

PLANNING BOARD
BOROUGH OF BERNARDSVILLE
Minutes – September 15, 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 7:34 pm.

2. **Roll Call:**
Present – Members Gardner, Graham, Horowitz, Kellogg, Macmillan, McQueen, and Thompson.
Absent – Ms. Paluck and Mr. Simoff.
(substitute) Board Professionals Present: Attorney Louis Rago, Planner David Novak and Engineer Paul Ferriero.

3. **Minutes:**
 - A. Review of 8/11/22 draft Meeting Minutes: Upon review, the need for several typographical corrections was noted. A motion to approve the minutes as corrected was made by Ms. Kellogg and seconded by Mr. McQueen.
Voice vote:
All eligible members voted in the affirmative; Ms. Thompson abstained.
 - B. Review of 8/25/22 draft Meeting Minutes: Upon review, the need for several typographical corrections was noted. A motion to approve the minutes as corrected was made by Ms. Kellogg and seconded by Mr. McQueen.
Voice vote:
All eligible members voted in the affirmative

4. **Communications:** The following correspondence was acknowledged by the Chair:
 - A. 9/13/22 A. Suriano email of Council request for PB study of zone line change re: 477-1 Mine Brook Road w/ requestor backup documents. (re: 7B)
 - B. 9/13/22 A. Suriano email referral of introduced ordinance #2022-1933 for D26 master plan consistency review re: Amended Quimby Lane Redevelopment Plan w/ amended RDP (re: 8A).
Responding to the Chair, Mr. Mottola explained that the purpose of this ordinance is to amend the adopted Quimby Lane Redevelopment Plan to accommodate the Equinet Properties, LLC development proposal for Block: 71, Lot: 6, previously submitted as PB application #SP-238.
 - C. 9/13/22 C. Gianetti, Esq. email transmittal of hearing exhibits re: Application #SP-240 – Greyfield Management, LLC (re: 7A).
 - D. 9/14/22 C. Gianetti, Esq. letter to J. Pidgeon, Esq. re: Affordable Housing Obligation - Application #SP-240 – Greyfield Management, LLC (re: 7A).
 - E. 9/14/22 J. Pidgeon email response to C. Gianetti, Esq. re: Affordable Housing Obligation - Application #SP-240 – Greyfield Management, LLC (re: 7A).

5. **Business of Visitors unrelated to the agenda:** None.
6. **Old Business:** 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 determined on 6/16/22; Application previously carried to 9/15/22; Application to be further carried to 11/17/22 - with new notice requirement.
7. **New Business:**
A. Application #SP-240 – Greyfield Management, LLC – Preliminary & Final Site Plan w/ Variances; 106 Mine Brook Road, B:97, L:3, Zone: D-C; Deemed complete 9/10/22; Previously scheduled to be heard 8/25/22; Adjourned to 9/15/22 per applicant's request.

Appearing on behalf of the application were attorney Craig Gianetti, architect Nancy Dougherty, engineer Richard Adelson and planner John McDonough.

Exhibits Introduced:

- A1** – 7/8/22 "Inspiration From Historic Bernardsville" (sheet A-10) by *studio 1200, LLC.*
- A2** – (undated) Colored Architectural Rendering by *studio 1200, LLC.*
- A3** – 9/12/22 Set of five Architectural Drawings (sheets A-4 ~ A8) by *studio 1200, LLC.*
- A4** – 9/9/22 Aerial Image (sheet EXH-1) by Frank H. Lehr Associates.
- A5** – 4/12/22 Site Plan (sheet EXH-3) by Frank H. Lehr Associates.
- A6** – 9/9/22 Rendered Landscape Plan (sheet EXH-2) by Frank H. Lehr Associates.
- A7** – 9/15/22 Fire Department Sight Lines (sheet EXH-4) by Frank H. Lehr Associates.
- A8** – 8/9/22 Planning Exhibit (set of four aerial photos of site & surroundings) by John McDonough Associates

Mr. Gianetti provided an overview of the application's location, size and required variances. He highlighted that the proposed three story structure will contain 22 market rate apartments on two floors that will consist of 14 one bedroom and 8 two bedroom units. With slight design modifications the applicant will present, only one variance and no design waivers will be required. A variance is required for the first floor elevation which is proposed at 0.32' above the sidewalk (for handicapped accessibility) where 1.5' is required. It will be demonstrated that the plans can be modified to provide the required 8' wide sidewalk along Mine Brook Rd. whereas a 4' width was originally proposed. Conforming 24' wide drive aisles and all 9' wide parking spaces will also be provided. Relief remains required for providing an on-street loading area instead of one onsite.

Ms. Dougherty was sworn and qualified. Displaying exhibit **A1**, she relayed what she reviewed and how the building's design was developed, which included consultation with members of the town's Historic Preservation Advisory Committee (HPAC). The project is located in the D-C Downtown Core district where multi-family housing is a permitted use. It is a transit oriented development due to its walkable proximity to the train station. The district's design guidelines were followed and enhanced with input received from the HPAC. A more residential appearance is proposed due to the project being located near the western edge of the downtown zone and its proximity to existing residences. Exhibit **A2** displayed the building's proposed exterior appearance, with a 10 on 12 pitched roof at the front that references the Bernards Inn. Exterior finishes include the use of rusticated stone veneer on base and highlight areas, with cement stucco wall surfaces above separated at points by cast stone water table features. Projecting *Hardy*

Panel window bays will be placed intermittently on the two upper floors. Four carriage lights and eight planter boxes at windows (with drought resistant plants) are also proposed for the front façade. The building complies with the height and minimum width requirements for the zone. Most of the apartments will have dens to accommodate modern work-from-home needs. Low walls and landscape plantings at the front of the building, combined with falling grade elevations toward the rear of the site will shield the view of most cars parked inside the first floor garage. The garage entrance will have an open metal roll down security gate.

Planning Board submission plan drawings A-1, A-2 and A-3, dated 7/25/22, were displayed and explained. The open first floor garage contains 38 parking spaces and is 3' below the street level. The enclosed first floor interior spaces at street level include a lobby, bike storage room, storage room, meters/MEP room and a mail room. The lobby and garage levels are fully accessible by means of an elevator and two connecting stairs. Electric meters will be located on the exterior of the building; gas and water meters will be inside. Both of the upper floors will have 11 apartments with identical layouts, except the five rear apartments on the 2nd floor will have private roof terraces. Units will range in size from 880 SF to 1,200 SF. Each will have washers and dryers and be separately metered. All will be designed as "type A" accessible apartments as required by code. Each floor will have a trash chute that empties into refuse containers inside the garage level trash room.

The drawings comprising exhibit A3 were displayed. The roof plan shows the building-wide gabled roof occurring at the front half of the building with a flat roof behind it. Visually screened HVAC equipment will be located on the flat portion of the roof. Access to the roof is provided by a hatch and ladder in the stairwell. The garage level will have a 14' clear height and the apartments will have 9'-9" high ceilings. Utility piping will be run across the garage ceiling. The roof will be wired and structurally designed to accommodate future solar panels. The bike room will be equipped with bike chargers. The main entrance is located closest to the town/railroad station side of the building to promote walkability. Energy star rated appliances, windows, lighting fixtures, roofing and high efficiency HVAC equipment will be installed. Low VOC materials will be used throughout the building. Displayed drawing A-8 illustrated cuts of the exterior finish materials, sign dimensions and bike rack details.

The additional information requested in Mr. Brightly's 9/6/22 review report will be provided. Responding to Mr. Szabo's 9/10/22 review report, Ms. Dougherty reiterated the need for a first floor height variance in order to accommodate handicapped accessibility. She believes the building has been designed be in accordance with the zone guidelines including, the building's parallel orientation and placement near to the street, provision of sidewalks, building articulation, varying roof forms and minimum roof pitch, building façade transparency at all floors, conformance and placement of finish materials, design references to existing downtown buildings, clearly defined entry and suggested architectural features. Five foot high screens will shield the rooftop HVAC units from view. An acoustical consultant will be engaged to address concerns regarding sound intrusion from sources of exterior noise. Mr. Gianetti added that he has discussed with the Borough Attorney their proposal to meet the affordable housing obligation for this development by constructing a four bedroom group home offsite instead of constructing affordable units onsite. He was told that the Council is receptive to the idea of such a developer's agreement but would not commit to one until the project was approved. He said the applicant would also be amenable to making a payment in lieu of construction. With an application

approval by the Planning Board either of the above solutions would be negotiated as part of a developer's agreement with the Borough. Chair Graham commented that he felt proposing an offsite or a payment in lieu solution would be problematic. Ms. Thompson added that the Borough ordinance forbids payments in lieu.

Fire protection features will include an upgrade from the code required NFPA 13R to a full NFPA 13 sprinkler system, which provides added protection. Due to limited site access, additional fire protection features will be considered in discussions with the Fire Department including an increased fire rating on the building wall closest to the fire house; additional fire vents at the roof and possible other structural enhancements. The building height meets the code requirement and the side yard setbacks will be greater than the required minimums. The first floor will be constructed entirely of noncombustible materials. A fire department connection will be located on the building.

Ms. Dougherty's responses to the Board and its Professionals:

(Ms. Gardner) The automatic rapid roll down garage gate will be operable from vehicles by means of RFID tags. Control from within the building will be provided for residents to admit visitors. The gate will be a see-through metal security type material. The proposed landscaping and sloping site will prevent views of the parked cars from the front of the building. Casement windows are proposed for the apartments.

(Mr. Horowitz) The veneer material shown on the elevations will be real stone. The garage gate will be located all the way to the back of the covered vehicle entrance portal.

(Mr. McQueen) The HPAC did have an opportunity to see the revised building façade design after consulting with the applicant but due to limited time constraints decided to withhold further comment until this hearing. The oval window beneath the front gable may be removed if that section of wall becomes clapboard clad as suggested by the HPAC.

(HPAC reviewing member Daniel Lincoln, RA) The applicant would be amenable to using dimensional roof shingles; adding gable end or mission style dormers on the roof areas above the projecting window panels; using clapboard siding instead of stucco above the garage entrance; alternating sections of clapboard siding and stucco on the rear and side walls; adding a half gable false roofs along the flat roof portions on the sides of the building.

(Paul Ferriero) She is confident that a 14' clearance can be maintained throughout the parking garage level irrespective of pipe projections along the ceiling. Gas and water meters will be located within the mechanical room that is located in the front corner of the building. A full NFPA 13 sprinkler system is planned for the building. If apartments are individually metered the gas meters may have to be located on an exterior side wall.

(Mr. Graham) They will consider using concrete block construction, in lieu of framed construction, for increased structural stability and fire protection of the stairwells. There will be the same number of stairs between the lobby and garage level in both the stairwell and the open stairs. The open stairs are provided for pedestrian convenience so that people do not have to go into and out of the enclosed fire stair, or take the elevator to change levels. They are also intended to make both levels feel like part of the same lobby.

(Mr. Novak) The rooms with the dens do not have closets. The bicycle storage room is designed to accommodate 20 bikes.

Mr. Adelsohn was sworn and qualified. Displaying exhibit **A4** (Aerial Image) he described existing conditions and the surrounding area. The site, just under a half acre in size, slopes from its northeast corner to its southwest corner. Multifamily housing is a permitted use in the Downtown Core (D-C) zone. Design drawing C2, dated 7/25/22, was displayed and used to show the flood hazard line, extent of the riparian zone and the site's topography. The DEP has determined that there are no wetlands on the property. The site plan and parking garage layout were explained as depicted on sheet C3, dated 7/22/22. The site will have 38 parking spaces, all but 12 of which at the rear of the lot will be covered by the building. The front yard setback of 5', east side yard setback of 11.5' and west side yard setback of 10.5' are all code compliant. All of the 15% required EV spaces are proposed to be constructed immediately. Garbage will be sent to the trash room on the west side of the garage from an above chute. It will be collected by building management. Recycled materials will be brought down to the trash room by the tenants. Both will be picked up inside the garage by a private hauler. *Chair Graham opined that collecting recyclables within the remote trash room would be inconvenient for tenants and recommended the applicant find a better location.*

Exhibit **A5**, a modified site plan, showed a revised parking layout wherein all of the parking spaces will be 9' x 18' in size and drive aisles will be 24' wide throughout as required. To accommodate the grade change a retaining wall extends along the rear of the property. Porous pavement will be used at the rear parking spaces and a bio retention basin will be located on the west side of the building. Together, these comprise about 2,000 cu. ft. in volume as part of the stormwater management system. The sidewalk in front of the building along Mine Brook Rd. has been widened to a complying 8' width.

Exhibit **A6** was displayed to illustrate and describe the proposed landscaping. It was noted that taller shrubbery or a higher knee wall would be needed to completely hide cars within the garage from being seen from the street. Design drawing C-6 was used to explain lighting plan fixture types and their locations. A design waiver is needed for lighting levels that exceed required limits at the property lines. Mr. Adelsohn stipulated that he can comply with all of the engineering comments expressed in Mr. Brightly's 9/7/22 review report. Mr. Ferriero highlighted the following regarding certain comments in the report: who pays for the electricity used by the EV stations needs to be worked out; the proposed access point and current layout of the bio retention basin does not seem very maintainable; don't underestimate the cumulative effect of all of the stormwater comments combined; there are too many open comments that need to be addressed, the applicant should be required to submit their proposed solutions before the Board decides the application.

Exhibit **A7** was displayed to demonstrate that there will be a 360' sightline from the fire house past the proposed building and that the building's location does not impede the view of westbound traffic from the fire house. It was acknowledged that large vehicles utilizing the proposed curbside loading space could impair the view of traffic for fire vehicles. Mr. Adelsohn said the loading space can be shifted further eastward to move it entirely out of the line of sight; possibly it could be placed in front of the main entry. Currently there is vegetation at the corner of the

property that already impedes the view for fire vehicles. The proposed development will be an improvement in that regard. A preliminary discussion had been held with the DOT prior to submitting the application but they have been subsequently unable to reach the agency for further conversations.

Mr. Adelsohn's responses to the Board and its Professionals:

(Ms. Thompson) Male Gingko trees that are not odoriferous in the fall will be used where called out in the landscaping plan.

(Ms. Gardner) If female Gingko trees are needed for survival of the males, perhaps a different species of tree needs to be considered. Property maintenance would be expected to cleanup any debris from flowering trees. The eight tandem parking spaces will be assigned to four of the two bedroom apartments; all remaining spaces will be unassigned.

(Mr. Graham) A notch along the rear of the property produces the small lot projection at the southeast corner of the property. No use other than landscaping is proposed for that portion of the site. A backup electrical generator is not currently proposed for the building but they will discuss and consider the suggestion.

(Ms. Kellogg) Although not ideal, cars in tandem spaces #9 and #16 will be able to utilize the full 24' width of the drive aisle to backup and pull out of those spaces. The same applies to space #34 but the bend in the wall behind it provides some extra maneuverability. They will review with the DOT her strongly expressed concern about running the DOT's stormwater drainage pipe beneath the building, instead of diverting it due to its age and capacity limit. There will not be any tiebacks for the retaining wall that will penetrate the neighboring property. The west building foundation wall will be treated to repel water from the adjacent bio retention basin. A perimeter fence will prevent children from entering the basin. They will check at the grading along the front sidewalk to assure there will be positive drainage away from the building.

(Mr. Horowitz) *Mr. Gianetti responded that an acoustical engineer will be consulted on how best to address sound attenuation to buffer noise from trains, police and fire sirens and the nearby police firing range. However, given its "transit village" location some tradeoffs are normally accepted for easier access to public transportation.*

Mr. McDonough was sworn and qualified. He explained that he had prepared a planning analysis of the application and what all he reviewed to arrive at his conclusions. Displaying the four aerial photos that comprise exhibit A8, he described how the proposed "infill" development is compatible with its surroundings and mostly compliant with the Downtown Core zoning. The site has the spatial capacity to accommodate the proposed development in use, scale and density. The proposal meets goals of the Downtown Core zoning by promoting the downtown as a civic core, physically enhancing the downtown character, respecting the town's historic character, creating a walkable, pedestrian friendly environment and providing sufficient parking. The application meets the intent of the zone plan with its conforming use, density, massing, height, setbacks, coverage, parking and design. The Board's comments will take a good plan and improve it. The application promotes the general welfare with new housing stock. It promotes

the provision of a variety of uses in the zone; promotes a desirable visual environment, efficient land use and appropriate population density. There are no substantially adverse impacts resulting from the application, nor is there any impairment of the zone plan based on application's high degree of conformance to the zoning regulations. The sole variance, which is requested for a lower first floor height than permitted in the zone, is for the purpose of achieving ADA compliance without having to build exterior ramps. The relief is appropriate and would meet the standard that would apply under a balancing of competing regulatory requirements. Mr. McDonough finds the relief requested for design standard waivers to be reasonable and appropriate. Based on the foregoing testimony, he said the applicant has met its burden for site plan approval and approval is warranted.

There were no questions from the Board or its professionals for Mr. McDonough.

Referring to the architectural front building elevation drawing, Ms. Dougherty discussed with the Board the knee walls as currently designed for screening vehicles inside the first floor garage. She explained that the garage floor level is lower than the exterior grade and that the low walls are more than 4' high on the inside of the garage. She said that these walls could be made even taller within the openings to provide additional screening of vehicles parked in the garage. Upon discussion it was agreed that the knee walls within the two front building openings will be increased 18" in height, to which the applicant stipulated as an approval condition.

Applicant's professionals responses to questions from members of the public:

(Glen Miller, Bernardsville Fire Chief, 125 Washington Corner Rd.): Ms. Dougherty responded that the building height measurements were taken from the average grade elevation in accordance the code. The pitched and flat roofs have different height requirements. She did not know whether their MEP consultant contacted the utility companies regarding the possible requirement for all gas and electric meters to be located outside of the building. She would also have to find out where a transformer or hot box would need to be located on site. While the garage level of the building is to be constructed entirely of noncombustible materials, she could not testify that the building could withstand the heat generated by a multiple electrical vehicle fire. Mr. Adelson responded that the sight lines from the fire house were measured as per the DOT standard – 14' back from the edge of the travel lane. However, an existing 18" diameter utility pole was not factored in.

Chief Miller commented that the power lines in front of the building are at 35' and their intersection with the building is not depicted on any of the drawings. Consequently, due to their proximity, he said firefighters would be unable to place a ground ladder against the building.

(Martha Kelshaw, 105 Mine Brook Rd.): Mr. Adelson responded that the on-street loading area is not large enough for a tractor trailer or landscaper's vehicle to pull into. The tractor trailers or landscaper's trucks that currently pull to the curb in front of the wooded area east of the fire house will likely no longer do so once the site is developed. Given the development's relatively small size, he does not anticipate the town's sewage treatment facility having any capacity problems due to the addition of this development.

A motion to extend the meeting to 11:20 pm was made by Mr. McQueen and seconded by Ms. Gardner. On voice vote all members voted in favor of extending the meeting.

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

Martha Kelshaw, 105 Mine Brook Rd.: expressed concerns over the risk of flooding that's already occurred in the area and possible exacerbation by the proposed development; doesn't want to see the town's character changed due to added traffic and noise pollution; decks on the back of the building don't seem like a good idea given their surroundings.

HPAC reviewing member Daniel Lincoln, RA: accepts the building, as it is mostly code compliant; appreciates the applicant's willingness to consult with the HPAC and the research that's been done regarding the town's history; given the building's location at the edge of the downtown district, it should have a more articulated, residential feel; he requested on behalf of HPAC that the applicant incorporate the use of dimensional roof shingles, mission style gable dormers similar to those on the Bernards Inn; the design of the sides of the building should be tied more closely to that of the front façade; add clapboard siding of two alternating colors in certain previously discussed locations.

Glenn Miller, Bernardsville Fire Chief, 125 Washington Corner Rd.: the location of the power lines must be addressed as fire damage to those would impact the fire house; welcomes discussion on the building construction type relative to fire protection; they would be unable to protect building residents with either ground ladders or aerial devices given current conditions; expressed interest in knowing the profit to the developer by constructing a group home somewhere in town instead of locating the four required affordable units within the building.

Johanna Wissinger, Environmental Commission Chair: appreciates the applicant's provision of a solar ready roof; has stormwater impact concerns due to the size of the project and its location; lacks confidence that the site can be engineered to comply with Major Stormwater Development standards and seeks assurances from the Board's engineer. *Mr. Ferriero responded that there were a lot of engineering comments and a number of revisions need to be made. As of today, the project does not meet the Major Development standards. He will be waiting to see if the applicant's engineer can demonstrate the projects ability to comply.*

Mark Tamke, 83 Seney Dr.: he is member of the Bernardsville Fire Company, which is a private organization; expressed disappointment that the Fire Company wasn't contacted as a neighbor to discuss the application prior to tonight; given the location, the size of the proposed development seems massive; due to the amount of vehicular traffic in the area he expressed concerns about residents' pedestrian travel to and from the building, especially those with children.

Kieran Flynn, 103 Mine Brook Rd.: (lives across the street) expressed concerns that the design of this new building once constructed will impact the character of the neighborhood and make the homes across the street appear out of character and old; when doing future alterations will those houses have to take on a similar appearance; *Mr. McQueen and Mr. Novak interjected that the strip of homes across Mine Brook Rd. were excluded from the downtown core when the zone boundaries were established.* Mr. Flynn was critical of the affordable units not being built onsite; felt the application was "breezing through" without sufficient consideration.

Responding to some of the public comments, Mr. Gianetti noted that only one variance is being requested and that otherwise the application is fully conforming with zoning requirements. With

respect to the fire department comments, they intend to address as much as possible for increased fire protection, but he wished to note that his client has reached out numerous times to the fire department to meet and discuss the application and have repeatedly been unable to get a response. Regarding the stormwater management design comments, he proposed they return at a future meeting after having provided the requested information needed to demonstrate compliance with major stormwater requirements.

Mr. McQueen spoke to the affordable housing (AH) discussion that has been taking place at the Council level. At its prior meeting, Borough Attorney Pidgeon appraised the Council that with recent purchases of the Finley Ave. and Bernards Ave. sites for AH developments, the Borough's AH trust fund has been greatly depleted. He asked the Council to consider if it would want to allow payments in lieu of construction on applications such as this, to better position the Borough for compliance with the next phase of its AH obligations. The Council did not discuss the matter last Monday but chose to defer the matter to a future unspecified date. Mr. McQueen asked that the Council be given the opportunity to continue this discussion with Mr. Pidgeon to determine the best path for the Borough to take.

*A motion to extend the meeting to **11:35 pm** was made by Mr. McQueen and seconded by Ms. Gardner. On voice vote all members voted in favor of extending the meeting.*

Chair Graham and members of the Board itemized the unresolved issues, questions and comments that need to be addressed before the Board can decide the application. Those included the Council's stance on the AH question; certifying the stormwater design's workability; diversion of the DOT storm drain line from beneath the building; fire company comments regarding the power lines, building construction type and electric car fires; location of utility meters; the provision of turning templates for the tandem parking; incorporating the Board's and HPAC's design suggestions, sound attenuation and proposed locations for a hot box and transformer. As counseled by Mr. Rago, it was agreed and announced that the application would be continued at the 11/17/22 meeting without further notice to the public. Mr. Gianetti agreed to provide the Board a written confirmation (via email) of his client's agreement to providing any necessary time extension the Board may need to decide this application.

B. 9/13/22 Council referral for Planning Board study of requested zone line change; Consideration of Commissioning Board Planner to perform study.

In response to the Chair's query, the Board agreed to directing Board Planner John Szabo to study this matter and prepare a report for consideration and recommendation to Council.

C. Review of 9/15/22 Bills List w/ Invoices.

Upon review, a motion to pay the listed invoices in the amount of **\$7,812.50** was made by Mr. McQueen and seconded by Ms. Thompson.

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. D26 Master plan consistency review of Introduced Ordinance #2022-1933 re: Amendment to Quimby Lane Redevelopment Plan; Introduced 9/12/22; Public hearing scheduled for 10/11/22; Planning Board review scheduled for 9/29/22.

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. 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.

D. 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 11:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



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

Keywords: Equinet-affordable-Greyfield-106-Mine-Brook-Gianetti-Dougherty-Adelsohn-McDonough