

HILLSBOROUGH TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
December 13, 2018

Vice Chairman, Neil Julian called the Planning Board Public Meeting of December 13, 2018 to order at 7:35 p.m. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting took place in the Courtroom of the Hillsborough Township Municipal Complex.

Acting Chairman Julian announced the meeting had been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 ("Sunshine Law").

ROLL CALL

Committeeman Carl Suraci - Present

Robert Wagner, Jr. - Present

Committeeman Frank DelCore - Present

Robert Peason - Present

Seat #5 Vacant

Neil Julian, Vice Chairman - Present

Sally Becorena - Absent

Seat #8 - Vacant

Kenneth Hesthag, Secretary - Present

Ron Skobo (Alt. #1) - Present

Sam Weinstein (Alt. #2) - Present

Also present: David K. Maski, PP, AICP, Planning Director; Philip George, Esq., Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein & Associates); Christina Restuccia, CCR, Covering Court Reporter; and Caz Bielen, Board Videographer (Premier Media, LLC).

DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

- November 29, 2018

A motion to approve was made by Committeeman DelCore, seconded by Secretary Hesthag.

Roll Call: Mr. Peason - yes; Committeeman Suraci - yes; Committeeman DelCore - yes; Mr. Wagner - abstain; Secretary Hesthag - yes; Mr. Skobo - yes; Acting Chairman Julian - yes. Motion carries.

DISPOSITION OF RESOLUTIONS

None

PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS

- *2018 Master Plan Reexamination Report*, Adopted November 29, 2018 - copies distributed

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

None

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES

None

PUBLIC HEARING - SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN APPLICATIONS

- **Hillsborough 206 Holdings, LLC** -18-PB-07-MSPV (TOD: 02-27-19) - Block 202, Lot 4 - Route 206. Applicant seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan; 'c' bulk variance for maximum height of an accessory structure; and design waivers, to construct a mixed-use development, comprised of 14 residential apartment / townhouse buildings, consisting of 175 dwelling units, 42 of which will be affordable housing units, with community clubhouse building and pool area, and dog-run area; and a non-residential component consisting of three buildings for 12,500 sf. of total retail space, and associated site stormwater management, trash enclosure areas, roadways, walkway and parking, on property in the MUID-1, Mixed-Use Inclusionary District - 1 Zoning District, and in the ASD, Architectural and Site Design Overlay Zone (*EC Review 11-26-18*).

Richard Hoff, Esq. of Bisgaier Hoff, representing the applicant, said the only thing to add to the introduction given by the Vice Chairman, is that this application comes in response to a re-zoning of the property, as part of the township's affordable housing plan. The plan was designed as closely as possible to the ordinance, with one variance associated with the clubhouse, and some waivers.

Acting Chairman Julian suggested the order of testimony.

Mr. Hoff said with the pleasure of the Board, he would like to start with the civil engineer and then address the Board Engineer's review letter; then proceed to the architect and Planner's memorandum, since they are the most substantive. The other matters will be addressed following.

Geoffrey Lanza, PE of Bowman Consulting, LLC was sworn in, reviewed his credentials, was accepted by the Board, and gave the following testimony:

Exhibits:

A-1 - Aerial View of Site - 80-Scale

A-2 - Color Rendering - 80-Scale

A-3 - Color Rendering - 40-Scale

A-4 - NJDOT Site Access Plan

Mr. Lanza oriented the Board with the general location of the project, using Exhibit A-1. The property is in the Mixed Use Inclusionary 1 Zone and contains a little over 28 acres. The site is bounded by Route 206 to the west, and the new bypass to the north. Railroad tracks are to the east. There are some commercial businesses on the west side of Route 206.

Mr. Lanza described Exhibit A-2 and A-3. The project will include fourteen residential buildings that contain 175 dwelling units, shown on the right side and center of the exhibit. The clubhouse will be to the right with a pool, with the retail to the left. Further along, Road "A", brings you into the residential buildings, with loop roads that run around Buildings B, C, D and E. Most of the buildings have garages and driveways with each unit. Parking can be in a garage and a driveway for each of the units that have garages. There are 102 garage spaces, and 102 driveway spaces. There is additional parking along Road "A". There is parking along the east side of Road "B", and a little pocket of parking at the west side of Road "D", so there is plenty of parking. There are 47 parking stalls for the retail, and 16 spaces west and north of the pool area. In total there are 404 parking spaces, where 389 are required. Sidewalks are proposed along all of the roads. Road "A" will have sidewalks on both side.

Mr. Lanza said there will be a school bus stop to the west of the clubhouse. He stated they have reviewed the proposal with the Board of Education and gotten their approval. The buses would come in, stop at that path for the children, and loop back out through the retail area. There will be seven masonry trash enclosures with gates. There is a double enclosure at the retail area. There is one between Buildings 2 and 3. There is one at the pool and the clubhouse area, to point out a few.

Mr. Lanza addressed the landscaping. He said they have extensive landscaping throughout the site. A six-foot high vinyl fence is proposed along Route 206, which starts at the corner of Road "D", and then cuts through between the retail and the building cluster. The fence is the buffering from the retail and from 206.

Mr. Lanza said the stormwater will be managed with a system of inlets and pipes, through two detention basins. One will be by the pool, the other one to the east. They will be extended detention sand filter basins that meet the requirements of water quality and quantity standards. The sanitary sewers will flow under Route 206, on the south side across 206 to the Hillsborough MUA pump station across the highway. Water, gas and electric will feed the site from the utilities located in Route 206.

Mr. Lanza explained Exhibit A-4 as being a larger version of the access drawing in the plan set. He said when traveling northbound on Route 206, one can enter the site just by making a right turn in. When traveling from the north heading south on Route 206, one can make a left turn into the site. A left-turn slot has been proposed. DOT is designing that intersection now and will be finalizing the plan to include the left-turn slot for this development. Residents leaving the site heading south must make a right-hand turn, then go up to the new bypass loop, come around through the intersection and head south.

Mr. Lanza said the plan is compliant except for a height variance and some minor design waivers.

Planning Director, Mr. Maski asked to comment on the parking. He said the narrative states the housing will be "apartment/townhouse" buildings. The RSIS has a higher parking ratio for townhouses. This project would be under-parked if it were townhouses. Mr. Lanza needs to clarify if they are townhouses or not.

Mr. Lanza stated they are all apartments.

Mr. Maski agreed the proposed parking was sufficient, since the dwelling units will be apartments.

Acting Chairman Julian asked if the bypass will affect timing.

Mr. Lanza said they will be trying to get the utilities across Route 206 before the State does the paving, which is expected to be within a year. The State's plan assumes this project being in place with the left-turn lane.

Mr. Lanza went over the comments in the engineering review memo from Maser Consulting dated November 21, 2018. He said they are agreeing to the “gist of the comments”. He said we will comply with comments #2, #3.

Board Engineer, Mr. White suggested Mr. Lanza address any comments which they will not comply with.

Committeeman DelCore noted the Board will assume the applicant will comply, unless stated otherwise.

Mr. Lanza responded to the comments in question. He said for Comment #7 - there will not be a homeowner's association, the units are rentals. Comment #5 - mailboxes are shown behind the units along Road 'A'.

Mr. Peason asked for more information about Mr. Lanza's comment on ownership. Mr. Lanza said since the units are rentals, they will be maintained by the owner of the property, which will have an on-site maintenance person. The owner will have an overall management company to maintain the rental units. There is no HOA, maintenance responsibilities fall to the owner.

Mr. Maski said it is understood that everything is private, including the roads and utilities, which will be maintained by the owner.

Mr. Lanza agreed. He continued with Comment #10. The trash and recycling areas were previously identified on the exhibit. Both will be picked up by a private hauler.

Mr. White asked about his Comment #8.

Mr. Lanza responded that the clubhouse and pool are for the residents and guests only. Comment #9 - there will be full-time maintenance staff on the property. Comment #11 - the firetruck can maneuver around the site. We will comply to add delivery and refuse trucks.

Mr. Maski said his office received a copy of the letter from the Board of Education today regarding the bus stop. The BOE said what is proposed is acceptable, as long as there are no obstructions, and the turning radius meets the requirements for a 54-passenger school bus. He asked if a turning radius template was also done for a school bus.

Mr. Lanza confirmed they had and that he would put that on the final plans for signature.

Mr. Lanza returned to the Maser Memorandum, continuing under the comments for site plan. He said they will comply with Comment #1 to grade the pavement. Comment #2 addresses loading zones. The plans show a striped area between retail pads 2 and 3, right in front of the Dumpsters. That should be sufficient for the three retail uses.

Mr. White questions deliveries by eighteen-wheeler trucks.

Mr. Lanza said he did not think that area was long enough to easily get a tractor-trailer in.

An unidentified participant said it would be close. It is about 60 feet from the crosswalk back from the dumpster. It is possible, but I do not think there will be any tractor-trailer deliveries there.

Board Attorney, Mr. George advised that since the person assisting with the displays continues to provide information; he should be identified and sworn in.

James Ward was sworn in, stated he works with Mr. Lanza, and is the civil engineer who signed the plans.

Mr. Maski asked about loading bays.

Mr. Ward pointed out the striped area between the two retail buildings, in front of the dumpsters.

Mr. Lanza continued with his response to the Maser Memorandum, starting at the top of page 4. He said they are in compliance with Comment #3, and if not, will be for #4, #5 and #6.

Mr. White advised addressing only those comments they cannot comply with.

Mr. Lanza said the filter and heater for the pool will be located outside of the building rather than inside. Top of page 5, there will be no basements. The flow will be above seasonal high. Mr. Lanza further addressed the stormwater using Exhibit A-3.

Mr. Ward added that the outfall from one of the basins has to get below the steep slopes in the bank, which is inside the corridor. If they try to discharge above, it would just erode. He said they have to bring that outlet down as close to the screen as possible to a stable discharge location.

Mr. Lanza said they are asking for a waiver for that.

Acting Chairman Julian asked if the outfall was or was not in the stream corridor.

Mr. Lanza stated it is not in the stream corridor, located just inside the township's stream, located within the stream corridor line.

(Unidentified speaker) A waiver is being sought to allow for it to be discharged into what would be characterized as a stream corridor body. If we pulled back further, we would be up in the slopes and erode it. The waiver is requested to put the head wall down into that area.

Mr. Hoff said the section of the ordinance is Section 188-64(d)3.

Acting Chairman Julian asked if the waiver would be from the State.

Mr. White said it would not.

Acting Chairman Julian said he recalled having discussion about this at the Environmental Commission meeting. He asked if the issues were clarified with the DRCC.

Mr. Hoff said they had.

Mr. Lanza said he would move on to the landscaping comments in the Maser memorandum. He said they will comply with everything else.

There was discussion about the lighting. A comment was made that it is very difficult to comply with the ordinance. They would like to get a little more lighting around the retail spaces for security. We did our best to achieve the .5 foot candle average maximum, except for in the retail area. It was thought best to have it be a little brighter. The increase in this area bumps the average up across the site; hence the waiver request. We think this is a good design for the way the height of the poles and how they are spaced.

Committeeman DelCore asked if the lighting on the residential side was okay.

Mr. Lanza said the lighting is below one footcandle, which is safe enough for low lighting. He said the ordinance is tricky the way it is written. They are looking to get it a little bit brighter at the entrance and the retail areas. As a result, the site is over the .5 footcandles, which he said in his opinion, is very dim.

Mr. Maski asked if the lighting has been an issue for other developments in town.

Mr. White said it had not been an issue for a lot of them, but that waivers had been granted, if requested.

Mr. Lanza said the light will not spill over. The light bulbs are only twelve feet high so the light is going to be very concentrated. He said many towns allow for one footcandle.

Acting Chairman Julian asked how much the lighting will be over.

Mr. Lanza said the Maser memorandum makes not over the differences. Coming in off of Route 206, the lighting is under one footcandle, which he said is well lit. The idea is that a little extra lighting is requested at the entrance for safety, and at the retail for security purposes. The interior roads and parking average .63 footcandles, which is thirteen-hundredths over the maximum .5. So, we can try to play with it some more.

Mr. Maski asked if the lighting dims down any once the retail is closed.

Mr. Lanza said he did not see why. It is reasonable to dim to low-level lighting at that point. He said they will add the lighting attached to the building as under Comment #2, and color of the fixtures. Back on page 7, he said they will work with the town's professionals to comply regarding the recommended substitutions. The comments on pages 8 and 9 will be complied with.

Acting Chairman Julian asked Mr. White if he was okay with that.

Mr. White said he was satisfied.

Committeeman DelCore said the only issue is the lighting.

Mr. Lanza and said that was the only issue related to Mr. White's report.

There was discussion on the request for a design waiver for the parking spaces for the retail. The speaker said the township ordinance requires 10 ft. x 20 ft. spaces; the plan proposes 9 ft. x 18 ft. retail spaces, which is sufficient for this type of retail. This is not a Home Depot or a grocery store where there will be shopping carts or big packages to load.

Mr. Lanza said he had mentioned there will be a six-foot wide sidewalk along both sides of Road 'A'. The other sidewalks around the other blocks are four-feet wide. The sidewalks in the retail area are six-foot wide, which is more than the required five-foot wide per ordinance. Six-foot sidewalks were used in the more heavily trafficked areas. The four-foot sidewalks are reasonable for most developments. The averaging is 5 foot, but a waiver would be required for some areas throughout the site.

Acting Chairman Julian asked what the vision is for the retail.

Mr. Hoff said the intent of the ordinance is to compliment the residential area. It was designed to not be a thoroughfare but keeps the main sidewalks down the middle at a larger length than required.

A request was made to talk about the exception for the frontage improvement.

Mr. Maski asked to have the comments on page 6 of his report addressed.

Mr. Lanza said given the Route 206 Bypass is coming in; they really cannot meet the requirements, and are asking for a waiver. There is a fence and a landscaped area inside the fence between the residences and the fence, and then Rout 206 is around the other side of the right-of-way.

Mr. Maski asked about the area between the fence and how the new right-of-way is being treated.

Mr. Lanza said they are not proposing anything on the other side of the fence. The fence is just inside the property line by about six inches.

Mr. Maski commented that is in the right-of-way line.

Mr. Lanza agreed.

Acting Chairman Julian asked if that was acceptable.

Mr. Maski said there is nothing in the ordinance about where the fence can go. It obviously has to be on their property. He said he did not know if DOT would have any problems with it.

Mr. Lanza said DOT already commented on the project but did not include anything on the buffer.

Mr. Maski again questioned that it would all be in the right-of-way.

Mr. Lanza said it is a big right-of-way.

Mr. Maski said the concern is that when you are driving up and down 206, you will see a six-foot high wall running several hundred feet without any landscaping.

Mr. Lanza noted the landscaping is on the other side of it. He asked if they can break up the look.

Mr. Maski said it could.

Mr. Lanza said they would discuss it with DOT since it is in their land.

Mr. Maski suggested the fence be moved back to allow for screening in front.

Mr. Ward said there is about fifteen feet so they can pull the fence back a little to be able to landscape on both sides.

After continued discussion, Mr. Lanza agreed to work with DOT to pull the fence in.

Acting Chairman Julian said so the applicant will work with the township on the landscaping and pull back the fence.

Mr. Lanza agreed.

Mr. Lanza said the light post spacing is spaced to get the lighting we think is desirable and safe. They are spaced about 100 ft. apart, rather than the required 60 ft. Keep in mind that some of the lighting is over in footcandles.

Mr. Hoff said Mr. Lanza's testimony had concluded but that he would answer any questions related to his testimony.

Committeeman DelCore asked if the Planner's report would be reviewed.

Mr. Hoff said most of the comments are directed to the architect.

Mr. Lanza was asked to address the signage. Exhibit A-3 was again displayed.

Mr. Lanza said a site identification sign is being proposed in the center of the grass median on the entrance road.

Mr. Ward added the sign would be twenty feet back from the right-of-way line. The sign would be five-feet tall, where four feet is allowed. The sign area is 36 sf. where 12 sf. is allowed. The sign is double sided.

Mr. Maski asked if the testimony is that the sign is three times the size allowed.

Mr. Lanza agreed.

Mr. Ward said the sign is ten-feet wide and five-feet in height. The signage area itself is 36 sf., which accounts for both sides. A smaller sign would be too small for this site.

Board members asked for the dimensions again since the math did not add up.

Mr. Ward said the structure is ten-feet long and five-feet high. The signage area is 36 square feet, which counts for both sides, which is eighteen square feet on one side.

Mr. Maski clarified you do not count the support posts or the support wall, but everything in between the posts should be counted. You do not need to count the double siding so the sign is 18 sf., not 36 sf.

All were in agreement on the final numbers.

Mr. Maski said he had a few items to address. He noted the wrong zoning map and wrong tax map were used. He said he assumed that would be corrected. There is a disparity between the height of the buildings on the zoning table verses on the architectural drawings. The architect's numbers are correct.

Mr. Lanza said they will straighten that out.

Mr. Maski returned to his memo, page 4, Comment #6 regarding the dumpster areas and refuse.

Mr. Lanza said the dumpster areas will be screened from the public on three sides, with a fence in the front. The details are on the plans. The masonry will be textured to blend with the overall design of the project. We agree with comments #2, and #3 regarding possibly putting a hose connection outside to maintain the area.

Mr. Maski said a waiver is needed.

Mr. Lanza agreed.

Mr. Maski asked about the labeling of the Retail 'C' pad. Is it a bank or is not?

Mr. Lanza stated it is a bank pad.

Mr. Maski said the pad should be marked accordingly. The reason to clarify is that you are only allowed to have a drive-through bank. You cannot have a drive-through restaurant, for instance.

Mr. Lanza concurred; no drive-through restaurant.

Mr. Maski asked if the stream corridor complies with 188.38 and 188.64.

Mr. Lanza said it does.

Mr. Maski said then you will need to indicate on the plan where you will be putting the conservation signage.

Mr. Lanza agreed.

Mr. Maski asked that the color of the fence be toned down from the white proposed, and that samples be provided prior to.

Mr. Lanza agreed to the request.

Mr. Maski had other questions that would be addressed by the architect.

Mr. White said the Environmental Commission's memo needs to be addressed.

Mr. Lanza addressed the Commission's bullet point items. The township stream corridor line is now on the plan; the waivers regarding the placement and head wall were discussed; tree clearing is to be restricted to a time of year so as to not impact the migratory birds, and Indiana bats, which will be complied with; and lastly, that a GSR32 spread sheet was not submitted. That has to do with the recharge to ground water. The bone of contention here is that a member of the Commission thinks the soil perks well. In fact, it does not; it is a 'D soils. The testing has been done around that only about barely twenty inches here and there that percolates. From there it is just bedrock; nothing is going to percolate through that. Hence, there is no need to submit a spread sheet; it would be pointless.

Mr. Lanza said with these soils, we are proposing to have the detention basins with the sand filter in the bottom and a perforated pipe to drain out. We can still talk to the Soil Conservation Service but do not think they are going to provide a reading on that, but we will try.

Acting Chairman Julian said that would be to verify the soils are Class 'D'.

Mr. Lanza said the soil does not perk so that is why the stormwater has been designed the way it has been, with the discharge going out to the stream.

Acting Chairman Julian said if it does not perk, it may be better in a sense since it will exempt you from some of the issues in terms of percolation.

Acting Chairman Julian noted receipt of the I-bat letter and for the long-eared bat. He said the Environmental Commission talked about the outfall for the Indiana Bat.

Mr. White had no more comments to be addressed.

Mr. Hoff said the Bureau of Fire Safety issued a letter dated November 28, 2018. We will comply with all of those comments as well.

Open to the public.

Susan Gulliford - Hunt Club Road

- Ms. Gulliford said the sign displayed is only to identify the development. She said the signage for the retail would be additional.

Mr. Lanza said that is correct.

- Ms. Gulliford asked if the 42 low and moderate units would be spread throughout the development or concentrated in one spot.

Mr. Lanza said they will be distributed.

- Ms. Gulliford said so then these units will not be in a separate building with a different exterior.

Mr. Lanza said no, and that the architect will go into greater detail on the design.

- Ms. Gulliford asked for more information on the exterior design of the two detention basins. She asked if they can be designed to be more rain gardens.

Mr. Lanza said the water is not going to stay in them for very long. They will have a sand filtered bottom, so it will look like sand at the bottom.

- Ms. Gulliford said she understood a rain garden drains within 48 hours or something.

Mr. Lanza said, in 72 hours.

- Ms. Gulliford again questioned the proposed.

Mr. Lanza said that was the case for the small storms. It needs to infiltrate into the sand, so we would not want to put grass in it. It water needs to get through the water quality feature of the sand before it goes out.

Mr. Ward offered that in his opinion, rain gardens are usually done on a smaller scale. These are larger for managing a hundred-year storm and things of that nature. It is going to have walls around it down in the ground so you really are not going to see it. There will be a fence around it. It is not meant to be an aesthetic feature. It is going to look like a sand trap. We have landscaped all the way around the outside. The landscaping is not integral to the bottom of the basin, but it is around the basin.

- Ms. Gulliford asked about tree removal.

Mr. Lanza said the information on the tree removal is on the plan. The display was put up for reference.

Mr. Hoff said the sheet is the same as submitted in the plan set to the Board.

Mr. Lanza said they have a tree removal calculation, and that they did survey all the trees. There are some trees around the perimeters that will be taken out.

Mr. Ward noted 109 trees will be removed around the perimeter. Based on the calculations, there are 109 trees to be removed, and 218 trees required to be replaced. We will be replacing 327 trees.

- Ms. Gulliford asked the specific location of the two trees 25 feet / 25 inches.

Mr. Ward said they needed to look that up. He said if they can save them, they will.

Mr. Skobo said he had a concern about the fence around the perimeter. He said the fences require maintenance so that they do not show mold and become an eyesore.

Mr. Hoff said one of the advantages of having the owner have rentals is that these units will not be able to be rented if the fence and grounds are not maintained. Maintaining the property in an attractive fashion is part of the business, both to attract the residential and retail tenants. So there will be on-site maintenance for very much those issues and others to maintain an attractive and well-laid out site.

Secretary Hesthag asked to discuss further the need for the waivers in the retail area. He asked if the wider spots, in accordance with the ordinance, can still be considered.

Mr. Lanza stated he does a lot of retail design in urban areas, even a little more urban than this. Those are at most 9 ft. x 18 ft. for these kinds of stores. The traffic engineer may have an opinion, but for more suburban-type things, this is a very common size. It is good to have the ten ft. wide spaces for those stores where you use shopping carts, like grocery stores and big box stores

Secretary Hesthag asked if the majority of smaller strip have that same size.

Mr. Lanza said no, not 10 ft. wide.

Break

Mr. Hoff called his next witness.

Jack Raker, AIA, of Minno & Wasko was sworn in, reviewed his credentials, was accepted by the Board, and offered the following testimony:

Mr. Raker said he would first like to thank the Board for considering a mixed use on this site. The building plans being shown is one of these sorts of three modules.

Exhibit

- A-5** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (Types 2 & 3 Module)
- A-6** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (3 Module - Front Elevation)
- A-7** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (3 Module - Rear Elevation)
- A-8** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (3 Module - Side Elevation)
- A-9** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (Clubhouse)
- A-10** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (Clubhouse - Front Elevation)
- A-11** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (Concept Retail Elevation)
- A-12** - Colorized Architectural Drawing (Concept Bank Elevation)

Mr. Raker said the plan shows a series of pods that are put together. There is a number of different lengths of buildings; all make up of a series of configurations. He explained the green area shown consists of four dwelling units. In this pod there are two garages. Those garages will provide direct access to the two dwelling units. There are doors at the front and the back to access each dwelling unit. In this pod there is a one-bedroom, and a COAH one-bedroom. He described the garage locations and access for each. He explained the term "COAH" is used to label the low and moderate units. Mr. Raker identified the stairways and access points. Each pod will have on average, four dwelling units and two garages. The bumps and jogs, ins and outs, allow to articulate the variation in the elevation. The bumps and jogs create shadows on the building. He said they also turn gables and accent different color doors, as well as garage doors and fronts doors. Changed panel styles of the front doors, the use of different roof colors, and two different siding colors help to break up the mass of the building even more, as shown in exhibit A-6.

Mr. Raker said there are a total of 175 dwelling units of which 133 are market-rate units. There are 20 one-bedrooms, and 113 two-bedrooms in the market rate. The COAH units are regulated by the state. There are 8 one-bedrooms, 25 two-bedrooms, and 9 three-bedroom affordable units.

Mr. Raker said they use the same techniques for all of the buildings on site. Exhibit A-7 was displayed. All of the units have terraces/porches out the back, and ground-floor patios. Accent materials such as metal roofs and stone base and siding will be used to break up the end units. Exhibit A-8 was displayed.

Mr. Raker reviewed the clubhouse building. He said it is the face of the residential portion of the project for the public. The client will be leasing out of this area. If you want to rent an apartment, this is where you will go. Package deliveries and such will go to the clubhouse. It is a gathering space for all of the tenants. There will be a fitness center; club room, usually with a fireplace; a gathering space; T.V.'s. If you want to have a large gathering, you can have it in the clubhouse. He said many people have the ability to work at home some days. They can instead go down to the clubhouse and work in little office space, like a co-work space with a little conference rooms.

Mr. Raker reviewed there is a front entry off the street. There are leasing, package and storage rooms. The clubhouse is to the other side, which fronts a club room that fronts off a large pool terrace. Outside that pool terrace there will be barbecue grills, covered seating with trellis work. The residents cannot grill in the apartments. The clubhouse elevation was shown. The clubhouse is the prominent building on the site, and is essentially the face of the project. It looks as though there are two-stories, but there is not. The clubhouse has high ceilings, right now showing about a 12 ft. 6in. plate. The clubhouse is designed very similar to the other residential buildings, accented with stone, siding, and accent metal on the clubhouse. He said they can drop the roof down but like the way it looks. The planner will go over the reasons the variance is being requested.

Mr. Maski asked for clarification of the type of fencing around the pool. The site plan shows a six-foot high solid fence around the pool, which does not match the details in the construction plan.

Mr. Raker agreed to have that addressed in the plans. He elaborated more on some of the materials to be used on the exterior of the clubhouse and residential buildings. The buildings will be natural tones, using the same color palate throughout the development.

Mr. Raker explained the retail elevation is a place holder for the retail. The tenant may have some input as to what it ultimately looks like. He said, of course, we would come back to the Board. The retail building as shown (exhibit A-11), uses a lot of similar materials and earth tones. However, we have gone with a nice brownish-red brick and stucco, and accent metal roofs for the retail to differentiate it. A waiver is required for having a flat roof building. We did not think a low-sloped roof would be very attractive. A waiver is also necessary for having a punched window opening that only yields a 30 percent glazing, rather than sixty. The bank pad and elevation are mislabeled as retail, but looked at as retail. This is a smaller, narrower

footprint, so a pitched roof could be done here. All of the retail buildings comply with the height requirement.

Mr. Hoff asked Mr. Raker to address the differences in the residential pods, as previously described.

Mr. Raker said there are a couple of larger buildings in the plan. These are concept drawings. There are some areas in the plans where the rear is not articulated as much as submitted. Conceptually, we are going to do the same thing, no matter the length of the building. Each pod is going to be bumped and pushed, and will have articulation front and rear. The recesses or bumps are used to avoid a long monotonous elevation. We wanted to break it up with a variety of textures and materials.

Acting Chairman Julian said from an architectural standpoint, you are blending the project.

Mr. Raker agreed.

Acting Chairman Julian asked that the Planner's report be reviewed.

Mr. Maski referenced his report, page 6, General Comment #13. He asked what if any measures are being taken to mitigate the noise from the railroad and the Route 206 bypass, particularly the units that are backing on to the railroad?

Mr. Raker said they will be putting additional glazing that will mitigate the sounds. But with modern construction, the way the walls are thicker, and the new model energy codes; the walls are not going to be a problem at all. We will not have to do anything extra.

Mr. Maski said he was aware Minno & Wasko designed the units in Raritan Borough, next to the railroad. He commented there were some extra insulation, extra windows, for example for that.

Mr. Raker said yes, but the new model energy codes require the extra thick wall, anyway. So, we are okay.

Mr. Maski asked about the units near the bypass.

Mr. Raker said they had not thought about it, but can definitely do that if the Board feels it is necessary. Again, you know, modern construction, and the way these are going to be constructed, is pretty tight.

Mr. Maski advised Mr. Raker to only address his comments, starting on page 7 of his report, for the waivers necessary.

Mr. Raker said we are good with all of the general guidelines, and portion scale and massing.

Mr. Maski asked that Mr. Raker next address Comment #5 under (B), because of a sort of exception in the ordinance allowing to go beyond one hundred feet.

Mr. Raker said they are good with everything under B.

After some discussion, Mr. Maski suggested a waiver should be requested for the one-story retail buildings.

Mr. Maski asked where all of the HVAC equipment will be housed, and if it will be screened.

Mr. Raker said the HVAC equipment is shown on the site plan. There is a condenser outside for each unit. He said he believed all were screened in the landscape plans. The landscaper can talk more about that. He said for glazing though, we will not comply. They will probably be around thirty percent for all elevations.

Mr. Maski said you are not fronting on a street because of the bypass.

Mr. Raker said they are not and that a waiver would be needed.

Mr. Raker said they comply with all of the façade treatment and facade materials. We are not doing an arcade on the retail along the front of the retail. Although it was encouraged, they find retail stores do not like to be in shadows.

In response to Mr. Hoff's questions, Mr. Raker said he cannot imagine having four stores in the small retail buildings.

Mr. Hoff said so that is likely not an issue.

Mr. Raker agreed.

Mr. Hoff noted there are some awnings on the elevations.

Mr. Raker said some of the other items should be addressed by the civil engineer.

Mr. White said the outside condenser units are not shown on the architectural, site plan, or the landscape plan. So, they need to be added to the plan.

Mr. Hoff pointed the condenser units out on a plan.

Mr. White said they are not screened with landscaping as the testimony stated.

Mr. Lanza stated they can add more landscaping. He said from the right-of-way and from the road, you are not going to see them.

Mr. White said he was okay with that.

Committeeman DelCore asked for more details on the number of garages.

Mr. Raker said the garages are all functioning. There are 102 garages for 102 of the units. The rest of the parking is driveway or on-site. All of the units are one floor. There are some loft units. At the upper level there is a unit that has bedroom unit under the roof. Mr. Raker described Sheet A-10 from the architectural plan set. The under the roof bedroom is serviced by a set of stairs.

Committeeman DelCore said that is not just open space but is considered to be an additional bedroom? Apartment?

Mr. Raker said that is correct. It is a bedroom for that unit.

Committeeman DelCore asked where the parking for the non-garaged units is.

Mr. Raker said the parking is on-site and evenly distributed. If you are on an end-unit, you will park on the side or in these other space (shown on the exhibit).

Secretary Hesthag said so not every apartment has a parking spot in front.

Mr. Raker agreed.

Secretary Hesthag said so even in the middle where there are longer roads, there are roads that you can drive through but there is no parking on the street either.

Mr. Raker said that is correct.

Secretary Hesthag said so you have to walk from the kind of corner to your unit.

Mr. Raker said you would walk from your parking spot about 100 feet, 150 feet, which is not uncommon for apartments.

Committeeman DelCore asked if there were designated spots for each apartment or open parking.

Mr. Raker said the garages and driveways are definitely designated. The remainder is open - first come, first serve.
Open to the public.

Susan Gulliford - Hunt Club Road

- Ms. Gulliford asked if the unit with the loft is a three-bedroom unit.

Mr. Raker said the one shown was a two-bedroom unit. The three bedroom units are in some low and moderate units.

- Ms. Gulliford said there are 93 affordable units, but the loft is not?

Mr. Raker said no.

- Ms. Gulliford asked if any of the affordable units are going to be ADA compliant.

Mr. Raker said there are ADA compliant units are on the ground floor.

- Ms. Gulliford asked if the township gets more credits for that.

Question for another witness.

- Ms. Gulliford said on the front elevation, those smaller dormers on the top is a design element, not a living space.

Mr. Raker said that is correct.

- Ms. Gulliford said if the Board approves the variance for the community building, if it will be taller than the one around it. How does it compare to the retail buildings?

Mr. Raker responded it is not as tall as the residential buildings. It is a little bit taller than the tallest points of the retail buildings.

- Ms. Gulliford asked if there are other developments this group has done, and in particular, in central Jersey that is similar to this one.

Mr. Raker said there is a similar one, but three-stories, in South Amboy. Two-stories are somewhat rare to do in multi-family residential. It is not something we see a lot of.

Mr. Hoff called his next witness.

Brian Seidel, PP, was sworn in, reviewed his credentials, was accepted by the Board, and provided the following testimony in response to questions asked by Mr. Hoff:

Mr. Seidel addressed the variance requested for the height of the clubhouse. He said this variance would be characterized as a 'c' variance, and be approved under the criteria of a 'c'(2) a flexible variance. We are looking for primarily that the benefits outweigh the detriments on the variance itself. In this case, the difference between the 29 feet proposed verses the 20 feet allowed comes down to aesthetics. The requirement for the height variance is based on accessory structures themselves. While the clubhouse is accessory to the residential community, the appearance of the clubhouse should not be subordinate to the community. We are looking for the aesthetic character to be consistent with the other uses and other buildings within the community. The proposed clubhouse is a fairly substantial accessory building in terms of its footprint and its amenities. The increased floor area or floor to ceiling area, and the taller roof line is in keeping with the building, character, and overall scale of the building itself.

Mr. Seidel said he could think of no detriments associated. Unlike an accessory structure such as a shed or detached garage that are often close to the side or rear yard property boundaries, this accessory structure is a clubhouse that is central to the community. It is set back off the street and as the architect testified, it will be slightly taller than the retail buildings that are closer to the road. It will not be as tall as the residential buildings within the community. The scale of the building is appropriate here it will not have any negative appearance or negative impact on the outside community. The clubhouse will be buffered with vegetation to the rear.

Mr. Maski noted the previous testimony was that with regards to the buffer, the landscaping would comply with the ordinance.

No questions from the public.

The civil engineer, Mr. Lanza, was brought back up.

Mr. Maski said he would like to finish addressing the comments in his report, starting with page 10, pedestrian circulation and public and semi-public spaces and street furniture.

Mr. Lanza reiterated the sidewalks around the residential buildings are four-feet wide; the sidewalks in the retail area are a minimum of six-feet wide. A waiver is needed for the four-foot wide sidewalks.

Mr. Maski asked if crosswalks will be provided.

Mr. Lanza said they will have crosswalks. He again used exhibit A-3 for display. Painted crosswalks are provided to get to the retail space across Road 'A', and crosswalks at this intersection along Roads 'D' and Road 'C', as it crosses Road 'A'; crosswalks at Road 'E' and Road 'B'; crosswalks along Road 'B' and Road 'D'.

Mr. Maski said the ordinance requires enhanced crosswalks.

Mr. Lanza said we are just showing two stripes on the plans right now. This is not envisioned as a high-speed parking area or roadway where speed tables or anything fancier than that would be necessary. We are not proposing it but can entertain the idea of enhanced crosswalk areas.

Mr. Maski said there will be a lot of people at a school bus stop.

Mr. Lanza stated they can do something with texture and additional striping to the crosswalks.

Mr. White said his concern is with Road 'A', with the school children.

Mr. Lanza agreed to work up a revised plan to address those concerns.

Mr. Hoff called the traffic engineer.

Corey Chase, PE, of Bowman Consulting, was sworn in, reviewed his credentials, was accepted by the Board, and gave the following testimony, in response to questions asked by Mr. Hoff:

Mr. Chase confirmed he had reviewed the traffic report submitted to the Board, and the review memo from its professional. He stated they will comply with all of the comments in Mr. White's letter. He commented that Item #2 addresses a comparison between the volumes in the report before the Board and a prior report (for a different application), focused on the diversion that was assumed as a result of the bypass. The diversion that was assumed in this report is a little more conservative than the other report. Item #3 is related to potentially analyzing the Saturday peak hour and the impacts this development may have on that. The Saturday volumes on Route 206 are actually 25 percent lower than evening. The trip generation associated with the development is relatively the same. The weekday a.m. and p.m. represent the worst case scenario impacts on the roadway. So, a Saturday analysis will not be necessary, based on the lower volumes on the road and similar volumes generated by the site. However, if the Board feels it is necessary, we are amenable to doing the additional study. Mr. Chase stated they will comply with the Maser comments #4, 5 and 6.

Committeeman DelCore said the traffic is less now, but there is significant development going on, on the other side of Route 206 off of Mountain View that could drive traffic numbers up substantially.

Secretary Hesthag added not just on Saturdays, but evenings on weekdays

Mr. Chase said we considered that and it is part of this traffic study. We took into account the developments in the area, so they are reflected in the am and pm analysis. But certainly, if the Board feels that Saturday analysis is necessary, they would apply the same methodology to that as well.

Acting Chairman Julian asked if the driveway access would be signaled.

Mr. Chase confirmed it would not be signalized. There will be an exclusive left-turn lane to accommodate the left -turn movements into the site. The left-turn egress movement will be restricted. You will be able to make a right in from northbound Route 206; a left in from southbound Route 206, via a left-turn lane; and able to make a right out onto Route 206 northbound. Mr. Chase said as Mr. Lanza noted, when the bypass comes in the intersection of Mountain View is going to have a jug handle. So, you will have a short distance to go if you want to travel south on Route 206. You will be able to make the U-turn at the jug handle and then travel back south on Route 206. Mr. Chase said a concept application has been submitted to NJDOT and is under review. Ultimately, a major access permit will be issued for the driveway. He said given the close proximity to the bypass, they are in close discussions with the NJDOT to make sure we are all on the same page.

Committeeman DelCore asked for information on the restricted left-turn out.

Mr. Chase said the plan shows there is a channelizing island, which is actually a grass median. The driveway is going to be channelized, which will deflect people to go to the right when coming out. Committeeman Suraci said the median looks to be angled. He asked for more details on making a left in to the project.

Mr. Chase showed Exhibit A-4. He said the rendering is a little bit deceptive because it shows the future bypass curb line, which does not exactly meet the existing curb line of Route 206. In the future, Route 206 is going to be widened with striping along Route 206 separating northbound and southbound. Then there will be a dedicated left-turn lane southbound on Route 206 to serve the subject property driveways. Vehicles traveling south would be able to enter this left-turn lane, and then make a left turn into the site.

Committeeman Suraci asked how many cars can stack up in that left-turn lane.

Mr. Chase said the left-turn lane is approximately 150 feet long, which can accommodate six to seven cars. That would be more than adequate for this development.

Committeeman Suraci said even though there is a traffic light further down, you will have cars stacking both ways during typical evening rush.

Mr. Chase said the study showed this driveway to be an acceptable level of Service 'C'. The signals to the north and south actually platoon the traffic along the corridor. So, you will see a platoon of cars go by, and then there will be large gaps in traffic that will follow.

Committeeman Suraci disagreed. He said Route 206 in the evening, Route 601 and Route 206 where it converges, as soon as the light changes you have another band of cars coming through. He said there will not be much of a break during rush hours.

Mr. Chase stated the benefit of having that left-turn lane is that it will provide an area for vehicles to stage and wait. It is not going to impede anyone traveling southbound on Route 206. He said the left-turn lane has been over-designed to accommodate additional traffic and vehicle stacking.

Mr. Chase reiterated this design has been discussed with NJDOT, and that they have collectively come together to develop this design that we feel is going to be adequate for the development.

Committeeman Suraci asked for clarification on the parties involved in the decision.

Mr. Chase said the applicant and NJDOT.

Committeeman Suraci asked Mr. White his opinion.

Mr. White said he could not supersede DOT, but concurs with the plan.

Committeeman DelCore asked to confirm there is plenty of room for the ingress and egress of buses and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Chase said that was correct.

Susan Gulliford - Hunt Club Road

- Ms. Gulliford asked if they are looking for a 2021 build-out on this project.

Mr. Chase said that was correct.

- Ms. Gulliford asked if the assumption is that the jug handle will be completed by then.

Mr. Chase said yes.

- Ms. Gulliford said the Apex Traffic Impact Assessment was reviewed for this application. The traffic study also looked at Country Classics in Montgomery. However, the Apex numbers, which were considerably higher, were not included. In fact, the Apex peak hour was considered 5:15pm to 6:15pm. The peak hour here was 5:00pm to 6:00pm, which is within fifteen minutes, but the total numbers during your peak was 125.

Mr. Chase agreed with the count.

- Ms. Gulliford said the Apex was 346 trips, with most of them coming from Apex out the highway. She asked if the trips from the new park are going to be included. How will 346 trips from Apex affect that traffic light and the traffic at that corner?

Mr. Chase said the trips associated with Apex are actually included in our study. They are included as part of the background. So, even though Apex's peak hour is slightly later than ours, we took their site generated traffic and included it as part of the background. All of the traffic from that area is reflected in our analysis.

- Ms. Gulliford asked if they also included the NJDOT one percent per year increase.

Mr. Chase said that was correct.

Mr. Hoff notified Acting Chairman Julian he had no more affirmative witnesses but have a number of professionals available to answer questions.

Mr. Maski asked to have a professional to address his comment regarding the Community Impact Analysis.

Mr. Hoff said the Planner can address any questions, but Mr. McDonough is not in attendance.

Mr. Maski said he had asked the Township's Tax Assessor to review the report. The Assessor concurred with the final analysis with some comments. The retail in the introduction notes 6,667 sq. ft. when in reality it is 12,500 sq. ft. on page 5 it references approximately 20,000 sq. ft. when again, it is 12,500 sq. ft. Our Tax Assessor, Ms. Blaney, did not think that was enough to skew the data, since one will essentially offset the other. The tax rate cited on page 7 is inaccurate. It should be \$2.419 for 2018, which would change the total to \$682,963. However, Ms. Blaney felt the more accurate tax would be \$650,000. Again, she did not think the differential was enough to invalidate the impact assessment.

Mr. Hoff offered to have those revisions addressed and resubmit, for the sake of the record.

Mr. Peason said he also had a comment on the CIS, page 7. He said in the conventional tax allocation, the school board amount is at 101,000 and the county tax is at 450. It looks as though those numbers were inverted. Also on page 9, it has a per capita cost based on the Taxpayer's Guide to Education Spending at 3,000 per capita cost - assuming that is per pupil. Roughing out a total education cost, not including any state, federal or other aid, shows \$105,000. Mr. Peason said he looked at the Taxpayer's Guide to Education Spending, which lists \$18,996, of which 67.1 percent is born by the local government, for a total of \$12,746 per student, putting the total cost more around \$446,000. He asked that the expert re-look at the report and confirm those numbers.

Mr. Hoff agreed. He said he did not want there to be that kind of discrepancy.

Committeeman DelCore asked if there was a witness who could speak to the general business model of the apartments, marketing, pricing, and the like.

Mark Pantirer, Member of 206, the LLC, was sworn in and provided the following testimony in response to questions asked by Mr. Hoff:

Mr. Pantirer said they will own the residential portion, and own and operate the property. As was mentioned, the intention is to build 175 apartments. The clubhouse will be utilized to staff a leasing team. All apartments will be rentals. The pricing for the free-market, or the non-affordable units will probably start somewhere in the high teens and go from there. As the market fills it up, it will adjust accordingly.

Committeeman DelCore asked for pricing for one-bedroom verses a two, and how they will be managed.

Mr. Pantirer said a one-bedroom would be around \$1,700, and somewhere in the mid-\$2,000's, including the garage, for the two-bedrooms. He said they will self-perform as the maintenance and manager of the property.

Committeeman DelCore asked how many employees will be on site at any given time.

Mr. Pantirer they will have a live-in Super who will be there to answer maintenance requests, and a leasing person who will be there roughly five days a week during leasing hours. That would be the extent of the on-site employees, but there may or may be more on the maintenance side, as needed.

Committeeman DelCore asked from a build-out perspective, what will be built first?

Mr. Pantirer said they have not staged it just yet, but will build-out the clubhouse and first set of apartments.

Acting Chairman Julian asked if there was any information on the retail.

Mr. Pantirer said the retail will be a little bit of a wait and see. He said they are going to want to have some input on design and opening up, but hope to find a tenant soon.

Mr. Maski asked how sure Mr. Pantirer was about getting a bank in.

Mr. Pantirer said they designed for a drive-through bank, to the extent that a bank would come. But if a bank is not the ultimate tenant there, then we would come in and possibly re-design that drive-thru entry.

Mr. Maski asked if he could summarize prior to a vote. First of all, this application requires a height variance for the clubhouse; a waiver for the commercial parking space stalls size; a waiver for providing a hose connection at the trash enclosures; and a waiver for the size of the monument sign. He said as a footnote, it is understood that the applicant is not getting any other signage approved at that point, and that would come in as a sign package when the detailed plans come in.

Mr. Hoff agreed.

Mr. Maski continued with the summary. The application needs a waiver for providing the five ft. sidewalk and ten ft. wide planting strip, et cetera, along Route 206; and several waivers from the ASDO standards as follows: from Section 188, 175 of the ordinance, D.1 has to do with single-story buildings; C.1(d) has to do with flat roofs; D.1(b) has to do with the entrances; D.2(c) has to do with the ground floor display windows; for lighting, to be exact, to exceed the maximum foot candles on the lighting; I.1(g) four ft. sidewalks instead of a minimum of five; the arcades are encouraged, that is not a "shall", so it should not be included; and that the stormwater outfall into the stream corridor was the other waiver.

Mr. White concurred everything was addressed.

Mr. Maski added, this is for preliminary and final site plan approval.

Mr. Hoff agreed.

Mr. George advised the Board an approval would be for all waivers and variances just summarized on the record, and shown during the testimony along with all of the indications as the experts did attune their testimony to the actual paragraphs of the reports that were submitted as to "will comply" or as to waivers requested.

Mr. Hoff said he agreed with the summation and had nothing further, other than thanking the Board for its time.

Acting Chairman Julian asked for any comments from the public.

Susan Gulliford - Hunt Club Road

- Ms. Gulliford said Mr. Peason started to bring up the cost of the children there. She said she was disappointed the Community Impact Analysis was not discussed more. With 416 anticipated persons living there at 2.38 per unit, she said she did not understand how they came up with only 35 children attending public schools. Were they anticipating a certain number attending private school?
- Ms. Gulliford said in the olden days, when you had a low-income unit with three bedrooms, it was assumed the two extra bedrooms were children of the opposite sex. Therefore, having two children in only those nine units, gives you eighteen right there. She said she was disappointed the 35 was not explained more.

Acting Chairman Julian asked Mr. Hoff if he wanted to address the concern.

Mr. Hoff said the Community Impact Statement is a checklist item. He again stated they will make the revisions discussed to clarify the report for purpose of the record. The Board knows what it can and cannot address. Mr. Hoff said if I show you a good bottom line number as to fiscal impact, I would not want you to approve it based on that. And, for similar reasons, for those that create a negative impact, the Board cannot turn down an application for those considerations, but understand why the Board wants them for informational purposes.

Mr. Hoff said there is a back and forth as to whether the project will be a financial positive or a net financial negative. That goes down a road where this Board knows it cannot consider for purposes of a site application. This is a permitted use in the zone. The fiscal impact statement is an estimate; maybe there will be more children, maybe less, but the Board is without jurisdiction to let that weigh on the decision-

making. He said so we provide the information for informational purposes, we do not want this Board to be considering that as part of the application. Mr. Hoff said from a land use perspective, they had satisfied all the criteria they were supposed to. To consider those contemporaneous types of issues, while again for the community, are outside the jurisdiction of this Board.

Mr. George stated Counsel is correct. The courts have decided over and over again that it cannot be used as a sole criterion to grant or deny an application. However, the Township would appreciate the clarifications raised by Mr. Peason.

Committeeman Suraci said the correction would be helpful because the school board weighed in, but strictly on the number of students. If that number gets revised, it should be submitted back to school board for their opinion. Having the correct information is important for planning purposes, and for the services that are provided. That is really the point of the Community Impact Statement. He said it is more of a PR to come with a conclusion that there will be a net position; most likely it is not. We know that the courts have already ruled with affordable housing, and do not care about infrastructure.

Mr. Hoff said the point was well taken. He said he will have Mr. McDonough double-check the figures and make corrections to address all of the comments raised.

Committeeman Del Core commented this application addresses some of the township's affordable housing obligation, and does a nice job of mixing in various components in a little complex. He said he wanted to caution that there is a distinction between number of children and number of school-age children. So, 35 may not be all of the children in the report. There are younger age children that may not be considered in that number since they are not getting on the bus or taking advantage of the school every day. Although at the end of the day we cannot consider those impacts, it is good to understand where the numbers come from so the Township can then try to work with the schools, to make sure that the amenities and services that need to, are provided. The more accurate, the more reasonable the assumptions are in terms of what's generally accepted in terms of the assumptions made.

Committeeman Suraci asked Mr. George if there was any way to put a stipulation or deed restriction that would require a homeowner's association. He said his experience is that apartments can be broken apart at some point and the buildings sold off individually.

Mr. Hoff said that would involve a subdivision and would require the applicant to come back to a board.

After a brief discussion on the number of variances theoretically needed for such an action, Mr. George commented that any action to condominiumize the buildings would by both state law and local ordinance, mandate having a homeowners association.

Acting Chairman Julian called for a motion.

A motion to approve Hillsborough 206 Holdings LLC, file #18-PB-07-MSPV, was made by Mr. Peason, seconded by Mr. Skobo.

Roll Call: Mr. Peason - yes; Committeeman Suraci - yes; Committeeman DelCore - yes; Mr. Wagner - yes; Secretary Hesthag - yes; Mr. Skobo - yes; Acting Chairman Julian - yes. Motion carries.

CORRESPONDENCE

None

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Maski said this concludes the meetings for the year. The reorganization meeting is scheduled for January 10, 2019 at 7pm, with a regular meeting following at 7:30pm.

Acting Chairman thanked the members of the Board, and professionals for their service to the Planning Board, and wished all present happy holidays.

A motion was adjourn was made and seconded. All were in favor; motion carries.

The meeting adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

*Submitted by:
Debora Padgett
Office Administrator / Planning Board Clerk
(Application minutes drafted from review of transcript)*