

**PLANNING BOARD**  
BOROUGH OF BERNARDSVILLE  
**Minutes – August 25, 2022**  
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 Gardner, Graham, Horowitz, Kellogg, Macmillan, McQueen, Paluck and Thompson.  
Absent – Mr. Simoff.  
Board Professionals Present: Attorney Steven Warner, Planner John Szabo, Jr. and Engineer Robert Brightly.
  
3. **Minutes:** Review of 8/11/22 draft Meeting Minutes: Upon discussion and voice vote, the draft minutes were tabled for consideration at the 9/15/22 meeting.
  
4. **Communications:** The following correspondence was acknowledged by the Chair:
  - A. 8/15/22 T. Malman, Esq. letter re: Request for adjournment of Application #SP-240 – Greyfield Management, LLC to 9/15/22 with request for public notice announcement (listed under 8A).  
The Board acknowledged and agreed to the applicant's request for postponement. Having been scheduled for this evening, Mr. Warner announced that this application will be carried to the 9/15/22 meeting without further notice to the public.
  - B. 8/9/22 A. Suriano email transmittal of introduced Ord. #2022-1930 re: New perimeter fence regulations (considered per 7B).
  - C. The New Jersey Planner, May/June 2022, VOL. 83, No.3
  
5. **Business of Visitors unrelated to the agenda:** None.
  
6. **Old Business:** None.
  
7. **New Business:**
  - A. Application #SP-243 – Mine Brook Rd. Urban Renewal Assoc., L.P.; PRELIMINARY (AFFORDABLE) RESIDENTIAL SITE PLAN; 18 Mount Airy Road, B:124, L:1, Zone: AH-6; Received 6/30/22; Waiver requests, completeness and public hearing 8/25/22.  
Appearing on behalf of the application were attorney Craig Gianetti, site engineer Kevin Shelly, traffic engineer Jay Troutman and architect Erin Pumo.  
Exhibits Introduced:
    - A1 – 8/8/22 (Aerial) Colored Site Rendering.
    - A2 – 8/8/22 Aerial Exhibit (of current site conditions).
    - A3 – 8/11/22 Colored Architectural Elevations (with material swatches)

Mr. Gianetti introduced the application, stating the property's location in the AH-6 affordable housing zone. The applicant is an affiliate of RPM Development Group, the designated developer of the Borough's three scattered site affordable housing properties. RPM was selected as the developer for all three of the scattered site properties through an RFP process that began in 2018. It thereafter entered into a developer's agreement with the Borough. Separate site plan applications were filed for each site but all will be grouped as one for the purpose of application to the State Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency for tax credits. The application deadline is August 31<sup>st</sup> and requires at least Preliminary Site Plan approval for all three sites. The County Planning Board's review letter was received only yesterday. It is the applicant's intent to meet with the County to address their comments, particularly as to site access and finding an appropriate alternative location that is acceptable to it, more in line with what exists today.

Mr. Warner confirmed that he had reviewed the applicant's notices and found them to be sufficient, giving the Board jurisdiction to hear and decide the application. He concurrently swore all of the applicant's and Board's professionals.

Mr. Shelly was qualified as an expert in the field of engineering. Regarding the three checklist items identified in Mr. Brightly's 8/5/22 report and the eight checklist items cited in Mr. Szabo's 8/11/22 report, Mr. Shelly said that they would agree to providing all of the information on subsequent plan revisions submitted to the Board. He opined that the subject information would not hinder the Board's review of this application for preliminary level approval. Of the requested checklist waivers, Mr. Szabo said he saw no planning reason why the application should not proceed. Mr. Brightly stated that he was also amenable to allowing the application to proceed, provided the information is provided on subsequent submittals.

Chair Graham affirmed the Board's agreement to granting the waivers and deeming the application complete.

Displaying exhibits A1 and A2, Mr. Shelly described the site and its environs. The flag or panhandle shaped lot is 0.74 acre in size and is located in the AH-6 zone district. Designed to the zone standards, the application requires no variances. The property is currently developed as a Borough parking lot. The applicant is proposing two, two story apartment buildings containing a total of 12 (all affordable) dwelling units; a permitted use in the zone. A 24' wide access driveway is proposed along the north side of the lot. Mr. Shelly concurred with expressed concerns that there are sight distance issues at the driveway entrance due to the proximity of an existing fence-topped abutment on Mt. Airy Rd. They will provide additional survey information regarding elevations of existing structures and work with Borough and County engineers to relocate the driveway to the location that provides the best line of sight for ingress and egress. Design waivers are required to locate the access drive aisle and parking area less than 10' from a property line and/or a building. Setbacks of four feet from building #1, five feet from building #2 and two feet from the northern property line are proposed. These deviations are required due to existing site constraints such as the narrow width of the property, an existing (Verizon) transformer easement at the southwest corner of the lot and an easement the Borough has granted to New Jersey American Water (NJAW) to install a water line partway into the property near the proposed access drive. Parking areas were located to work around these constraints. Fifteen percent of the parking spaces will be "make ready" electrical vehicle (EV) spaces. Three percent

of these will have Electric Vehicle Supply/Service Equipment (EVSE) installed upon issuance of a C/O and within six years of the C/O, all EV spaces will have EVSE. Each EV space counts as two spaces in satisfaction of RSIS required parking. The parking requirement is reduced from 24 to 21 spaces, with 22 spaces being proposed. A six foot high, three-sided masonry trash enclosure with heavy duty gates will be located at the end of the drive aisle. It will be roofed to prevent spillage/leakage into the adjacent stormwater management system. A seven foot high masonry retaining wall is proposed along the northern property line. A fence for fall protection will be installed on its top and a guardrail will be installed along the drive aisle. Another retaining wall less than two feet high will be built along 95' of the southern property line behind building #2. It will turn northward for a short distance from the southeast corner of the lot. New water service will be accessed from Mt. Airy Rd. An underground stormwater detention basin will be located under the parking areas. The project does not qualify as a "major" stormwater development. Trees and foundation landscape plantings are proposed. Given the size of the development, tenants will be required to carry their own trash to the trash enclosure and place it in the containers. While there currently is no formal plan for development of the panhandle portion of the lot, and no plans for any tree removals, the applicant would be amenable to making the panhandle an outdoor amenity for tenants, with picnic tables, benches and/or walking paths, in a manner that would not be intrusive to neighbors.

Mr. Shelly stated the applicant's intent to comply with all of the engineering comments contained in Mr. Brightly's 8/5/22 report and Mr. Szabo's 8/11/22 report. In accordance with the zoning officer's 7/13/22 review letter, they have obtained the Fire Chief's comments, with which they intend to comply. Regarding the Environmental Commission's (EC) 8/2/22 report and its suggested use of green pavers, Mr. Shelly does not believe such use is a practical alternative to solid pavement for a residential development. He believes that they are often destroyed and present a maintenance issue. The site is fully conforming as to the allowable impervious coverage. As for the EC's suggestions for development of the panhandle, they would not be amenable to clearing any trees.

#### **Mr. Shelly's Responses to the Board and its Professionals:**

(Ms. Gardner) Safety perimeter fencing would be provided to the extent the area of the panhandle can be made usable for tenants. All of the ground floor apartments will be accessible.

(Mr. McQueen) A lot of things need to be considered in relocating the access drive at Mt. Airy Rd., including the existing site constraints, engineering input from the County and Borough, and possible changes to the buildings' geometry,

(Mr. Macmillan) Working with the NJAW water main easement constraint was the primary reason for the orientation of the site layout. There is a six foot high vinyl boundary fence on the neighbor's property to the south. *Mr. Macmillan commented that flipping the site layout away from its southern border would help mitigate privacy concerns with that property. The traffic light at Olcott Square is a significant contributing factor to the traffic backup in front of the site and that light is not municipally controlled.*

(Ms. Kellogg) They would propose that the County accept an eight foot ROW easement rather

than an eight foot dedication, which would reduce the size of the lot. The needed increase in the size of the detention basin would not be significant. It will be designed in accordance with applicable regulations and the existing subsurface hydrology and be coordinated with the location of other on-site structures. They will consider adding additional landscaping between building #2 and the property line but subsurface stormwater drainage lines are currently proposed there.

(Mr. Brightly) The survey shows a couple of fences from neighboring properties encroaching into the panhandle area of the site. They will look into removing those if necessary to secure that portion of the property as an outdoor amenity. The trash enclosure as shown is probably too large for only 12 dwelling units and could be reduced and recessed so that it does not impact any dwelling windows. The structure is fully enclosed; adding a man-door to it may be considered.

(Mr. Warner) The project as a whole is feasible irrespective of how it's layout may need to be reconfigured, including the County's request for a 33' wide ROW. It will be necessary to meet with the County to find out what it deems acceptable.

*Mr. Warner stated that the Board may not and will not consider chat comments made on the Zoom platform, as the MLUL requires all comments to be made under oath. Accordingly, he asked that members of the public refrain from making chat comments.*

#### **Mr. Shelly's Responses to members of the public:**

(Julie Ruth, 361 Mt. Harmony Rd.): The buildings will be constructed with the required distance from the existing transformer as per state construction codes. It is not certain that a fence gate would need to be provided for site security.

(Johanna Wissinger, EC Chair): Recycled waste will be segregated from trash. Property owner RMP Development will be responsible for maintenance of stormwater structures under the operations plan, including green infrastructure. A tree removal permit will be obtained as necessary for the current or any reconfigured site layout. *Ms. Wissinger was sworn to provide comments regarding the EC's recommended green pavers: These are currently in use at a residential development in Bernardsville. The use of drought resistant "Micro Clover" eliminates the problem of frequent mowing. She recommended reconsideration of their use.*

(Jeff Collar, 20 Mt. Airy Rd.): Options for moving the transformer and NJAW water line easement will both be investigated in relocating the access the driveway further south. Any redesign of the site will enable trash vehicles to safely navigate it. It is his opinion that the site can be made to work even if the current constraints cannot be mitigated. *Mr. Gianetti responded that to the extent the buildings can be moved farther from Mr. Collar's house, they will be.*

(Arlene McCoy, 66 Mt. Airy Rd.): Any revised plan would be submitted to the Fire Official for review and they would have to comply with any fire safety issues that are raised. No comments from the Fire Chief, who reviewed the plan, were made about access, turning radii or site maneuverability.

(Brian McParland, 32 Prospect St.): Location of the access driveway where currently proposed

was chiefly driven by the location of the NJAW water line easement and Verizon transformer. Having heard all of the stated concerns, they will work on providing the best location for the site access at Mt. Airy Rd. *Mr. Gianetti responded that Preliminary Site Plan application allows the Board to approve a conceptual plan that must return for Final approval and ultimately comply with all of the comments raised and conditions imposed. Preliminary approval acknowledges that the use is permitted and the plan complies with the zoning ordinance. Final details remain to be worked out. County approval must be obtained and if the plan is changed significantly due to the various constraints, there may need to be an amended Preliminary Site Plan application together with the Final application.*

Ms. Pumo was qualified as an expert in the field of architecture. Displaying exhibit **A3**, she described the exterior finish materials to be used on both of the two buildings. Those include stone veneer wall accents, fiber cement board siding in board and batten and shiplap patterns, standing seam metal roofs and wood accents at entry porches. Colors of the fiber cement board will be white, light gray and dark gray. The stone veneer will have a mixed color pallet that will be complimentary to the other exterior finish materials. Windows will have black, contrasting frames. Displaying drawing sheet A-100, she explained that there will be three ground floor and three second floor dwellings in each building, for a total of 12. Dwelling entrances are grouped under roofed porches on the front and side of Building #1 and on two sides of Building #2. The unit mix will consist of seven 2-bedroom units and five 3-bedroom units.

#### **Ms. Pumo's Responses to the Board and its Professionals:**

(Mr. Graham) There was no specific architectural principle that guided placement of building entrances relative to distance from the parking lot. The idea was to not have all of the doors in one location to mimic more of a single family residential look. Water heaters will likely be tankless. *Mr. Graham commented that he found the remote locations of the entrances to be incongruous and the design layout a non-starter.*

(Mr. Horowitz) Air conditioning condensers will be grouped outside of the buildings and air handlers/heaters will be located in a mechanical closet inside of each dwelling. They will consider the addition of visual screening and sound attenuating options for the condensers.

(Ms. Kellogg) Electrical meters will be located on the north side of the buildings. *(Mr. Gianetti responded that he would have to talk with his client regarding restrictions on what would be allowed to be kept on the porch adjacent to Mine Brook Rd.)*

(Mr. Brightly) *(Mr. Gianetti and Mr. Shelley responded that it would likely be NJAW that dictates where backflow preventers must be placed but that they will endeavor to not have a "hot box" located on site.)* Units 001 and 002 will be at the same grade elevation. Unit 003 will be at a different elevation. Final drawings will show floor and exterior finish grade elevations. Pedestrians accessing the apartment entrances closest to Mt. Airy Rd. from the parking lot, will have to walk on the driveway pavement to the Mt. Airy Rd. sidewalk that will connect with the walkway to the covered entrances. *(Mr. Gianetti responded that concurrent with a redesign of the site, onsite walkways to all entrances can be added.)*

(Mr. Szabo) Ms. Pumo affirmed the ways in which the buildings comply with the ordinance design standards. The buildings will be designed to the Department of Energy's Zero Energy Ready Home green building standards and application will be made to obtain Energy Star certification. The design will include high efficiency heating and cooling systems, Energy Star certified appliances, low flow plumbing fixtures, highly insulated walls, roofs and windows, low-E glazed windows, native plantings for landscaping, low VOC interior finish materials, LED lighting throughout the building and site, and electric vehicle charging stations. Use of solar energy is not being proposed for the buildings.

(Mr. Warner) (*Mr. Gianetti responded that the bedroom distribution of units is compliant with U.H.A.C. requirements and that overall, the project will be AH credit worthy for the Borough. The development will comply with state sound level requirements.*)

*Responding to Mr. McQueen, Mr. Szabo elaborated on how he believes the buildings, as designed, reasonably comply with the zone's architectural design requirements. He said he takes no exceptions to Ms. Pumo's testimony regarding such compliance. He noted that this site is one of the Borough's three "scattered site" affordable housing developments that will yield 60 dwelling units and are part of the Borough's settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center and the Courts. Inclusionary developments containing 400 dwelling units would be required to yield 60 affordable rental dwellings. Mr. Gianetti added that while there are monetary constraints to such 100% affordable developments, RPM is an experienced affordable housing developer that builds quality units. He said that their completed projects are not visually discernable as affordable developments. Chair Graham commented that reducing the size of the trash area may offer flexibility in redesigning other areas of the site.*

#### **Ms. Pumo's Responses to members of the public:**

(Jeff Collar, 20 Mt. Airy Rd.): Having not explored a single building design option, it is difficult to speculate whether a single, garden-style apartment building would help relieve the site's spatial constraints. They could explore moving the two buildings next to each other to free up space on the site so that buildings could be moved farther away from his home.

(Dan Lincoln, RA, 28 Olcott Ave. Historic Preservation Advisory Committee reviewing member): Porches are five feet deep but they will consider making them deeper for greater usability. *Mr. Gianetti responded that the applicant would welcome the HPAC's input on the pattern and color of the cultured stone to be used on the exterior of buildings.*

(Johanna Wissinger, EC Chair): The use of solar energy was not considered due to cost constraints. (*Mr. Gianetti responded that they will ask the client if they have used solar energy on other developments and whether it can be considered, even partially, on this one. As it may be cost prohibitive, they cannot commit to using it on this development.*)

(Brian McParland, 32 Prospect St.): The two building concept is to make the buildings appear more like single family homes.

Mr. Troutman was qualified as an expert in the field of traffic engineering. He detailed his analysis of traffic conditions relative to the site, the preparation of his 7/19/22 traffic report and its conclusions. He said the analysis showed that with only 12 dwelling units, the peak hourly traffic impact would not be significant and there will be no measurable impact on traffic conditions in the area. The new development, with 22 proposed spaces, will be replacing an existing parking lot with 49 spaces. The preliminary plan submitted will be revised to address the location of the ingress/egress driveway. Based on comments received, the driveway will be no further north than where the current driveway is located. County approval is expected once all of their comments have been addressed.

#### **Mr. Troutman's Responses to the Board and its Professionals:**

(Mr. Macmillan) The control of the traffic signal at Olcott Square is under the jurisdiction of NJDOT. A traffic striping solution could be explored with the county to better facilitate ingress/egress movements.

(Ms. Kellogg) The position of Boylan Terrace does not pose a traffic congestion problem given its location and limited access. The low traffic generating aspect of the development will be able to take advantage of gaps in traffic on Mount Airy Rd.

(Ms. Gardner) They will need to demonstrate to the county that sight distances are adequate for making left turns into traffic from the site the way they are currently made.

(Mr. Graham) His traffic report doesn't specifically mention the extreme congestion that occurs during rush hour on Mount Airy Rd. But he agrees that the northbound traffic backs up for many hundreds of yards in the morning.

(Mr. Warner) The on-site traffic design, including turning radii, the size of parking spaces and drive aisles, is in accordance with the RSIS. Emergency and service vehicles were taken into consideration.

#### **Mr. Troutman's Responses to members of the public:**

(Jeff Collar, 20 Mt. Airy Rd.): Traffic was measured over a one hour period during morning and afternoon peak hour periods on a normal weekday when school was in session. Eight site movements in the AM and nine in the PM were counted. He has no knowledge of why it was decided to have only one way traffic on Boylan Terrace.

(Katie Lynch, 20 Burrows Ave.): Plantings and buildings are placed to remain out of sight triangles. There will be no increased traffic congestion caused by left turns into the site due to the low amount of traffic generated by the proposed development.

(Brian McParland, 32 Prospect St.): There will be no increased traffic volume or danger from vehicles because there is no significant increase from current conditions. The numbers are well researched.

**Comments by members of the public** *(all were sworn by Mr. Warner):*

Neil Schetelick, 27 Mine Ave.: Asked questions and made comments that were unrelated to this application.

Jeff Collar, 20 Mt. Airy Rd.: As the owner of the neighboring property, the proposed development will be obtrusive to his family's home. Residents in the building nearest to his will be able to look into his daughter's bathroom window. He asked that the layout be redesigned with greater setbacks from his property. He would be agreeable to having trees planted on his property for privacy. He approximated that his house is set back about 10' from the common property line.

Dan Lincoln, RA, 28 Olcott Ave. Historic Preservation Advisory Committee reviewing member: While he would prefer more of a traditional design, he finds the scale, materials and colors to be appropriate. He believes it would be appropriate to flip the buildings to the other side of the lot. He recommends that the front porches be at least seven feet deep and perhaps the color palette be varied among the three AH scattered site developments. He is pleased that two buildings are proposed rather than one large one, as the scale would be incongruous with the neighborhood. He applauded the architectural design as not being indicative of affordable housing. He also applauded the Borough for taking the initiative and sponsoring these 100% affordable developments that offset the need to build hundreds of market rate units.

Hearing no other public comments, Mr. Gianetti closed by thanking the Board for its understanding of all the site constraints discussed during the hearing. There will be discussion with the county about moving the access driveway southward, which will likely require modifications to the site layout. In making such modifications, they will be taking into considerations all of the feedback provided tonight. He asked that the Board grant Preliminary Site Plan approval together with the requested design waivers.

**Comments by the Board and its Professionals:**

Mr. McQueen: As a 100% affordable development, the Borough gets a bonus toward its AH obligation; reiterated concerns regarding the site entrance location, traffic and proximity of development to property line; urged that expressed concerns be strongly considered in any redesign. Moving forward with the development is important but getting it right is equally important.

Mr. Horowitz: Agreed with Mr. McQueen's cited concerns and noted the large number of issues that need to be addressed; was supportive of the two building concept and of granting preliminary approval.

Ms. Kellogg: Agreed that the two building concept would be more compatible with the scale of the neighborhood as opposed to one large building; expressed disappointment that more parties were not consulted prior to developing the proposed site plan; believes there are too many unanswered questions about the development to support approval.



Mr. Macmillan: While cognizant of the end of the month time constraint for making application for low interest tax credits, he looks forward to an inspired redesign that addresses the expressed concerns for the sake of the community.

Ms. Gardner: Agrees with prior comments regarding the completeness of the proposal; felt time allotted for consideration was too short; agrees that the applicant has met the threshold for approval.

Ms. Thompson: Agreed with other members comments and particularly those of the Chair regarding the absurdity of the buildings' layouts as relates to access from the parking lot; felt many unanswered questions remain, but that there isn't much choice other than moving forward at this time.

Mr. Szabo: Preliminary approval only gives the applicant vested rights to move forward and greenlights the expenditure of funds to produce a final design. It is in the final approval that all of the detailed engineering must be presented and agreed upon. He reassured the Board of the normalcy of this bifurcated application process and the benefits of identifying problems in the preliminary phase and addressing them in the final phase. He said the Board would be afforded the time it requires to fully review the final design in greater detail. As a 100% AH project, there is the need for cost consciousness, but that does not excuse bad design. While the Board can always say no, it must be cognizant of fact that the scattered site developments are part of the Borough's AH settlement agreement with the Courts and Fair Share Housing Center and at some point the units are expected to be built.

Mr. Brightly: Based on the testimony and comments, he has little doubt that the applicant will need to return with an amended Preliminary Site Plan application.

Mr. Warner: Agreed that an amended Preliminary Site Plan application can be reasonably expected because the law requires the Final Site Plan approval to be substantially similar to the Preliminary. He elicited Mr. Gianetti's affirmation that obtaining only Preliminary approval will allow the developer to apply for low interest housing tax credits from HMFA (notice of awards expected to be announced toward the end of the year) and that a letter from the Board attorney stating that such approval was granted, as opposed to submitting memorialized resolutions, will also be sufficient for making said application.

Assuming a motion to grant approval, Mr. Warner summarized the requested design waivers and conditions and stipulations stated during the course of the hearing and would be attached to an approval. A motion to grant Preliminary Site Plan approval as conditioned and stipulated to was made by Mr. Horowitz and seconded by Ms. Gardner.

Roll call vote:

All in favor: Members Gardner, Graham, Horowitz, McQueen, Paluck and Thompson.

Those opposed: Ms. Kellogg. Those abstaining: Mr. Macmillan.

**B. D26 Master plan consistency review of introduced Ord. #2022-1930 re: New Perimeter Fence Regulations; Introduced 8/8/22; Public hearing scheduled for 9/12/22; D26 review 8/25/22.**

Mr. Horowitz noted that this ordinance was recommended by the Housing and Zoning Advisory Committee, which he chairs. Advised by Mr. Szabo, he crafted the document that is before the Board. It was submitted to the Council as a "term sheet" but ended up being accepted as the ordinance. The blue font, underlined edits shown in Section F were added by the Council. The idea was to promote the orderly appearance of fences by regulating their height, orientation and maintenance. The regulations apply only to the smaller lot zones, not the 10 acre zones.

Mr. Szabo commented that the ordinance is not inconsistent with the master plan as the master plan does not speak to such zoning regulations. It is an attempt by the advisory committee to fill a gap in the zoning ordinance. He said that Bernardsville is perhaps the only town he knows of that does not have fence regulations and opined that it would promote certain principles of the master plan on strengthening residential neighborhoods and their design. Responding to Mr. Warner, he agreed the ordinance would also promote Sections 2.a. and 2.i. of the MLUL.

The Board noted a pair of typographical errors that it asked be relayed to the Council with transmittal of its finding. A motion finding the draft ordinance, as corrected, to be *not inconsistent* with the master plan was made by Ms. Thompson and seconded by Ms. Kellogg.

Roll call vote:

All members voted in the affirmative.

C. Review of 8/25/22 Bills List w/ Invoices.

Upon review, a motion to pay the listed invoices in the amount of **\$13,478.00** was made by Ms. Thompson and seconded by Mr. McQueen.

Roll call vote:

All members voted in the affirmative.

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

*A. Application #SP-240 – Greyfield Management, LLC – Preliminary & Final Site Plan w/ Variances; 106 Mine Brook Road, B:97, L:3, Zone: D-C; Received 5/3/22; Scheduled to be heard 8/25/22 – Postponement to 9/15/22 requested, granted and announced per 4A above .*

*B. Application #SP-241 – Essex Building, LLC – Preliminary & Final Site Plan w/ Variances; Corner Essex Ave. & Claremont Rd., B:75 L: 5 & 6, B: 76 L: 4 & 5, Zone: D-C; Received 6/20/22; Scheduled to be heard 9/29/22.*

*C. Application #SP-238 Equinet Properties, LLC - Preliminary & Final Residential Site Plan w/ Variance; 55 Claremont Road, B:71, L:6, Zone: D-CL; No PB jurisdiction determination on 6/16/22; Application with new notice requirement carried to 9/15/22.*

Mr. Szabo represented that the development is being discussed for incorporation into the Quimby Lane redevelopment plan.

**D. Public hearing for master plan adoption of 7/28/22 draft Parks and Recreation Plan; First draft reviewed 5/26/22; Revised Parks and Recreation Plan rec'd 7/28/22; Public hearing date T.B.D.**

E. Public hearing for Preliminary Investigation of 25 Claremont Rd., B:71 L:3 as Area In Need of Redevelopment per Council resolution #22-154; P.I. by Borough Planner Szabo authorized 6/30/22; Pending PI report by Board Planner – public hearing date T.B.D.

9. **Business of Visitors, second opportunity:** None.
10. **Executive Session:** None.
11. **Adjournment:** Chair Graham adjourned the meeting at 11:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



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

Keywords: affordable-housing-Mount-Airy-Gianetti-Shelly-Pumo- D26-ordimance-1930-fence