

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**BOROUGH OF BERNARDSVILLE**  
**Minutes – July 13, 2023**  
**VIRTUAL ONLINE MEETING**

1. **O.P.M.A. Statement:** A statement of adequate meeting notice and adherence to the state mandated emergency remote meetings protocols, as set forth on this meeting's web-posted agenda, was read by Chair, Robert Graham, at 7:32 pm.

2. **Roll Call:**

Present – Members Canose, Graham, Horowitz Kellogg, Macmillan, McQueen, Otteau and Simoff. Absent – Ms. Gardner.

Board Professionals Present: Attorney Steven Warner, Planner John Szabo, Jr. and Engineer Robert Brightly.

3. **Minutes:** Review draft minutes of 5/25/23 meeting.

Upon review, Ms. Kellogg noted a typographical error. A motion to approve the minutes as corrected was made by Ms. Kellogg and seconded by Mayor Canose.

Voice vote:

All eligible members voted in the affirmative.

4. **Communications:** The Chair acknowledged receipt of the following:

A. 6/5/23 Dykstra Walker Design Group notice of LOI application re: 55 Claremont Rd. (re: #6)

B. 6/27/23 A. Suriano email transmittal of introduced Ordinance #2023-1974 re: Detached accessory dwellings in R-1 and R-1-10 zones. (re #7A).

C. 7/10/23 Burgis Associates Services Proposal re: Climate Change Hazard Vulnerability Study (re: #7B)

D. The New Jersey Planner, March/April 2023, VOL. 84, No. 2.

5. **Business of Visitors not related to the agenda:** None.

6. **Old Business:** Continued Application #SP-238A – EQUINET PROPERTIES, LLC – AMENDED PRELIMINARY & FINAL RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN w/ Variances & Design Waivers; 55 Claremont Rd., B:71, L:6, Quimby Lane Redevelopment Zone - Subarea 6; Previously heard 5/11 & 5/23; *Scheduled to be continued 7/13/23.*

*[Eligible to vote: Members Canose, Graham, Horowitz, Kellogg, Otteau and Simoff]*

Appearing on behalf of the applicant were attorney Roy Kurnos, Equinet Properties principal Richard Reimers, engineer Mark Gimigliano and planner Matt Flynn.

Exhibits introduced:

A7 – 7/6/23 NJ DEP permit for flood hazard area construction (8 pp).

A8 – 5/20/23 Compendium of photographs taken by John J. McDonough Assoc., LLC (3 pp).

A9 – Page #28 of Quimby Lane Redevelopment Plan, figure 1.6, aerial view of entire area.

Mr. Kurnos reopened the application reporting that the applicant has addressed the issues raised by the Board at the prior hearing, including several issues with the County Planning Board; issues related to wetlands and the infiltration basin system; Fire Prevention Bureau review; and, the 7/6/23 NJ DEP permit for flood hazard area construction.

Mr. Mottola noted for the record that contrary to Mr. Kurnos statement, a copy of the 7/6/23 DEP permit had not been submitted to the Board, only the 6/5/23 Dykstra Walker notice of LOI. Mr. Warner said the DEP permit could be introduced as a numbered exhibit during direct testimony.

Mr. Gimigliano addressed the open items that remained from the prior hearing. In coordination with the county engineering office, only a 5' ROW easement .will be required on Claremont Rd. and not a dedication. Accordingly, there will be no changes in lot area, density, setback or impervious coverage. The front entry steps that will occur within the easement will be permitted to remain. Regarding sight distances from the Mill St. / Claremont Rd. intersection, the county requires that there be no street trees within the Claremont Rd. line of sight nor in an additional 5' easement behind it. As a result of their meeting with the Fire Prevention Bureau, they have added an exit door from the south side of the building at the garage level. No exterior stairs were required from this exit to Claremont Rd., only a 5' by 5' concrete pad at grade outside the exit door. This exit has been added to the site drawings. Soil testing was conducted with the soil found to be suitable for infiltration and the ground water level to be at a sufficient depth. From the test results all onsite infiltration was able to be consolidated to a single location, with a second, previously proposed smaller infiltration area eliminated. Steep slopes excavation was also able to be reduced. A vehicle maneuvering diagram has been added to the site plans, which shows the movements of a pickup truck that would be used by a private garbage hauler. It demonstrates that a truck can pull into the garage, collect trash, turn around in the area provided on the driveway and exit the site. Templates have also been added for the various vehicles that were analyzed, with vehicle measurements provided as requested. Tall and narrow evergreen shrubs have been added as foundation screening plantings along the back of the building. The amended site drawings were submitted to the DEP to assure that they were reviewing the latest plans. The DEP has verbally confirmed that there are no wetlands on the property, although receipt of the LOI from them is still pending. The EV charging stations have been moved to the uncovered parking spaces exterior to the garage. It was debated without resolution whether the accessible charging space should remain within the garage or also be relocated with the others.

Mr. Gimigliano displayed the 7/6/23 land use permit issued by the DEP. It includes a reissuance of the FHA verification, a flood hazard area individual permit for disturbance within the riparian zone and the flood plane, and a freshwater wetlands GP-11 for the discharge pipe from the infiltration basin into the Mine Brook. Mr. Gimigliano pointed out a typographical error in the permit where the actual revised drawing date of 6/19/23 was stated as 7/19/23. He said that he will provide a copy of the DEP permit to the Board as well as a copy of the LOI once received. Other changes made to the plans include a 30" high concrete parapet wall along the driveway and edge of the uncovered parking spaces, with a metal fence to be installed on top of the wall; stairs down to the walking path have been moved next to the driveway turnaround area; a 4' high safety fence will replace the existing metal railing at the top of the existing stone masonry wall; a fence will separate the walking path from the steep slope area to protect anyone walking on the path;

evergreen shrubs have been added along the foundation wall at the rear of the building. Mr. Gimigliano stated that while the 5' x 5' pad outside the south exit door is within the 7' side yard setback, it is not roofed and therefore does not further reduce the deficient side yard. With this pad addition and the adjustment made to the wall at the driveway, the overall amount of impervious coverage was reduced slightly from 9,400 SF to 9,315 SF.

Mr. Gimigliano's responses to questions from the Board and its professionals:

(Mr. Szabo): He did not know if the county will allow the 4' wide planting strip along Claremont Rd. that is required by the Redevelopment Plan (RDP). Variance relief is required for a 7' wide sidewalk along Claremont Rd. where 8' is required. Their planner will address this relief.

(Mr. Simoff): The county asked that there be no trees planted in an easement 5' behind the sight lines as depicted on sheet 8 of the site drawings. It may be possible to fit in one street tree at the south end of the property. The county directed the car position at the crosswalk for measuring the sight lines. Having modeled a 19' pickup truck to simulate the vehicle size that would collect garbage, a similar sized SUVs could also maneuver the driveway and garage. The height clearance is believed to be adequate for the garbage collection vehicle.

(Mr. Warner): Slope disturbance in the 15% to 25% range will be 1,995 S.F. where 1,000 SF is allowed; 2,700 S.F. in the >30% range where 250 S.F. is allowed.

(Ms. Kellogg): Plantings along the foundation wall will be "Skyrocket Junipers" that can grow up to 15' to 20' tall. The maximum height of the exposed foundation wall is between 13' and 14'. They will take a closer look to ensure that the roots of these plants do not interfere with the foundation wall footings and the *Cultec* infiltration system. Mr. Brightly suggested incorporating the use of planter boxes. Mr. Szabo said he would have their landscape architect look at it.

(Mr. Graham): There is public access to the walking path from Mill St. via a gated entrance. There are also steps down to it from the parking deck.

Mr. Gimigliano's responses to questions from members of the public:

(Bonnie Sellers, 140 Post Kennel Rd.): The majority of the slopes being disturbed are along the front of the property which are manmade slopes from the construction of the road and the structures on the property. These slopes are going to be eliminated, not disturbed and left unprotected, subject to erosion. The normal concerns with slope disturbances won't be an issue here. Eliminated steep slopes will be replaced with building and the resultant slopes will be stabilized with no stormwater discharging across them. Disturbance will be minimal overall.

(Alison Kleinert, 20 Stevens St.): Methods to mitigate stormwater runoff will be to collect it from the roof, driveway and other impervious surfaces and pipe it to an underground infiltration basin which will allow the water to slowly seep into the ground. Any overflow water will be piped to the stream. When soils are exposed during construction, super silt fences will be in place along the slope and stream to protect from erosion. He did not know the time line for construction.

(Kathy Peachy, 70 Chilton St.): In place of the previously proposed street trees, which the county

won't allow, foundation plantings along the front of the building are proposed. *Mr. Kurnos added that the applicant would be interested in working with Mr. Szabo's firm's landscape architect regarding street scape plantings and would be willing to donate to the tree fund in lieu of planting the required number of trees.*

Mr. Flynn was sworn and qualified and, in describing the subject property, displayed exhibit A8 (three aerial views of the site). He highlighted the low percentages of lot coverage by the existing building (7%) and impervious surfaces (13%) as the basis for two of the variances being requested, because the RDP does not permit new development to exceed existing coverage amounts. He classified the proposed percentages (building 38%; impervious 50%) as being reasonable and modest in terms of typical developments of this type. Relative to the extent of streetscape improvements, he noted that the site is not in the heart of the downtown area but rather on the fringe. And, as shown in the photographic view from directly overhead, the lot is substantially underutilized in its current state. The requested variance relief includes a side yard setback of 7' where 10' is required; building coverage of 7,065 S.F. where 1,375 is required and improved lot coverage of 9,315 where 2,475 is required. Also requested are variances for steep slope disturbance in the 15% to 25% range and the >30% range as detailed by Mr. Gimigliano.

Mr. Flynn opined that the variances can be justified by the C2 balancing test. The positives/benefits include replacing a use that is not permitted with one that is; providing for affordable housing; promoting residential development; creating pedestrian activity to support local businesses; providing high quality architecture and a more visually attractive streetscape that will improve the pedestrian oriented quality of the area (as opposed to the existing substantially undeveloped lot); creating a better zoning alternative, whereas strict compliance to the zoning ordinance would result in a substantially undeveloped site; and, promoting purposes A, G, I and M of the municipal land use law. As to the negative criteria, Mr. Flynn does not believe there will be any substantial detriment to the public good nor to the intent of the Zone plan. None of the C relief will appear as non-conforming. The side yard setback variance does not result in two buildings that are too close together and does not create an alleyway effect as the building on the adjacent lot is set back behind the proposed building. The steep slope variances do not relate to disturbance of any sensitive natural lands, but rather man-made slopes. Slope disturbance is unavoidable due to their location on the property and will not result in any adverse stormwater impacts. The RDP recognizes this land as having the potential to, "radically expand the quality and quantity of amenities while facilitating high quality development that will create a critical mass of activity". All of the foregoing goes to the C2 balancing test that shows the benefits substantially outweigh any detriments. The C1 hardship test would similarly apply as relates to the land and the lawfully existing structure thereon.

Mr. Flynn's responses to questions from the Board and its professionals:

(Mr. Horowitz): Regarding the passage on page 49 of the RDP that requires minimizing the visibility of parking and parking structures to the greatest extent realistically feasible, he stated that looking at the overall scheme, the applicant's proposal substantially complies. Mr. Gimigliano responded that *only the four uncovered parking spaces face outward, the rest face inward inside the parking garage, which is mostly underground on three sides. He acknowledged that architectural elevation drawing sheet 4 has not yet been updated to reflect the note on sheet 3*

*of the site drawings that calls for extending the foundation walls around parking spaces and providing continuous 30" high parapet walls, finished to match the foundation, along the edge of the entire parking area with a metal fence atop the parapet. The fence would probably be at least 3' high. Regarding the requirement not to exceed the existing lot coverage Mr. Flynn referenced page 4 of the RDP that shows the entire redevelopment area and the much larger coverages on several of the other lots and opined that the subject property stands in contrast to the vast majority of other existing lots that have substantially greater existing coverage. This property may have been overlooked in the greater scheme of the RDP. Supporting the claim that the slopes on the property are likely manmade, Mr. Gimigliano said that although the site's natural terrain would have been sloped, there's evidence that based on the surrounding grades that the steepness of the slopes, especially at the front of the property, it is based on fill for the road construction and development of the dwelling. The retaining wall that is supporting some of the slope is also evidence that the steep the slopes have been altered by man. There may have previously been steep slopes, but they were probably not as steeply sloping as currently exist.*

*(Mr. Simoff): Mr. Gimigliano responded that did not have the exact figures but estimates that about a third of the lot is undevelopable due to the presence of the stream and floodway. Mr. Flynn did not agree with Mr. Simoff that the total lot coverage percentage should be adjusted higher based on the parts of the lot that are undevelopable. Mr. Gimigliano concurred that lot coverage is never calculated by subtracting undevelopable portions of lots.*

*(Ms. Kellogg): That the lot is all residential and will have only 50% impervious coverage does give it a transitional character between two different areas of the town. He did not know if 5" of width from each residence could be removed to eliminate the deficient side yard on the south side. In that the adjacent building is behind the subject building there is sufficient space between the two lots to provide for safety and maintenance operations. The building code requires only 3' between buildings. Mr. Reimers responded that he met with the fire officials who were completely aware of the 7' side yard and were comfortable with it from a firefighting standpoint. He noted the building will be fully sprinklered and will have 2 hour fire rated separations between dwelling units. Performing maintenance in the 7' side yard will not be an issue even with its sloping gradient. He would be willing to explore Ms. Kellogg's suggestion of reducing the size of the units to eliminate the side yard variance.*

*(Mr. Warner): Regarding relief criteria for the requested design waivers (no off street loading space where one is required; a RSIS de minimis exception for using overhead electrical service; not providing contours at one foot intervals for uses in the flood plain; screening the parking; no street trees or planting strip along the sidewalk), they are a much more relaxed standard than variances for which the Board can grant relief based on reasonableness and impracticability. He does not believe that complete screening of parking is a design requirement per se, but an effort has been made to hide the parking as much as possible. The applicant's engineer has testified that the site can function safely and efficiently despite the deviations being sought. The requests are reasonable given the location of the property and the site constraints. Given that this is not a commercial or mixed use building, it allows for a more efficient use of the sidewalk space. If a smaller development were being proposed, his planning testimony would likely be the same.*

Mr. Flynn's responses to questions from members of the public:

(Bonnie Sellers, 140 Post Kennel Rd.): He did not know that there had been prior conversations about this area potentially being designated as a park.

(Johanna Wissinger, Environmental Commission Chair Washington Corner Rd.): He categorized the site as underutilized because the existing single family use of the site is not a use currently permitted use in the zone. Mixed commercial/residential developments, restaurants, coffee shops, cafes, retail businesses, townhouses, artisan manufacturing, fitness centers, art galleries, co-working buildings, parks and public plazas are all permitted uses in subarea 6 of the RDP. He displayed exhibit A9 and noted the extent of existing impervious coverage and reasoned that if the existing amount of impervious coverage is permitted to be continued, that's part of the vision for the redevelopment area. The applicant will calculate and provide the number of trees that will be donated to the Borough.

(Aaron Duff, 51 Crescent Dr.): Single family dwellings are not permitted in the zone. A minimum number of units is not specified in the RDP for a townhouse development.

At the conclusion of Mr. Flynn's testimony, Mr. Kurnos said that he had no more witnesses but that he may want the opportunity to discuss with his client some of the issues that have arisen tonight. They may want to discuss other options and meet with the county to discuss the absence of street trees and alternate plantings. He said he would be amenable to hearing comments from the Board, its professionals and the public, but reserved the right to provide more direct testimony after comments have been made.

Comments by the Board and its professionals:

Mr. Szabo: Requested that the applicant look into making the walking path and its surface material handicapped accessible, or in the alternative, seek relief; he recommended using a pervious type of pavement material as suggested by Mr. Brightly, which would be more consistent with the RDP's requirements. *Mr. Brightly added that the path would not be able to fully meet accessibility requirements due to the slope and would likely need variance relief.*

Mr. Otteau: Asked to see a turning diagram using 14' and 16' vehicle templates; stressed the importance of earlier comments on screening the view of headlights from the parking garage; likes the overall design of the project but finds it to be a lot for the site.

*Mr. Kurnos agreed to provide an updated architectural rendering that depicts the proposed screening.*

Mayor Canose: Echoed Ms. Kellogg's earlier sentiment that it would be worthwhile for the applicant to consider reducing the width of the dwelling units by 5" to have a conforming side yard, or have one less unit.

Mr. Graham: Suggested reducing the building footprint in order to facilitate a set of stairs and walking path from Claremont Rd. down to the brook and over to Mill St. along the already proposed path. It would not be wheelchair accessible but would create more public accessibility

to the brook. Counter to the Council's preference for a payment in lieu, he conjectured that it may be possible to create a smaller eighth dwelling and satisfy the affordable obligation on site.

Mayor Canose: With another round of affordable housing obligations coming in 2025, the Borough has no more property to build on; additional properties must be bought to meet the Borough's obligation. The Council takes this into consideration with small projects that may require only one unit.

Mr. McQueen: Looking for the better paths, Council will consider multiple ways to fill whatever obligation comes in 2025. This being a challenging property, the overarching, very forward looking vision was that this corner of the RDP would contain a park. Visions ultimately require implementation. With Quimby Lane being done in pieces, that implementation requires flexibility. Realizing the vision requires partnership with private enterprise and this property is a part of that vision. It will be interested to see what the developer comes back with.

Mr. Macmillan: As the town's initial redevelopment area, it is important to get it right; new renderings of the front of the building will be helpful.

Ms. Kellogg: Appreciates the public input on the application; finds the architecture very desirable for its fringe location and nicer than some other recently approved residential projects in the downtown; approves of the hidden underground parking and parapet screening that block headlights; finds the magnitude of what's proposed to be excessive for the site, which was envisioned as parkland; is not opposed to the project but how it's proposed will discourage the whole downtown plan for a park; doesn't think that downsizing the end dwelling to become an affordable unit is of significant magnitude.

Mr. Simoff : Asked for further clarification on the height of vehicles and the clearance height in the garage; agrees with Ms. Kellogg on overdevelopment of the lot.

Comments by members of the public:

Johanna Wissinger, Environmental Commission Chair Washington Corner Rd.: Reminded all that the stream is very important to protect from adding additional storm water, otherwise there could be unfortunate results. It should be forward in everyone's minds that in the creation of the RDP, residents really expected the inclusion of recreational park land for public use, which was a good part of why people were agreeing to it and considered it to be a good idea.

Kathy Peachy, 70 Chilton St.: Commended the Board and developer on their due diligence; stressed the importance of thoughtful streetscape planting along Claremont Rd. frontage in keeping with the existing character of the lot; also believes a new rendering of the front of the building should be made to depict a new planting scheme due to the county's tree restrictions.

Aaron Duff, 51 Crescent Dr.: Per the QLRP, the required number of affordable dwellings need to be provided on-site or variance relief should be sought. The governing body would need to amend the QLRP as it now stands to allow for payments in lieu of on-site construction of affordable dwellings. Relative to the proposed construction on steep slopes, the application contradicts the



master plan. A 4' wide non-ADA compliant walkway does not meet applicable standards and risks compromising the vision of the QLRP. The application is antithetical to the creation of new green space and park area as envisioned for subarea 6. While this type of development in Bernardsville is laudable, this is the wrong lot for it as it is an overdevelopment of an environmentally sensitive area. It contradicts the goals of the QLRP and should be denied.

Mr. Kurnos asked for a postponement of the hearing for at least 30 days in order to meet with his client regarding business decisions on how they wish to proceed. Mr. Mottola identified August 17<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> as the two scheduled meeting dates for that month. Per Mr. Kurnos' request, Mr. Warner announced that the hearing will be carried to August 17<sup>th</sup> without further notice to the public. Mr. Kurnos will provide a written extension of the decision deadline to August 31<sup>st</sup>.

## **7. New Business:**

**A. D26 Master Plan Consistency Review Intro'd Ord. #2023-1974 re: Use of Detached Accessory Dwellings in R-1 & R-1-10 Zones; Introduced 6/26/23; Public hearing scheduled for 8/14/23; Planning Board D26 review scheduled for 5/25/23.**

Mr. Warner noted that the review before the Board is not a public hearing and that the Board will hear its planner's advice as to whether or not the ordinance is consistent with the master plan. He also referenced the draft resolution prepared in anticipation of a not inconsistent finding.

Mr. Szabo explained that the Council wishes to eliminate the restriction on use of detached accessory dwellings by only family members, guests and staff help in the R-1 and R-1-10 zones only, which are minimum 5 and 10 acre lot zones. This will not change or alter the character of those zones in any way as the number of occupants will be limited since these are accessory, not primary dwellings. The overall use of the zones as anticipated by the master plan will not be changing. There will not be any impacts to the zones and the ordinance will not be inconsistent with the master plan. As in the current zoning, only one detached accessory dwelling will be allowed per lot; limited in size to a total of 1,500 S.F.; and, they will not be able to be subdivided off to become a principal dwelling.

Mr. Horowitz, a housing advisory committee member, provided some background on the impetus for the ordinance as having come from a resident that requested Council allow them to rent their accessory dwelling. Council referred the matter to the housing committee, which found that the zoning currently in place limits the size of accessory dwellings; it would provide for better utilization of existing residential assets but might not create a building spree of accessory dwellings due to their limited size. Mayor Canose advised that such rentals are already taking place but are not getting safety inspections. The new ordinance would require registration and inspection of such rentals.

Mr. Szabo and Mr. Warner noted for the Board that accessory dwellings are permitted as a conditional use. They require Planning Board site plan review if conforming and a D3 use variance from the Board of Adjustment if non-conforming to all conditions. If the Borough wishes to handle new applications administratively, and not require potentially cumbersome land use board review, the use regulation should be moved out of the conditional use section of the



zoning ordinance. Applications would then be handled administratively by the zoning officer. Upon discussion, the Board generally agreed that the proposed ordinance is not inconsistent with the master plan but wished to amend its draft findings resolution by adding a recommendation that the governing body revisit whether it wishes to continue to require planning board review of applications as a conditional use or further amend the ordinance and allow applications for accessory dwellings to be handled administratively via zoning permit applications. Mr. McQueen moved adoption of draft resolution #2023-14 as amended, finding introduced Ordinance #2023-1974 not inconsistent with the master plan, and was seconded by Mayor Canose.

Roll call vote:

All in favor: Members Canose, Horowitz, Macmillan, McQueen, Otteau and Simoff.

Those opposed: Members Graham and Kellogg.

As requested by the Chair, a motion to extend the meeting to 11:15 pm was made by Mayor Canose and seconded by Ms. Kellogg.

Voice vote:

All members voted in the affirmative.

**B. 7/10/23 Burgis Associates Services Proposal re: Climate Change Hazard Vulnerability Study.**  
*Due to the lateness of the meeting, this matter was tabled to the July 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

**C. Consider issuance of Request for Proposal for Zoning Ordinance Amendment Study re: Regulation of Warehouses in the I Zone.**  
*Due to the lateness of the meeting, this matter was tabled to the July 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

**D. Review 7/13/23 Bills List w/ Invoices.**

Upon review, a motion to pay the listed invoices in the amount of **\$13,528.00** was made by Mr. Simoff and seconded by Mr. McQueen.

Roll call vote:

All members voted in the affirmative.

**8. Board Reviews/Public Hearings/Pending Applications: The Board acknowledged the following matters and their current status:**

**A. Application #SP-246 – FEST, LLC. – Addition & Renovation to Existing Mixed Use Bldg.; 12 Mine Brook Road, B: 99, L: 2, Zone: D-C; Received 2/6/23; Deemed incomplete 5/22/23; Waiver request & completeness determination scheduled to be heard 7/27/23.**

**B. D26 Master Plan Consistency Review Intro'd Ord. #2023-1975 re: Amending Outdoor Dining Ordinance; Introduced 7/10/23, Public hearing 8/14/23; PB review scheduled for 7/27/23.**

**C. Application #SP-247 – AR at BERNARDSVILLE, LLC – PRELIMINARY MAJOR SITE PLAN w/Variances & Design Waivers; 39 Olcott Sq. + 5 Morristown Rd.; B:125, L: 1-3, Zone: D-C; Received 3/21/23; Pending completeness review.**

**D. Application #SP-242AP+F Mine Brook Rd. Urban Renewal Assoc., L.P. – AMENDED PRELIMINARY & FINAL MAJOR (AFFORDABLE) MULTI-FAMILY SITE PLAN; Mine Brook Road, B:80, L:15.38, Zone: AH-3; Received 6/1/23; Pending completeness review.**

*E. Application #SP-243AP+F Mine Brook Rd. Urban Renewal Assoc., L.P. – AMENDED PRELIMINARY & FINAL MAJOR (AFFORDABLE) MULTI-FAMILY SITE PLAN; 18 Mount Airy Road, B:124, L:1, Zone: AH-6; Received 6/1/23; Pending completeness review.*

*F. Application #SP-244AP+F Mine Brook Rd. Urban Renewal Assoc., L.P. – AMENDED PRELIMINARY & FINAL MAJOR (AFFORDABLE) MULTI-FAMILY SITE PLAN; 63 Bernards Avenue, B:102, L:12, Zone: AH-7; Received 6/1/23; Pending completeness review.*

*G. Application #SP-248 – 114 CLAREMONT, LLC – PRELIMINARY & FINAL MAJOR MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN; 114 Claremont Road, B:37, L:17, Zone: D-CL, Received 6/1/23; Pending completeness review.*

*H. Application #660 – MEGALLA-WHITTAM – RE-SUBDIVISION / LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT w/ No Variances; 601 Mine Brook Rd., B:90, L:10, Zone: R-2 and 24-3 Douglass Ave., B:90, L:1, Zone: R-1; Received 6/21/23; Pending completeness review.*

9. **Business of Visitors – second opportunity:** None.
10. **Executive Session:** Ongoing Community In Crisis Litigation.  
*Due to the lateness of the meeting, this matter was tabled to the July 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.*
11. **Adjournment:** Chair Graham adjourned the meeting at 11:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank Mottola, Planning & Zoning Boards  
Administrative Officer & Recording Secretary

Keywords: Equinet-QLRDP-55-Claremont-Kurnos-Reimers-Gimigliano-Flynn-1974-sidewalk.