hears from a lot of people is somewhat concerning because it sounds like the all-too-common fate for these things of death by a thousand paper cuts. We are really confident that the people on the Planning Board and Redevelopment Entity and the Planners and Developers can figure out the challenging questions of how to root traffic and how to deal with resident parking and he is sure we can solve these problems while moving redevelopment forward. Is this framework perfect for the competing needs that we have in Highland Park of course not but this is an early stage and it is just a framework nothing in it is set in stone but is it an excellent start to the goals that we want to accomplish. He think it is and hopes that we are moving forward and will get something for everybody that lives in Highland Park. The status quo of the last few decades is clearly not working in terms of the trajectory of Main Street and this framework is a better approach so let us get it done.

Mary Forsberg, 317 Denison Street, said that this is the first meeting, Carl and herself have been on these meetings since they live right in front of the where the parking garage or behind where the parking garage would go, and this is the first meeting that we have not come away incredibly depressed at how idiotic the whole plan is. Yesterday she sent Jennifer Santiago and Mr. Thomas a four page analysis she prepared on the May 13<sup>th</sup> Planning Board and my comments were rejected because I was told I could attend the meeting and I could state my opinions but I couldn't give you a four-page analysis. In that analysis I concluded that the Planning Board cannot and should not endorse the 2021 redevelopment plan for Tracts A, B, C and D because it is inconsistent with the 2019 Master Plan. It is inconsistent because Tract D the parking garage and the party plaza on North Third is not included in the 2019 Master Plan and has never been included in a single plan in the past. We all know that in addition to that, the Master Plan recommended in several places the preparation of a master parking management plan and we all know that it hasn't been done and the only reason it was done is that there was a little bit of pressure put on it. The redevelopment plan ignores the common practices that have been adhered to in the past in order to build this parking garage. The two documents in question are therefore inconsistent and should not be endorsed by the Planning Board. She said that she felt relieved that she does not think the Board is going to endorse it tonight or at least she hopes they are not going to endorse it. There have been a lot of interesting and intelligent questions and she would like her four-page analysis included in the record for the May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting and made available on the Borough's web-site. She would like to send it to the members of the Planning Board because you've heard from the developers but you haven't heard from a member of the public and I am not a developer. She herself and her husband live right next to where you're proposing a parking garage and party plaza and she thinks it is important for you to hear from members of the public not just from people who are proposing this and she is really appreciative of the fact that we are not being held to three minutes. She had a lot of comments on things that people said when they started talking about the 500 people that were part of the Master Plan, that's 500 people out of over 14,000 people it's a very small percentage of Highland Park, 7% of those people wanted a better CBD, we want a nicer main street too but this end of Highland Park is not the end I mean, There is plenty of parking in this end of town, you can park at Raritan, you can park at Rite Aid, you can park at Stop n Shop. There is plenty of parking here and if somebody put some pressure on Jim Polos, the former Mayor, who owns the parking lot that you are talking about building a parking garage on, is plenty of parking here. The 2019 plan they never asked whether anybody wanted a parking garage, nobody, not a single person actually no one person said they wanted a parking garage but 9% said that parking really was not a problem. How is it that only 9% said it was a problem, it is interesting that all of a sudden having done no analysis of anything about this plan they are putting out an RFP for a parking management plan, that is sort of amazing. She has asked questions about the parking garage, Highland Park claims to be certified green municipality, is a parking garage that is not necessary a green sustainable thing. She said that she is curious about some of the decisions like the International market, the whole new thing is not require developers to put parking next to their locations. She is curious to see if anyone is going to want to rent the space from the International market and have they come up with alternative parking spaces.

What is going to be done with all developers that are going to be involved in this, how are you going to manage having them make sure that their people pay for parking in this parking garage. She said that professional office zoning allows for private parking garages. She does not think they are public parking garages so she doesn't know if Jim Polos is going to build the parking garage himself but she certainly hopes that you're not thinking that residents of Highland Park are going to be building this garage and paying for it. She doesn't think very many people if given that opportunity to do that they would not want to do so. She said that she would like to send everyone her analysis of this because she has spent a lot of time looking at, reading minutes of various meetings and things and has written this analysis. Mr. Thomas indicated that the statement that developers have presented their plans, there are no developers on this site; Mr. Baumann and Mr. Constantine are not developer representatives. Mr. Thomas said that the four-page document is already in the hands of Jennifer and actually he has it and read it and the fact of the matter is that what I did not want to have happen is that your document would be coming in and that there's be no opportunity to discuss with you what your positions were, now that you have testified I don't have a problem with the idea that you end having your document made part of the record but that is because you have testified and that is the exception to the rule. He said that he would inform Jennifer on how that is distributed. It is not the members of the public's responsibility nor should they attempt to contact members of the Board directly that would be absolutely inappropriate, that would be just as bad as having the document come to a Board member then the Board member relying upon it and nobody having the ability to be present to defend that document and that would be a critical defect in terms of any kind of review. He said that he would talk with Jennifer about that distribution.

Randall Solomon, 331 Felton Avenue, sworn and affirmed. He said that the process as he knows it, is that the development plan lays out kind of what we would accept, what we would love to see, puts big stakes in the ground for things that we would want but then we have to work with actual developers who are going to spend their own money to develop their plan and a lot of the details. A lot of these details will be worked out with an actual developer who is willing to put up his or her own money to do studies to work with DOT and other folks to buy properties and create an actual plan. An actual plan would be submitted and go through extensive review, public review and then review with the professionals. He said that he is very much okay and he knows and accepts Joe Baumann's premise that we need to approve the plan generally we need to approve something and let them get going. He thinks things like the parking deck, will the parking deck work, will people use it, yeah, no developer is going to come in here and propose to build a residential development that requires that parking deck without having done a tremendous amount of study as to whether or not people would actually park in that parking deck. There is a lot time for these questions to be worked out and we have to get started so he accepts that premises and supports the general concept of the plan, at this phase he think the job is not to solve all these problems but to put our stakes in the ground for the things that we want and that we really need and make sure the plan is defining those things. He is concerned about the town square, one of the things he was excited about for redevelopment was that we could have a better town gathering place and the Main Street lot is okay but it is a parking lot and it was not really made for the purpose. Main Street has done a great job of programming it and turning it into something that is really wonderful but thinks in the plan going forward the town square should not be something that is an afterthought. We say that we will figure that out after we accommodate the developer and everything else and he thinks we need a really good town square, most of the plans that he has seen significantly shrink the acreage of the land that's available to be programmed and does not think the festival street option works for all things that people want to do. We are going to see a significant decline in the amount of cool stuff that's happening downtown if our town square because a flex space competing with cars and people complaining about traffic and have coordinate with the police every time. This is an important detail that needs to be worked out; we need to make sure that we have a farmer's market. He said that he seen the maps that Main Street put out there that show how many tents and how much square footage would be available for the different proposals and it is pretty stark how little is available on festival street. What we want out of redevelopment, one of the big things we want out of redevelopment is a good town

gathering place and that is something that really ought to be thought through and that is one of the stakes that should be put into the ground prior to moving forward.

Monica Day, 427 Cedar Avenue, sworn and affirmed. She said that the redevelopment plan is not consistent with the Master Plan. The Master Plan does not have any mention of a centralized parking facility, the only mention of off-site parking is from the 2019 Master Plan update, is in the prepare a parking management plan element of the Land Use recommendations, that was the language that was quoted by Mr. Constantine in his opening remarks. Since that language is part of a parking management plan element, it is not part of the Master Plan and therefore this redevelopment plan is not part of the Master Plan. She said it was news to her when Mr. Constantine's presentation that there is now an RFP for a parking management plan that was not at all anywhere in the draft redevelopment plan that was published on the website. There was a mention in that plan that it would be useful to have plan. She strongly argued that this redevelopment plan should be put on hold until the results of the parking management plan can be incorporated. It is entirely possible that this parking management plan, even accounting for this magic centralized parking structure, would conclude that all of the additional residences plus parking for activities for shopping for people coming to the farmers market for all of the intended uses of that parking garages at the current or at the proposed redevelopment density would exceed the capacity of that parking garage which would then push parking onto the local streets and private parking lots such as Stop N Shop and Rite Aid. She said that this would reduce the quality of life in Highland Park for all of these reasons and said she would argue that this redevelopment plan is presently not consistent with the Master Plan that it should be delayed until the parking management plan has been developed.

Sasha Rudie, 247 Cleveland Avenue, sworn and affirmed. She said that she wanted to voice her support for the idea of redevelopment. She is a huge fan of transit-oriented development, which is what this is shaping up to be. She has concerns, does think the town needs a face lift for some of the older buildings, she doesn't know that the new buildings need to be five stories, objects to the lobbies and workout spaces over storefronts and mixed use spaces on the first floor. She also objects to making existing residents pay for parking at the garage. She is concerned the varying heights of the building in the town would be out of character considering most are two to three stories at most. She asked if there was a reason the parking garage is not in Tract C, she worries that pedestrians on North Third will be in danger being so close to cars frequently coming and going and exhaust. Tract C is larger and more central to all the different tracts and public spaces that would allot North Third, Tract D to have a longer safer Farmers Market and community area. Is it possible that Tract D parking lot spot could be the new Farmers Market space with an event/community space building there nearby. She also supported the idea of a jitney to transport people from Highland Park to the train station. She said with proper execution the town could have the charm and appeal of Metuchen and Somerville with the closed off areas and the encouragement to shop, stay, and gather.

James Nichols, 232 Harrison Avenue, sworn and affirmed. He said in the interest of time, he referenced the commentary documents that the design committee of Main Street prepared and the Board approved. He said that he would like to enter that into the record if you can do that at your discretion. He said that he would like to read the cover letter and especially draw people's attention to the plan document that is attached at the end, the map that analyzes the farmer's market impacts and he could walk through the actual document, but in the interest of time, he will not do that. He said the reason why he would like the members of the Board to have a look at it as he thinks as volunteers try to answer a number of the unanswered questions that have been discussed tonight, and so it might help flesh out the issues that maybe still need to be addressed. He indicated that they did submit this commentary to the Borough Council and their liaison Matt Hale and Teri Jover as they were working through the preparation of this plan. Jim Constantine tried to be collaborative throughout the process and in general, we are in favor of redevelopment especially as it would positively impact the businesses who really are our constituency as Main Street Highland Park. The

commentary was prepared by the Design Committee of Main Street, reviewed by the full Board and conveyed to the Redevelopment Entity in late December 2020. The document has been updated to indicate specific areas where the redevelopment plan has responded to or incorporated out input as well as areas where our concerns have not as of yet been addressed. We have also included site diagrams that were prepared to specifically address the feasibility of proposed alternate locations for the public plaza that accommodates not only the weekly Farmers Market but a wide variety of events and activities throughout the year. These events and activities have increased in scope and success every year and have helped to sustain the viability and vitality of the Borough's commercial business district over two decades or more. He emphasized that the two kinds of events you know we talk about the Farmers Market as obviously very impacted but wanted to draw attention also to the spontaneous events that happen at the town square. Those are distinct in the sense that one is scheduled and the other is spontaneous and so that interfaces with a closed street is worth being born in mind because the spontaneous event can't happen in the middle of a street that requires street closure. Taking together the commentary and attached documents represent major areas of concern that Main Stetter has regarding the proposed plan. First their most obviously and significant concern is the direct impact that the plan would have on Main Street's programming and operations including the Farmers Market space. The Main Street office, borough square event space, the pavilion, and the many events both plain and spontaneous that these resources support. They believe that the planned failure to make adequate accommodations for our operational needs would challenge the ongoing viability of our organization and our programming, undermining our ability to support our local businesses as we collaborate to recover from the pandemic. The second concern with the proposed redevelopment plan is born out of the long-standing rule that Main Street Highland Park and the Design Committee in particular have played in promoting and safeguarding the aesthetic and urban design qualities that make Highland Park unique and economically viable as the funky urban and walkable place that we cherish. Their members have devoted many valuable hours of efforts and considerable professional expertise to this cause over many years and preparing this commentary is just one part of those efforts. In this role, the commentary speaks more generally to how the proposed plan will impact the commercial business district and the Borough overall and to specific issues and elements of the plan that we believe should be addressed now rather than waiting for the subsequent review and approval of individual projects. We conclude by supporting the redevelopment of the commercial business district in concept but also recommending that the development of Tract A could proceed independently while the more difficult issues proposed by Tracts B, C and D are more thoroughly studied and resolved. It is their hope that this information will help the Planning Board in its consideration of the proposed redevelopment and its likely impact on the future of Main Street, the commercial business district and the Borough itself, defined by himself, Marcus Schiffman, Co-Chair of the Design Committee, Jenny Chapman, Vice President of the Board and Rebecca, Executive Director. The document itself is 14 pages of kind of detailed questions about all aspects of the plan, specifically those things that we feel like should be addressed now rather than waiting for individual developers to address because they really transcend the individual tracts but speak to the holistic combination of all of them. He also mentioned that there was an attachment that was prepared by their Executive Director, which specifically highlights all of the contributions of Main Street annually. On Friday's when we have the Farmers Market and these other events, it's exactly the goals of this plan which is to have lots of people in the streets, we draw people from surrounding towns, a lot of things we'd like to have happen seven days a week at least we're having one day a week part of the year but in addition to those events, the attachment is worth noting and then in addition to that there is a plan if those could be shared now that would be great. The graphic that we attached is an analysis of the thought comparative sizes of the existing Farmers Market space, 0.78 acres compared to a reduced area that could be developed on Tract C also allowing redevelopment of part of site as well as the sizes and scales of the Farmers Market what it would look like on both part of North Third as well as South Third. The big issue there is reduction depending on where the street closed occurs, from 60 plus vendors down to 32 vendors in the worst case scenario but a lot of that depends of the specifics of street closures. He re-emphasized that the Farmers Market is something that can be scheduled to happen on Friday's, its happening increasing amount of the

calendar growing from the Spring into late Fall and now almost to the end of the year. He said is last thing is to come back to this idea of the distinction between the Farmers Market and the idea of a town square which is where unsponsored spontaneous events can happen without being scheduled.

Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that it was clear to him that the members of the public have been heard. There has been a lot of discussions, the Board's function as he understands it and explained in the beginning of the meeting is to make a determination as to whether or not the plan is inconsistent with the Master Plan, and the language specifically says which are inconsistent with the Master Plan and recommendations concerning those inconsistencies or any other matters as the Board deems inappropriate. So you can either solicit for the discussion for the Board, you could seek a motion to determine whether or not it is inconsistent or it is not inconsistent or you can end up having a motion that says its not inconsistent but you have the following recommendations to be attached to your motion. Ms. Hammond asked if they were determining whether each tract was consistent or inconsistent. Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that was really up to the Board, if the Board feels the overall plan is not inconsistent you can do it that way, if you feel certain parcels are consistent but parcel d is not you could indicate that, it's generally consistent with the Master Plan but have certain recommendations for example. He said Mr. Constantine has made some suggestions as part of his presentation, that if the Board makes a recommendation be that the plan ultimately, not today, but ultimately, would supersede the existing ordinance not an overlay. There's also been a suggestion that he tried to put into a kernel that would be that it would include a recommendation that the pedestrian/parking/bike study be in place prior to any developer agreement recognizing again that there are no developers right now, that the idea is to try to get a plan as suggested to something in place so there can be the beginnings of some discussion but without the plan there can't be. There are a number of different options.

Mr. Kluger said that he did not know how others felt, is there a sense of whether some of the information that they heard testimony about but have not seen actual documents whether that would impact the voting on whether it is inconsistent with the Master Plan. He thinks there is maybe up to three documents that the public spoke about but have not actually seen it, and does not know what impact that would have on their own ability to make a decision tonight to the extent that the documents deal with issues of jurisdiction. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said to the extent that the documents deal with the issue of jurisdiction, he does not think they will have an impact. We had testimony from Ms. Forsberg as to essentially what was contained in her four page summary, she outlines the points that she has made, you know I cannot get into you minds individually as to whether or not as to reading those four pages will be more informative than listening to what she has to say tonight, the same is true with regard to the Main Street plan. It is much more detailed and addendums but does think Mr. Nichols did certainly outline pretty well the information, he did not read all 14 pages but they made their best attempt to give the Board their thumbnail sketch whether or not those documents will influence your vote he could not say.

Mr. Kluger asked Ms. Jover if Main Street was involved in the drafting of the plan or have meetings. Mr. Hale said that they had several meetings and consultations with Main Street throughout the whole process; we had many meeting with them. Ms. Hammond asked if he was familiar with the plan that Mr. Constantine was talking about and the recommendations. Mr. Hale said that yes he was, he has read their concerns, their plans, and thinks that the document has changed in many ways in reference to that. One of the things that they have asked for is to have the tracts more separated than they were originally and that was something that Main Street thought was a good idea and we agreed. We thought that was also a good idea to have a stronger commitment to a public space that was also a recommendation. He said that he doesn't think everything that is in the Main Street document is in the plan and the reason for that is that many of the things that are in the Main Street document have to do with the organizational functioning of Main Street as an organization, which is different than redevelopment. He said that they certainly had

meetings with Main Street, we certainly considered and valued their opinion and incorporated many of the things that Main Street asked for.

Mr. Kluger asked after reading their document is there any material in there that you would say yes I would after reading that and hearing you I would make some material or significant changes to the plan as it's written today. Mr. Hale said having read the plan he would not because part of the goal of this is as Mr. Baumann said earlier is balancing is trying to figure out how are we going to get more people down on Main Street and is the Farmers Market going to stay exactly the same way, I don't know and it can't and still have more people down on Main Street. He said that he does not think that there was anything that he read in the Main Street plan other than the things that he mentioned. They did mention they would like to have more flexibility for one tract to move ahead of another, that is in the plan, they did mention that they would like to have the potential options for on-site parking, that is in the plan, they did mention that they would like to have a stronger commitment for a public space, that is in the plan. Those are the things that we decided that were relevant to the plan and that is what we added to the plan.

Ms. Hammond expressed concerns with the hour, indicating that there were additional people from the public waiting to speak. Ms. Hand indicated the Board does have an obligation to review some of the documents that were suggested and continue to hear from members of the public, at one point there were 50 participants in this webinar and for every one person who wants to speak there's another 10 who are not speaking who are listening very intently to everything that is going on. She said from her perspective we'd be best served on a motion to continue to the next meeting and pick up discussion again at that time. She said she thinks that the plan is not inconsistent with the Master Plan; however, she is not a fan of all the provisions that have been presented especially with parcels C and D. She is a big fan of redevelopment and encouragement and putting this catnip out there to developers to encourage them to come in make plans make proposals and work out those elements. She does trust in the redevelopment committee and the town council to work with those developers as those opportunities arise. However, having put her feelings out there on the plan as it sits she is not sure she is ready to vote tonight given how many more opinions of the public there are out there and we have not heard yet. Ms. Hammond said she agreed, and she was trying to get a sense for how comfortable people would be coming to some sort of vote this evening. Mr. Kluger also agreed with Ms. Hand.

Mr. Hale asked for guidance on what areas that the Board would like addressed and how would the Board like them addressed. Ms. Hand said that she feels they have to let the public tell them part of the answer and there is no time to finish that discussion tonight, especially given that we took the position that we are very clear that we cannot and will not communicate one-on-one with members of the public outside of this open public forum where we all have full disclosure and transparency, so that people have the opportunity to engage with us and tell us their concerns and now we will submit supplemental documents they'd like us to see. Maybe something new will come up and she is not ready to shut down that line of discussion when there is still so many more comments and people want to be heard and it is 10:38 PM and she feels we need to wrap things up for the evening.

Ms. Hammond said that there is a lot about this and that is really good, there is a lot about this that is exactly what we've been looking for but does see a flaw that she doesn't imagine just some negotiating getting us around. It would take Mr. Constantine, or Mr. Baumann or someone with experience with this to say this is how that is going to be handled and she feels is just not getting that sort of input. Mr. Hale said that has been a lot of discussions about a lot of different issues and if those can be framed in a way that we could respond to he thinks that would be helpful. He said that he is not asking what it would take to get support; he is asking what the questions that are unclear.

Mr. Thomas said that one of the questions that was raised is the viability of closing off North Third Street and it's interplay in that closure with the parking garage whether or not that can actually work; given the fact that it is intended to be for use on a regular basis and yet there's only one access which is on North Third. The other issues that has been raised by the public is whether or not the parking garage concept is something that is consistent with the Master Plan, there seems to be a sense that some members of the public seem to feel that it is appropriate and others obviously strongly feel to the contrary. There is also the questions of public space that has been raised by both members of the Board as well as the public giving the possibility a higher priority in terms of its location to the extent, recognizing Mr. Baumann's point, that you can't put specificity when you don't have a developer. That has been his experience, when you have a developer you come in with redevelopment plan you some of the specifics, you negotiate with them and then you come to see if it all fits together. This is a different kind of animal and there is a need for flexibility and feels that the Board needs to understand that. One of the issues with flexibility is how much emphasis do you put on the public space, should that become more emphasized in the plan, should there also be more consideration with regard to how the ambiance of the Farmers Market should be dealt with similar to the public space. Should there be a greater sensitivity toward that and giving it a higher priority in terms of the plan, so when the plan gets approved, Mr. Baumann, Mr. Constantine, the committee can go to a developer and indicate these are all the things we want but be aware these things are important to us, don't lose sight of them. Ms. Hammond agreed with Mr. Thomas' statement, and expanded on his last point, which is that the thing that she heard several people say is there actually a difference between the town square and the Farmers Market, we are sort of conjoining those two as if it is one entity. She asked if anyone else heard anything that we want to make sure is added to that list that Mr. Thomas outlined.

Ms. Hammond closed the public comment portion of the meeting. She indicated when the Board meets again there would be ample time for public comments. She thanked the public for attending and providing comments. Mr. Thomas, Esq., said so that nobody leaves or misunderstands, we are closing the public comment for tonight it looks like the meeting is going to be continued until the next meeting which is I believe is the 10<sup>th</sup> of June, so if you still have concerns or comments there will be an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Kluger said the front page of the document says endorsed by the Planning Board on whatever day, we didn't have that language in our previous redevelopment plans and he doesn't know if that was the correct language that should be used, that the Board actually endorsing it when and if we get to that point. He addressed Matt Hale, he would still like to hear more about specific circulation around and traffic around Tract D and about parking, not necessarily as much about whether there's going to be enough parking for the new developments that are proposed but what impact by building on all these tracts could have on the existing businesses and existing operations of the town and residential areas just to make sure it works. He said that it was news to him that the Reformed Church has a big use of parking spaces in the back of that lot, there are already a number of people who live in the downtown who don't have places necessarily to park. He thinks that kind of news and hearing from businesses close to lot C who feel that they are going to be impacted negatively by losing the parking that's all over there. He said he wants to make sure that we have some responses to those.

Mr. Thomas, Esq., said to Mr. Hale, Mr. Baumann and Mr. Constantine that he does not know that these are necessarily responses but there are issues that the Board needs to wrestle with and if you do have more information about that it would be helpful.

Mr. Thomas announced to the public that the meeting was not over, it is over for tonight, it will be carried until the 10<sup>th</sup> of June at 7:30, same format as we have had today and if you want to get more information check the website. He said that he did not know who the 6-7 people were but if these are repeat comments he thinks the focus should be on people that have not spoken and given new comments and if you choose

you can go back to someone that's already given comment or after reading the documents you may want to question a member of the public if they participate as to what they had in mind when they wrote the document.

Mr. Baumann said that he just wanted to remind the Board and Atty there is a 45-day response. Mr. Thomas said that they are hopeful that you will convey to the Redevelopment Entity which of course is the Council what has happened tonight and there has been some legitimate discussion and an earnest discussion by this Board and that they did not want to go to the wee hours of the morning and the Board wishes to come to a conclusion at the June meeting.

**Minutes:**

March 11, 2021 Regular Meeting

Ms. Hammond indicated that the March 11, 2021 minutes would be carried until the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**Memorialization of Resolutions:**

Resolution P2021-03

Jassin LLC, P2-02, 236 South 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Minor  
Subdivision & Bulk Variance, Block 68, Lots 18,  
19 & 20

It was MOVED by HAMMOND and seconded by NOLAN that Resolution P2021-03 be approved.

ROLL CALL: Ayes – Brescher, Hadhazy, Hale, Hand, Kluger, Lanaris, Williams, Hammond

Nays - None

Abstain – Malay, Nolan

There being eight (8) ayes and two (2) abstentions, motion passed.

**Correspondence and reports.**

Zoning/Building Officer report – Scott

Rehabilitation Screening Committee report – Kim – None

**Action on any other business and work session.**

**Public comment on any item not on the agenda.**

There was a motion to adjourn from WILLIAMS and a second by HAND at 10:55 pm the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Santiago  
Board Clerk