

**HIGHLAND PARK PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
August 12, 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 January 29, 2021 and to the Home News Tribune on January 29, 2021. 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 August 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 August 10, 2021, and has remained continuously posted as required by law.

Roll Call:

Present	Kim Hammond left at 8:06 pm, Scott Brescher, Khalidra Hadhazy, Matthew Hale, Rebecca Hand, Alan Kluger, Paul Lanaris, Jeffrey Perlman left at 9:29 pm, Allan Williams
Absent	Padraic Millet, Steve Nolan
<u>Board Professionals</u>	Roger Thomas, Esq., Jim Constantine, Planner, Bruce Koch, Engineer

Minutes:

May 13, 2021 Regular Meeting

It was MOVED by KLUGER and seconded by HADHAZY that the May 13, 2021 Regular meeting minutes as distributed be approved and with a voice vote by all present, the minutes were approved.

Resolutions:

Resolution P2021-06 Consistency Review of Cannabis Ordinance

Chairperson Hammond said Resolution P2021-06 would need to be tabled until the next meeting. Roger Thomas, Esq., indicated that the resolution was incorrect, he will correct that and get it out to everyone and it should not have any bearing on Council actions because the action that was taken by the Board on the 8th of July which is the formal action and well before the date you are required to take action by which is the 22nd of August.

Resolution P2021-07 Suburban Real Estate Development LLC, P2021-02, 238
Cleveland Avenue, Block 169, Lots 31-33

Chairperson Hammond recused herself.

Mr. Kluger said he would turn it over to Roger Thomas, Esq. to cover which version we are looking at and what changes and any other proposed changes from member of the Board.

Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that there have been some modifications; he referred the Board to condition 13 dealing with various things in terms of sidewalk replacement, curbing and things of that nature. Mr. Kluger appropriately raised the question about whether or not the milling that was going to be done, if you recall there was going to be some milling and overlay on that street and on Cleveland Avenue, and the question was whether or not it was going to be the entirety of the street or some portion of the street. He had a follow-up conversation with Bruce Koch in regards to that and Mr. Koch in fact indicated that he had discussed at the meeting as well as with the applicant the fact that it was going to be done curb to curb so that is now going to be added. We also raised some questions with regard to the neighbors on Harrison Avenue, condition 12 on page 9 indicates the approval is subject to the applicant providing for natural landscaping buffer including evergreen trees both along the entire rear property line of the all the lots, both under and proposed for the development sufficient to provide screening to the rear of the neighbors on properties fronting

Harrison Street and along the easterly side of the right most lot currently under construction. Said buffering and landscaping shall be subject to the recommendations of the Shade Tree Advisory Committee as well as the approval by the Borough Planner. There is also an issue with regard to making sure that Mr. Koch's comments in his report were incorporated and believes that vast majorities of his comments were there, both Mr. Koch and Mr. Constantine's reports were incorporated into the record and that was found on page 6. There was also a question as to whether or not we needed to make reference to the fact that you did grant waivers for purposes of completeness with regard to certain items: traffic study, environmental impact statement, subdivision sketch plan, and slopes. He said that he feels it is not necessary, you grant waivers all the time, and does not think it is necessary to point out what those waivers are once you deem an application complete. If you find that those waivers that you have granted during completeness review, need to be supplements and if you want additional information you always under the statute have the right to do that. There was also an issue that was raised with regard to the requirement for tree replacement, under condition 13 it will probably go at the end on page 10 indicating that this approval is also subject to the requirement of the tree replacement ordinance.

Mr. Thomas, Esq. said as a result of some concerns that were raised, he had a conversation with Mr. Constantine and he was good enough to indicate that some of the concerns should be highlighted and taken into account. He said that Mr. Constantine sent him a copy of a revised ordinance.

Mr. Constantine said on page 4, first paragraph, it was noted one shade tree and one flowering tree for total of two trees should be provided in the front yard of each lot, we are suggesting adding in or relocated to the rear yard when the homes are pushed forward, the front yard gets smaller. There are already shade trees along the street that are going to be planted shade tree and an ornamental so we wanted that flexibility and that works in concert with the recommendation as it's been rewritten regarding landscaping in the back. Further, down in the second paragraph, fifth line it was agreed by the applicant that they would maintain the same building envelope and slide it up toward the front of the street, we are suggesting that we change that to read, "It was agreed by the applicant that they would increase the rear yard setback by approximately five feet." That clarifies what the Board approved and it does not get us into an area where we are referring to the building envelope which is not defined, it achieves the same thing but with absolute clarity. We are suggesting approximate because the very first home that is going to be constructed the requirement in the PO zone was for a 25' rear yard because it was proceeding under the existing zoning set back at the rear, all the other homes will be greater than 30 feet. On page six, after the first whereas, the paragraph after that, fourth line down, currently reads "they include the relocation of the building envelope and the placement of the house within the building envelope, we are suggesting that be reworded to read "they include the reduction of the front yard setback of the homes by approximately five feet, the next sentence reads "the intent was to move it, just substitute each home further towards the street. Fourth line up from the bottom on page six, a front yard variance is required but reads a front yard variance is required but the building envelope would remain the same as previously configured on the plan to avoid undue extension in the rear yard and increasing the depth of the rear yard. We are suggesting is read a front yard variance is required and increasing the depth of the rear year which shall be recorded for each lot on the as-built survey and as a deed restriction prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. He said that he is not sure if it is the as-built survey for the final survey. To address some of the issues about the rear yard and the fact that somebody won't have the ability to buy one of these homes and extend it out you will have in the resolution and in the documents that conform to this clarity. We have increased the rear yard setback by sliding the homes forward, we will have the deed restriction on each lot that will clarify that and we will have a final or as-built survey that will indicate that increased rear yard setback for approximately 30 feet on most of the homes. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said that the language allows it to be tracked appropriately through a title search so that it is not lost in the shuffle in 10 years.

Mr. Constantine said starting on page eight; condition one to further reinforce this in the conditions. The first condition reads that the Planning Board incorporates the recommendations of its Planner by way of

variances and for the reasons expressed here and before grants the variances to allow for a reduction in the front yard by allowing the front of the building including the porch to be moved. We have added approximately five feet closer to the front of the property and also we have added increasing the rear yard setback of the building by approximately five feet which shall be recorded for each lot on the as-built survey to be approved by the Planning Board Engineer and Borough Planner and as a deed restriction approved by the Board Attorney prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. We have then deleted the rest of that sentence. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said to the extent that anything can be locked in permanently it does go a long way toward that end which was the intent and purpose of what the Board was doing at the time and it is clear for future enforcement purposes. He said the only other comment he would make is on page six, it said the meetings open to the public there was a concern raised with regard to the demolition of the building on site and how the dust caused considerable problems in the neighborhood. The applicant agreed to test the debris to assure that there was no deleterious substances and there was a sense that maybe that language could be a little bit stronger because there was a big concern. If the Board chooses maybe it could be strengthened a little bit to indicate that members of the public also were concerned that there should be testing of the material before it was taken away to assure that no deleterious substances were in that.

Mr. Kluger said that he thinks they were looking for even stronger than just cause considerable problems in the neighborhood, people raised very significant issues potential health issues, potential damages to their yards and their everyday life was halted back there for however long because they didn't do the proper procedures to screen the Harrison Avenue neighbors from the work that was being done. He said when speaking with Mr. Thomas, Esq. he referred to item twelve, you talked about screening when the property is developed, the proper landscaping and screening and what he was looking for here was that the applicant agreed while were being very remorseful and regretful of what had happened they agreed to it won't happen again that they would put up some kind of appropriate screening so that if they're doing additional construction work or clearing work that the neighbors on Harrison would be protected but unfortunately as a number of us saw over recently that didn't happen and they didn't do it and their excavator was back there taking dirt out in a number of dump trucks and there was no screening put up at least as of when he was there a week ago. He said he thinks we just need to be strong and clear here that they made nice in front of us at the meeting but after that they sort of went back to usual business and he thinks we need to be strong here. He said that he and Scott had corresponded and hoped that Mr. Brescher was taking this very seriously and watching them a bit more because he thinks they have shown us that maybe we cannot fully trust them on certain things that they have promised to. Mr. Brescher said that he is watching them but will not babysit, he asked what kind of screening is the Board looking for, typically, you would water it down so you don't get dust and they did have the machine running and there was water coming out of it.

Mr. Kluger said he spoke with Mr. Constantine about this and they have used it at other construction sites where you cannot see in some material that was able to protect the neighbor's properties. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said that there is certainly construction fencing that is put up during construction that would not impact or reduce the amount of dust that would occur, and that is what Scott is talking about and if they are watering it down as they are supposed to he's not sure what else there can be done. He said that he would be happy to send a letter to the applicant's attorney indicating that there is a concern for ongoing activity that seems during construction that have adverse effect on abundant properties and that they should take all means reasonable to be able to minimize the adverse impact on the abutting properties.

Mr. Kluger said that he came away from the meeting that they were not going to start any new construction or clearing until all the environmental studies were not only done but also approved by our professionals. In hindsight it looks like the, looking back, we received their phase two studies beginning of this week so we hadn't seen them yet, we saw lots of construction activity going on, it appears that those letters may have been received by the applicant before they started the construction work but he doesn't know that anyone in Mr. Koch's office or Mr. Constantine's office or Scott's office has seen them. He said he has asked this at previous meetings how this interplay between the environmental studies, the environmental issues raised

and the permit that was approved and whether it was okay for them to start new excavation work until all out professionals have reviewed the environmental studies.

Ms. Hadhazy asked if there was anyway we can add language to this that rather holds them to account for air quality and for minimizing dust. She doesn't think that we have to decide what they have to do, what measures they have to use and what mechanisms they use to do that but add language to this that addresses air quality because a lot of the residents did raise concern and that is a really big concern. It is a commercial building that they have demolished to build residential homes and its producing dust that no one knows what it is and is there stronger language that can be added. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said the action that was taken dealt with certain things and he does not know that you can necessarily start adding things at this point in time. He would be happy to include in a letter the fact that there is concern about the ongoing construction and that it appears as though it may have been having adverse impacts on the quality of life on abutting properties and that all actions reasonable should be taken to try to minimize those impacts. He said that he does think that reports were submitted, the reports did indicate that there were no asbestos or other deleterious substances at least as he read them, he can't answer for what Scott or Bruce saw. Maybe in light of what had happened prior to the meeting with all the dust and everything else should they have maybe submitted those reports to Scott and said look I think we are ready to go, is this okay and get some kind of formal approval probably would have been good politic to do but he doesn't know that's necessarily something that they are required to do but in an effort to try to be good neighbors they probably should have done and it doesn't sound like they did.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Thomas, Esq. in the future could we require that any, if there is environmental issues that no construction can occur until everything is resolved. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said that you could, the issue becomes being able to know that in advance, for example if you have a gas station that is going to be remediated up front, not all sites are quite so obvious and things may end up occurring that you do not know so on appropriate cases yes you can. That clearly was not done in advance when they started digging the hole for the first foundation but it was done apparently simultaneously with digging more holes or whatever else they were doing on site and it has to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis you can't simply say in every single situation you have to show that there's no environmental effect. Mr. Williams said he thinks you would have the Engineer weigh in on something like that, this cannot happen, a professional saying you cannot do this until we have resolved this issue. He said not only did they excavate but the precast foundation is already in and he thinks it would be good to verify that they have met the requirements that Mr. Constantine just mentioned, how far it is from the street to the front of the foundation and how far is it, what is the distance in the back. Mr. Constantine said it does and we did check that however, there was an issue with the first house and I think Mr. Thomas, Esq., weighed in on this. They were applying for we have not approved this resolution so we have not approved our variances yet so that is why the first house actually the rear yard isn't fully 30 feet in the rear yard setback. Mr. Thomas Esq. said that first house was being asked for by way of a permit if was one house on one lot and they had every right to be able to pull that permit so at that time there was no requirement for that 30 foot setback so they proceeded ahead and now you have a situation where it's whatever Mr. Constantine said its 29 or so feet as opposed to 30. He understands what is being said and assuming the foundations that you are referring are being appropriately measured so that they are located in the proper spot.

Mr. Kluger asked the professionals how often do you see an applicant come in for a number of houses and then just submit a by right permit for one of the lots. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said that he has not seen it but that it does not mean that it is some thing they cannot do. Mr. Kluger said he was thinking that do we really have an application for seven houses anymore or is it really just location for six houses because one of them is now part of a totally separate permit or even application and does that change any of the numbers or any of the other calculations or anything that we are going or does this one lot that they are building on a separate permit sort of roll into this application. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said he thinks it rolls into this application and as outlined in what Mr. Constantine has talked about that's why he provided the language of approximately 30

feet although it's 29.whatever essentially meeting the variance standard. Therefore, he thinks it is important to recognize because then the other elements of this approval apply not just to the six houses that are going to be built so that it is important to be recognized as part of this application.

Mr. Williams said he had another question about the testing that and beef it up a little bit, it would seem that would be a condition of approval also. Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that they have already submitted that material. Mr. Williams said that he does not know what Mr. Koch thinks but he does not think it is adequate. Mr. Thomas Esq., said that he would defer to Mr. Koch to determine that, what he saw said that there is no asbestos or other substances.

Mr. Kluger asked Mr. Constantine about the lot that they have started building on, did that also have a front facing garage. Mr. Brescher said yes it does it was originally considered a craft room but laid out as a garage and not it is a garage. Mr. Constantine said he believed when they submit the bill the building permit through they had no garage on it because they cannot have a front facing garage until we approve this resolution. He thought they had prepared an alternate plan but then they will fold it into this application. Mr. Kluger said that the reason it was by right was that it did not have a garage when at least according to the original permit. Mr. Constantine said that was correct it did not have a garage facing the street, which would require a waiver.

Mr. Kluger said that it is just an end around of what our process here and I do not think that in the future we hope that does not happen again but it really should not.

Ms. Hadhazy said she understood if we cannot change the language entirely in the resolution but was strongly in favor of any letters like follow-up letters to this applicant stating the seriousness of managing dust and preserving good air quality in the neighborhood. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said that he absolutely agrees and that they should be respectful of the quality of life of the abutting property owners and do everything that they can in the future in light of what has happened in the past to minimize the impact of this construction. Mr. Hale asked Mr. Thomas, Esq., to copy Mr. Constantine, Mr. Baumann, Mr. Schmierer and Teri Jover on that as well.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Constantine about lot 33 and said it still is probably eight feet above street level, and asked if it was his assumption that all of these homes will be at the same level. Mr. Constantine said basically the same level, he believes that what their testimony was, there was some feathering they were doing of grades. Mr. Williams said currently it is still way above the level of the others, 31 and 32. Mr. Constantine said they had a grading plan that was part of the package.

Mr. Kluger said that another item that we may want to talk to the applicant about or at least in Mr. Thomas, Esq. letter to their attorney is just the, again from walking the neighborhood and seeing some of the construction activity it appeared that some of the construction vehicles were operating very close or on top of or around the catwalk or the public sidewalk that runs all along from like Cleveland to Harrison to Lincoln almost like going over the right of way. Either because they needed to get around some trees or some telephone wires and there appeared to be some tree cutting that occurred. He said he didn't know if it was their property or on the property next to them and he doesn't know if there is some way we can have that looked at or make sure that type of activity is not occurring as it could be damaging the sidewalk area that is over there. Mr. Thomas Esq. asked if it was construction equipment that is going across the sidewalk that is necessary to get into the lots. Mr. Constantine said it was a mid-block walkway that is the catwalk that are in these old Northside blocks they are like little hidden routes. He said that the catwalk he believes is owned by Mr. Stern and sits between two other lots not owned by the applicant. Mr. Thomas, Esq. said he would be happy to talk to Mr. Constantine to get a little bit more detail.

Mr. Kluger said it seemed like the construction activity was happening not on this applicant's lot but the next property over so maybe they had permission to use it or cut down trees in order to get their construction vehicles around but it also seemed like they were going over the catwalks as well. Mr. Thomas, Esq. asked does this particular property then have a catwalk that then goes over to Harrison and that's what they are

using that catwalk. Mr. Koch said this one does not it is a lot away. Mr. Thomas Esq. said that he could add that to the letter.

Mr. Constantine said that the walkway is a public right of way and he thinks that is the safety issue that is being raised and the catwalk was damaged and if it is damaged it would seem to me that they have an obligation to repair it.

Mr. Lanaris asked if there were, two underground storage tanks and an old oil fired boiler on one of those lots and was soil sampling done directly underneath those tanks. Mr. Williams said the tanks had been removed earlier and samples were done across the front of 31 and 32. Mr. Koch said there were four soil samples what they took. He said that he had questions about some of the reports that they had submitted but was not sure this was the venue to discuss that or he will check with one of his LSRP's and present those questions to the professional who submitted the reports. Mr. Lanaris said that the report he saw certainly did not identify a cursory description of where these samples were taken from. Mr. Koch said that there was a completely separate report from a soil consultant that has more test sites on it and the results of that. Mr. Lanaris said it seems to him that they could take four samples within a one square foot area and everything is clean. Mr. Koch said they did not do that but his question is going to be was the sampling done in accordance with the DEP criteria.

Mr. Kluger said the fact that they have already dug the excavation for the one lot we gave them approval for and dug out a lot of soil and put the foundation work in there is not much they could do with in that one lot area in terms of testing anymore, its been disturbed which goes back to his initial comment. He said Mr. Williams had asked the same question which is there anything that we can do to make sure in the future that when we know we have phase one studies that raise environmental issues whether we should be issuing any building permits or clearing permits or construction permits or any type of permits on that lot and he thinks that is an issue that needs to be addressed going forward. Mr. Lanaris said especially with the history of the lots across the street and the history of the lower lots it certainly makes sense to go a little slower on this one.

Ms. Hadhazy said that she feels that the soil samples and soil contamination with regards to underground oil tanks but a lot of the residents concerns had to do with the demolition of the building and the dust produced from that and she did recall from that testimony from this applicant and residents were concerned with the dust and what particulates could be in that dust. She said to Mr. Kluger's point and Mr. Williams' point about testing materials before the demolition of the building to make sure that there is no asbestos particles flying in the air when they tear these buildings down. For the future when we are in a situation that would be something that we should consider before permits are issued.

Mr. Williams said that it was his understanding that there were two episodes of dust one of it was when they were crushing the concrete and the other was when they were moving dirt around and they took a sample of the dirt but they did not take samples of the crushed concrete and now they have mixed them both together at least it looks that way from the street.

Mr. Lanaris asked Mr. Koch when they know a building was constructed prior to 1978 and they know they are going to demolish it, isn't it required to take internal samples of the building materials to ensure that there's no lead paint or asbestos. Mr. Brescher said they did submit a report, and he would forward that to Mr. Lanaris when he is back in the office tomorrow. He said that there was no asbestos found. Mr. Kluger said the applicant did testify at the last hearing that there was no asbestos in the building.

Mr. Kluger said that within our rules we need to watch them carefully and just based on what we have seen from them so far.

It was MOVED by KLUGER and seconded by WILLIAMS that the resolution as modified be approved.

ROLL CALL: Ayes – Brescher, Hadhazy, Hand, Kluger, Lanaris, Millet, Nolan, Williams
Nays – None

Abstentions – Hale, Perlman

There being eight (8) ayes, no nays and two (2) abstentions, motion passed.

Action on any other business and work session.

Chairperson Hammond said that she would like to speak to the Board about a checklist change to the site plan review that was discussed at the January meeting. That would allow the Board to understand who the professionals were involved in an application when it was in redevelopment. Many times when a project goes to redevelopment, the applicant might feel like decisions were made, certain things were set in motion and then they still come before the Planning Board for review. We had a situation where we still had questions on perhaps the girl's school on Cleveland Avenue and we felt like those people were not available to us so we had a meeting in January to discuss this. The motion was moved by Hammond and seconded by Williams to request to the Borough Council to amend the checklist for a preliminary and final site plan to include any documents that were part of the redevelopment process. She thinks there was also a request that we would have access to question any of their professionals.

Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that he would make that request to the Borough Clerk and the Borough Attorney; it does not need to be reaffirmed by the Board. Ms. Hand said that a letter did go out from Mr. Thomas' office on January 26. Mr. Thomas, Esq., said nothing seems to have occurred and he will provide that letter along with a follow-up and remit that. He said that he would report at the September meeting. Mr. Hale said that he apologized that it did slip through the cracks, there has been talk about in generalities but doesn't think there is any issue with the Council providing those documents.

Ms. Hammond said that the Board had voted on was to include any documents submitted as part of the redevelopment process but the implied references also that we would be able to ask questions of the applicants professionals such as their LSRP. The reason this came up was that there were questions posed at a meeting that could not be answered.

Mr. Thomas, Esq., said that he would supplement the previous letter if necessary. Mr. Hale suggested including Mr. Baumann since he is Counsel for the Redevelopment Entity.

Ms. Hammond said that she wanted to make a note, we have already made our recommendations to Council about the redevelopment plan, and they have not had their public hearing yet. The Planning Board was cited on the cover page of the plan as approved and memorialized by the Planning Board and we did ask for that language to be removed since we found some issue with some of the tracts and made recommendations. We felt that did not accurately capture the activity of the Planning Board and she spoke to Ms. Jover and Mr. Constantine and they were comfortable pulling that since that was not the case. Both the redline version and the final version are online for public consumption. Mr. Constantine added that the recommendations from the Planning Board's resolution were incorporated into the revised draft. He said he believed they captured some of what was suggested verbatim or we adjusted the language and we included some things such as some of the issues raised by Jeff Perlman that were not in the resolution. He said that there was a whole lot of housekeeping that was done based on the discussion at the Planning Board and specifically the resolution.

Mr. Constantine said that Allan Williams asked the question previously regarding the sidewalks on Madison, there has been a meeting, exhibits were prepared, and Chris Cosenza and Teri Jover did go out and met with all of the four property owners who would be affected by this on Madison Avenue. There are two single-family homeowners between Cleveland and Harrison and the next block up on the north side of Madison between Harrison and Grant. It seemed that the consensus from the property owners was their preference was that the sidewalk sit against the curb or a sidewalk integrated with the curb for location and there was different impacts on yards and existing landscaping and existing trees depending on where it might be located. There will be going back to the Borough for final determination as to width of that sidewalk and then still be determined are the bike lanes which might also serve for some safer walking on Harrison which would extend all the way up to the Edison border from Madison. There still an engagement

with the Harrison Avenue neighbors that needs to take place as well. Ms. Hammond said the width of sidewalks to be determined, that is going to be determined by the Borough, and when will that be determined. Mr. Constantine said that Ms. Jover was going to talk with Bruce Koch and touch base with Safe Walking and Cycling Committee to get more input on the Borough's side, there was input from the neighbors, some different options but we know the generally consensus from some of the neighbors was to keep it furthest from their windows and front door.

Ms. Hammond said Mr. Williams brought up a good idea, which would be to see whether you or someone in the Code Enforcement office could give the planning board a real short course on when something is going to be built what that permitting process looks like, that could be incorporated into one of the regularly scheduled meetings. It does not necessarily affect exactly what we do but thinks it could inform and sort of give the Board a little insight as what the process is once it leaves the Board. She indicated that it did not require an answer at the moment. Mr. Brescher said that he would get back to Board with an answer.

Mr. Kluger asked Mr. Hale to give a quick overview of the scooter ordinance. Mr. Hale said two things passed at Council, one the regulations for electric scooter within the Borough which pretty much follows the State regulations in terms of public safety, age, where they can ride, helmet laws, how they can be ridden. The second aspect of that is we entered into a contract with VoRides, which is a scooter company that services Rutgers. They are one of the companies that provides a hub where you can pick up a scooter and a centralized place to pick it up and we are working on the details of where they might be able to place a scooter hub.

Mr. Perlman asked if there was a sense of when Highland Park residents will be able to rent a scooter and bring it into the Borough. Mr. Hale said the hope is by the end of the year but no specific timetable.

Ms. Hadhazy asked if there was a designated location. Mr. Hale said that will be discussed with the provider and is part of the process. It is an iterative process so we will come up with their expertise and where we think might be a good idea and if data tells us, there is a better place or more usable place we can move it.

Correspondence and reports.

Zoning/Building Officer report – Scott - None

Rehabilitation Screening Committee report – Kim - none

Public comment on any item not on the agenda.

Mr. Kluger opened the meeting to the public for matters not on the agenda; see no one public comment was closed.

Mr. Constantine said that he wanted to update the Board on a couple of things happening at the Redevelopment Entity. We have identified a couple of corridors for focus in the Master Plan that the Planning Board adopted December 2019; we actually have interest on Upper Raritan corridor, the old Lube Oil site next block over and we had presented some of the early discussions that have been going on. There is interest from property owners to come in and try to do something consistent with the Master Plan that is not permitted by current zoning. At the Redevelopment entity Tuesday night we also shared an outlined the Cleveland Avenue corridor so outside of the private school that been approved that was subject to a redevelopment plan and now this seven lot subdivision. What happened American Properties developed across the street sort of what remains on Cleveland Avenue and so we basically presented that to the Council and for consideration to also move the remaining portion of Cleveland into a redevelopment plan so that we can more or less custom fit zoning consistent with the goal of the Master Plan. Right now we have

the hodgepodge that was identified as a problem in the Master Plan we have PO zoning, LI zoning, residences mixed in, we have a hodgepodge of uses so I guess it is stay tuned to see some focus on those two areas which basically is further implementation of the Planning Board's Master Plan in addition to what is happening downtown.

Mr. Kluger asked how far along on Upper Raritan. Mr. Constantine said there were a number of folks that had circled on the Lube Oil site but there is a group that would like to try to develop that end and then the next block up to the north has also been assembled as well. We just pointed people back and asked that they start by looking at the Master Plan, the vision actually we have a sketch a before and after looking at that exact block in the Master Plan. The last corridor just to hit on in the Master Plan was the Woodbridge Avenue and that's being explored for a neighborhood preservation program grant which would provide some funding for planning but actually funding for improvements through a state program because it is a qualifying area in terms of some of the income levels and the surrounding neighborhoods. The report to the Planning Board is of the corridors you identified outside of downtown, which also includes River Road these other, three corridors are moving forward into the next phase of planning at least portions of them.

Mr. Hale said in regards to the neighborhood preservation program, there are few municipalities in Middlesex County that have qualified for this, this is obviously a state process and a lot can go on but we think we have got a good team together to a good plan being set up and so we are hopeful and it could be a significant help up on Woodbridge.

Mr. Kluger said at the last Council meeting he thinks they approved something to do with an easement down at the end of South Adelaide did that have to do with the rezoning or the Polos property. Mr. Koch said there was a storm sewer easement with a storm sewer pipe in in that would have precluded the construction of the subdivision as it was envisioned and approved so on the plan. There was a new storm sewer easement created and the storm sewer line would be routed through the new easement but the existing easement has to be abandoned/evacuated and the Borough passed the appropriate ordinance to allow that to happen.

Adjournment

There was a motion to adjourn from HAND and a second by WILLIAMS at 9:00 pm the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Santiago
Board Clerk