

MINUTES

CRESSKILL PLANNING BOARD

JULY 28, 2020

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting at 7:33 PM and announced the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act had been fulfilled.

Members present at roll call:

Mayor Romeo, Councilman Kaplan (via phone), Mr. Morgan, Ms. Bauer, Mr. Mandelbaum, Mr. Rummel, Ms. Tsigounis, Mr. Ulshoefer and Mr. Sutura. Also present were Mr. Stamos, Planning Board Attorney, and Mr. Azzolina, Borough Engineer.

Ms. Tsigounis made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 14, 2020, meeting, seconded by Ms. Bauer. All present were in favor of the motion. Motion approved.

Correspondence

Letter of Introduction from Mr. Bob Rusch, Construction Official, dated July 17, 2020, sending a representative for JHL Dental to this Board for approval. They would like to open a dental office at 210 Knickerbocker Road, 1st Floor. It has been a dental office for over 50 years and they just purchased it. The dentist has practiced in New Jersey for four years. She graduated from the dental school in Long Island and then was in Connecticut for two years and then came to New Jersey. The dentist that used to be there has retired and she purchased the place and plans on renovating the space. She will submit plans to the Building Department for the renovations. She will probably have the drawings in two to three weeks and will submit them to the Building Department. Mr. Mandelbaum made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Ulshoefer. All present were in favor. Motion approved. Memo given to the Building Department stating the Board's approval.

Subdivision Committee

Ms. Tsigounis had nothing to report.

Report from the Borough Engineer's Office

Mr. Azzolina had nothing to report.

Old Business

None.

Resolution for Application #1560, 368 12th Street, John & Stephanie Hroncic was introduced by Ms. Bauer, seconded by Ms. Tsigounis. On Roll Call: Mayor Romeo, Ms. Bauer, Mr. Mandelbaum, Ms. Tsigounis, and Mr. Rummel all voted yes. Mr. Calder is no longer on the Planning Board and Mr. Malone was absent. Motion approved. The original resolution shall become a permanent part of these minutes.

Public Hearing – Application #1559 – 1 Union Avenue

Mr. Mark Madaio was present representing the applicant. His offices are on Legion Drive in Bergenfield, NJ. Mr. Madaio stated that the application should feel a little familiar to the Board for a couple of reasons. About 10 years ago, this application was presented, and by “this application” he means substantially similar as far as footprint and size, and somewhat different in the apartment unit number, but a substantially similar version of this application was presented. Mr. Madaio presented Mr. Stamos with the notice documents.

The property is located at 1 Union Avenue, and it is Block 74, lots 47 and 47.03. This was approved in conjunction with them granting to the Borough what is now referred to as the municipal parking lot. The parking area that is behind this property has now been provided to the Borough by easement and is hopefully the beginning of a nice downtown parking area behind several of the prominent stores and hopefully behind what they are proposing here. The application that they will present, again, is substantially similar to what was approved 10 years ago, but the project that was approved 10 years ago had a couple of drawbacks that were just insurmountable. They know that because it has been 10 years and it hasn't been built. In the last 10 years, and in everything that has happened in real estate, and in everything that has happened in Cresskill, and in everything that has happened in construction, somehow this project didn't get built. And that's because, as originally approved, it just doesn't work that well.

One of the ways it doesn't work that well is the project sort of has an original problem. That problem is, the project as approved in 2010, provides for the construction of effectively an addition to the existing bank. That really was the project 10 years ago. It was not a clean slate. It was an addition to the existing bank structure. As 10 years has gone by and we look at that existing bank structure, they realize that it is not part of serving the primary anchor for the downtown. The hope here is the project will be substantially similar, but it will start out with a fresh piece of earth. The bank will be torn down and gone. It will be all new. Nothing here will be an add-on or a tack-on. In doing it all new from the beginning, they get some benefits.

The first benefit is, when they remove the existing bank, they remove its variances. The existing bank has variances. Eliminating that bank eliminates the yard setback variances that are pertinent to that bank and which are grandfathered and approved as part of the property. The bank was the end of the center. The bank had a drive-thru. That won't happen anymore. One of the things they are presenting tonight, which they think makes this substantially better and different and warrants some of the changes, is that they have taken a bank drive-thru located very near the corner of Union and Piermont and gotten rid of it. There will no longer be a bank drive-thru. The bank will exist, but it will be one of the interior spaces. That, by itself, the elimination of cars potentially backing onto Union and the configuration of any drive-thru, he thinks they tolerate a lot of drive-thrus, but he doesn't think any town or Board looks forward to creating drive-thrus. So, there is a value to eliminating that.

The impact and look of the facility on Union will be entirely different than what was originally provided. That is to say, it is a different builder, it is a different developer, it is more of what he thinks is a destination look rather than a block of stores in the downtown. You will see that it looks a lot more upscale, a lot more like a Tice Mall. Those are the fit, the finishes, and the looks and the lighting that they will be presenting this evening. They will be eliminating the driveway onto Union. In total, the footprint of this building versus the footprint of the building 10 years ago, is about a 500 square foot difference. When they are talking about a 10,000 square foot building that was approved 10 years ago and never built, they are talking about a very small difference, relatively speaking, and they will show where that 500 square feet goes. Where it goes is necessary and makes sense.

The other thing they will indicate is that it was approved for seven residential units upstairs. Of those seven residential units, two were to be affordable. And of those units, which of course were never built and in the current configuration likely would not be built, Mr. Madaio thinks that they were already counted towards the affordable housing obligation. So, some might say, well this approval is an awful long time ago. The fact is, they are still married to this. They still need to do the project, and the Borough has counted the units that were approved ten years ago to the affordable housing obligations. They need to get done one way or another. The difference is seven units, two are affordable, and this proposes 11 units, two are affordable. That's the current math that applies with the Fair Share Housing settlement agreement. It is 15% of 11, which is 1.65 he believes. The idea here is to finally build something where they produce those units that are currently being counted as Borough obligations.

There are some other minor variances. There is roughly the same parking variance. The additional square footage doesn't very much change the parking configuration, but there is a slight deviation on the parking. One of the things Mr. Madaio wanted to point out is that they do not need a density variance. As they proceed, maybe there will be some discussion that there are too many units. Understand that this project is entirely a permitted use in the zoning ordinance. They are not asking for a use variance. They are not asking for a deviation based on density. In other words, by the zoning schedule, this number of units fits, and you do not need that additional D variance that would be required for density.

Having said all of that, Mr. Madaio, wished to call the engineer and stated that he doesn't even think there is an engineering report because it is essentially the same item that was put in front of the Board 10 years ago, but it is worth taking a moment to take a look at that to make sure we all know what we are talking about. Mr. Madaio called Mr. Bob Muller from Hubschman Engineering, 263 S. Washington Street, Bergenfield as his first witness.

Mr. Stamos noted that he reviewed the notices and everything appears to be in order. Technically, he noted that the prior approval that Mr. Madaio keeps referring to has expired. Mr. Madaio acknowledges that it has expired but feels that they are still married to the affordable housing obligation on this property. Mr. Muller was sworn in by Mr. Stamos. He is a licensed land surveyor and has been licensed since 1992. He has worked on this project and agrees that it is basically the exact building as the prior approved plan and the town has not produced an engineering report.

Mr. Muller noted that the lot is on the corner of Union and Piermont and is currently occupied by Connect One Bank. There is a small driveway that comes in off of Piermont and the rest is pretty much green area. There is a driveway that comes in off of Union Avenue that is an ingress for the property. There is a parking lot with 26 parking stalls with two handicap spaces. You exit on the north side of the property onto Allen Street where you make a left. The topography that currently exists is very level. There is barely a foot of change in elevation from north to south. When it is built it will be very similar to what you have there now. The date of the plans is February 20, 2020. The revision date is July 6, 2020. This set is marked as Exhibit A1.

Mr. Madaio marked as Exhibit A2, a copy of the Easement Agreement done in August 2009, where the predecessor gave the rights of the entire parking lot to the Borough to be used as a downtown parking area. They are going to have a parking shortfall with this, just as they did last time, but that parking shortfall tradeoff last time around and the tradeoff for that this time around is the fact that they gave all of their parking to the downtown area, except for the parking as it relates to the units.

Mr. Madaio asked Mr. Muller to go over the proposed building. Mr. Muller stated that what they propose to do is take down the bank and build a new 10,855 square foot building. It will have six retail units on the first floor and 11 apartments above. They will be doing a whole new streetscape, adding two light poles on Piermont, adding four trees, two on Piermont and two on Union Avenue, redoing all the pavers, making a sidewalk along side the building and make the driveway a little bit smaller so people can walk around the building. They will be adding five trees back in the parking lot. There will be some drainage to pick up the increased impervious coverage on there and a seepage pit. Those are the major additions. All the amenities that the building needs are based in the footprint.

Mr. Madaio asked Mr. Muller about the side yard setback where 5.6 was previously approved and 7.85 is proposed, so the side yard setback is larger than previously approved, and he doesn't believe any such side yard setback is required by code. Mr. Muller noted that it is not required, and he is talking about the side yard on the north side of the building and it is showing a 5.6 setback. Mr. Muller explained that as far as parking, they are supposed to have 83 spaces and they are providing 26 spaces, with two ADA spaces. Mr. Madaio stated that on the prior approval they were providing 26 on a demand of 79 spaces. This go round they are providing 26 on a demand of 83. All 26 have been given to the Borough.

Mr. Madaio stated that for the residential units, originally seven were approved and they are proposing 11. The residential units have a limitation of 15 per acre and their request, whether it is seven or 11, is completely conforming. The maximum number of studio or one-bedroom apartments, and this comes from the affordable housing code, is 20%, and they are actually providing 50%. They are trying to provide a greater number of one-bedroom or no bedroom units. Even though it requires a variance, it is a variance so that they try to not build as many bedrooms. The number of three bedrooms units, 20% is mandatory under the Borough code. They currently propose zero. That is so they provide the least amount of bedrooms. If the town mandates that they provide a three-bedroom unit or more two-bedroom units or less of anything else, they will follow whatever the Borough's plan mandates. But their intention is to do this with as little of that as possible.

Mr. Madaio stated that signage is important to the retail businesses. They want a sign in front and may want a sign in back since you can enter the stores from the back. It is different than almost any other store downtown. It exceeds the permitted zoning, but it doesn't exceed what your eye would be comfortable with and what is commonly accepted as part of signage in a current building. There are 13 total signs. The height from grade, there are some signage that is a little bit off on height. The total sign area is 305.7 square feet. The ordinance is really not designed for multi-tenant space. It is designed for one-story, one sign.

Those are the variances that they seek. Mr. Muller explained that it is pretty much the same application except they are getting rid of the existing bank and just putting a few units above the new bank. Mr. Madaio stated that the bank that is currently there was going to be proposed as attached to this property as an endcap with a two-story atrium. The existing bank was to have a drive-thru and be two-stories high. That meant that there were no second-floor apartments in the atrium of the bank. There was 2,500 square feet of the second floor that was really bank atrium. When the bank and the drive-thru were eliminated, and the bank is now just a one story bank in the middle of the mall somewhere, they now have 2,500 extra square feet of the second floor that's not floating in the air anymore. It's now freed up for use. You will note that many of the smaller units they have are anywhere between six or seven-hundred square feet. He noted that there are configuration changes that enables them to add four units, but a big chunk of that four units is the fact that there is no longer an atrium for the bank. They can't just end the second floor in the middle of it. They intend to build an entire second floor and it's 2,500 square feet larger than the last time around because there is no longer an atrium. That's where they pick up most of the area to put more units.

Mr. Madaio passed out Exhibit A3, which is a comparison of the past approval and the present proposal. Mr. Muller noted that the retail in the 2009 approval was 9,926 square feet and, in the proposal, it is 10,334 square feet. It is a difference of 408 square feet. The retail has gotten bigger by 408 square feet and in exchange for that, they eliminate the drive-thru and they eliminate the endcap bank. There were five one-bedrooms approved in 2009 and there are six one-bedrooms in the proposal. There were two two-bedrooms in the 2009 approval and there are five two-bedrooms in the proposal. The height in the approval in 2009 was 34 feet and they are proposing 33 feet. Either one conforms. The building footprint in 2009 was 10,320 square feet and they are proposing 10,855 square feet. The impervious coverage that was approved in 2009 was 30,575 square feet and the proposal now is 32,518 square feet. That is an increase of 1,583 square feet. The percentage of coverage in the 2009 approval was 89.2% and the proposed is 94.85%. The parking demand in 2009 was 80 spaces and the current demand is 83 spaces. The existing building to remain in 2009 was 2,426 square feet and the proposed is zero because they are removing the bank. The addition in 2009, because in 2009 the bank was staying and they were adding on to it, was 7,894 square feet, and the proposal is a footprint of 10,334 square feet.

Mr. Stamos asked if the square footage goes up by 5,000 square feet and the bedrooms go up from nine to 15, why does the parking spaces only go up by three. Mr. Muller explained that the parking spaces are dependent on the retail space, which is 10,334 square feet divided by 150 equals 69 spaces. In the residential, there is 11 units times 1.25 spaces is 14 spaces for a total of 83 spaces. Ms. Tsigounis asked if it was based on the unit or the bedrooms. There was some disagreement as to whether the residential parking was calculated based on the unit or the number of bedrooms.

Mr. Madaio called the architect, Mr. Christiano Pereira, as his next witness. Mr. Pereira, CPA Architecture, 6401 Park Avenue, West New York, NJ, was sworn in by Mr. Stamos. He is a licensed architect in the State of New Jersey. He has been licensed in New Jersey for six years. He has owned his own practice for 15 years. He is licensed in the states of New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Maryland, Virginia and a few other ones. He has testified before many Boards in New Jersey. He has testified in all the surrounding towns but has not testified in Cresskill.

Mr. Pereira is the architect on this project. He designed the colored rendering and it was marked as Exhibit A4. The corner of Piermont and Union is such an important corner. This is what anchors the downtown. It is what anchors the shopping district. What the client said is he really would love to put something here that would really set the tone of what happens in the downtown. The way they tried to design the building was exactly that. They didn't want anything that would overburden the corner. So, as Mr. Madaio mentioned, not only are they below a foot on the building height that was previously proposed, they are really a lot less than that because that is the dimension that measures to the top of the stairs that gives access to the roof. The building really feels much smaller. It is about 26 feet to the roof. It is a much smaller structure.

The other thing that they wanted to do is they wanted the building to have a feeling of being a corner gem. The material choices and the way they intentionally illuminate it and the way they intentionally use materials on the lower floor, of course with a lot of glazing because you have a lot of retail here, is meant to attract people, and a lot of people know there is a whole district here, please come in a visit our town. They have a lot of brick and glazing store fronts, a lot of lighting, the signage, as Mr. Madaio mentioned, and you can see here, these are signage dimensions that are being recommended by many of the national retailers that are looking to rent spaces like this. There is a minimum of square footage they want, and a minimum height, and he thinks you can see that there is nothing that is jumping out at you. They intend to standardize the signage with a darker background and lighter font. Something very classy as you can see in the rendering.

As you transition to the residential, they also transition the language of the building to something more residential, so they had to figure sections of the building with a nicer groove with a metal finish to it with some details around the windows, beautiful windows with grills, and a corner presence. The corner has a canopy that really sets the tone. The two wings of the building that face both streets, with the corner being round, allows them to orient the building parallel to the two streets and really set that tone. They set the building back. There is some lighting in all the retail as well as on the upper floor of the building. He pointed out the stair shaft where they measure the top height of 33 feet.

Mr. Madaio noted that Mr. Pereira stated that the corner of the building is now rounded. The existing approved structure is not rounded, there is a jog. Mr. Pereira explained that the prior approval had a semi-rounded corner, but it didn't anchor the two sections of the building. It transitioned without anchoring. They felt it was important to follow that grade of the street and let the building be consistent through the intersection. Mr. Madaio noted that following the curvature of the road is another thing that they are changing from the 2009 approval. Mr. Pereira wanted to mention that they paid a lot of attention to creating a structure that is accessible. They do have a lot of people that live in town and are retired and want to stay in town, but they don't necessarily want to take care of a home or take care of their gardens. Finding quality residential spaces like this is very hard. He thinks they are doing something extremely right here where the zoning is allowing this. This will allow some people to stay here. To that point, this is probably one of the few buildings you have in town that has an elevator to the residential units on the second floor. He believes a lot of the buildings do have residential units on the ground floor, but a building with residential

on the second floor with an elevator, he doesn't believe we have many. He thinks that is an important thing to point out.

Mr. Madaio asked for a comparison on the footprint and a comparison on the second floor. He wants the Board comfortable that this is not way bigger than the last time around in any sense. Exhibit A5 was marked as the comparison of the 2009 approval and the proposed. The prior approval from 2009 is the red line and the current application is the regular line. In the 2009 approval, the frontage was not rounded, it had a jog in it. What they propose is rounding the frontage to be the same roundness of the corner. They pick up some square feet there. The biggest space where they pick up some square feet is the back entry to the bank which becomes the back entry to the stores. The two places where this is bigger is the curve to follow the road and the back of the bank, which is about 300 square feet in the back, which is divided into three retail spaces. That is the size comparison.

Mr. Madaio marked the second floor comparison as Exhibit A6. Again, the red is the prior approval from 2009 and the regular line is what they are proposing. In 2009, there was no second floor because the bank was an atrium. That 300 square feet from the first floor they put a second floor on top of it. Mr. Pereira noted that not only are they picking up a little bit of square footage for one of the apartments, but they are giving a terrace to one of the units, so that is not livable area. The second floor also bears the same curve as the first floor. When they talk about an addition of 400-500 square feet overall, a little bit is in the front and a little bit is in the back, and other than that, it is exactly the same second floor, except the space over where the bank was didn't exist before because it was the atrium of the bank. Now they can actually use that space.

Mr. Pereira stated that the original plans were dated February 2, 2020, and the revised plans are dated July 16, 2020. On the northeast side of the building you have a set of stairs and an elevator. This is also the residential lobby. You can take the stairs down to get access to the utility rooms where the meters are. The elevator goes up to the second floor where the residential units are. The retail spaces range anywhere between 1,312 to 2,707 square feet. They also have a second means of egress for the residential units on the upper floor towards the other side of the building. That allows ingress and egress from the apartments. This is very close to the garbage area, so it is very convenient. They did allow a door access to the rear of the lobby where the parking is to every single one of the retail spaces. That is why they have signage located in the rear on the property.

The driveway is a single driveway that is about 20 feet wide. They did create a five-foot sidewalk along the side of the building where the bank was. There are ADA parking spaces and ADA ramps in the sidewalk. Mr. Madaio noted that the ability to put in that sidewalk and change it to one lane is because they eliminated the drive-thru lane. There was a drive-thru lane and a by-pass lane. The entry can now get narrower and still provide a sidewalk. There is no more cuing in that driveway.

Sheet A1.02 shows the second-floor residential units. It shows the stairs, elevator, double-loaded corridor. There are units facing the street and units facing the back. This is where they distribute the one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. It is a very clean layout. The units are very nice. All the two-bedroom units have two bathrooms. All the one-bedrooms have one bathroom. Plenty of space and plenty of natural light.

Mr. Madaio stated that the entire architectural set will be marked as Exhibit A7. Mr. Pereira turned to Sheet A1.03, which is the roof plan. They took a lot of care in laying out the units to provide shafts for any of the retail spaces that are down below. They provided shafts in all the retail spaces, so all the layouts are worked around such shafts. All the boxes marked with "Xs" are the retail shafts. All the other machines are the rooftop units. The retail spaces will have a rooftop unit for heat and cooling and the residential units will most likely have central air which will require a condenser which will be placed on the roof. That is the reason they brought the stair shaft all the way up so there was easy access to the roof without using ladders. Ms. Bauer asked if they will be visible from the street. Mr. Pereira said that they will not be visible from the street. They are low units and they will be hidden by the parapets. Mr. Madaio wanted to reiterate that the second floor is served by an elevator in addition to the two stairways. Also, the entire building is fully sprinklered.

Mr. Pereira also noted that all the units will be adaptable for ADA as they are required to do for a building with an elevator. In terms of elevation, the height of 33 feet is at the top of the stair shaft. The top of the roof is at elevation 25. They were conservative when they put the dimension in terms of height. They are way below what they require, which is 44.

Their clients own a lot of real estate related to retail and a lot of those retailers are asking for a certain size signage. What they wanted to do is approach this now. This is what they are all asking for and they are asking for about 30" in height for their sign or logo, and the thought is to have something consistent, but also very elegant, which is dark background, and ask them to use the light or white version of the logo or letters so it really stands out at night. They have signage for each retail. The corner retail has signage on both sides so you can see it from both Piermont and Union.

On Sheet A2.01, there are a few other elevations which shows the signage for the retail spaces and a little sign for the residential entrance. As far as materials, they intend to use a few shades of brick for the lower façade and a lot of glazing. On the top floor they plan to use some stucco on the top floor with the metal roof finishes. In the back, they intend to carry some of the same material, except for the top floor in the rear they plan to use some fiber cement planking.

Mr. Madaio asked if he needed to show the affordable units or if it didn't matter. Mr. Pereira noted that they don't show it, but they need to provide a two-bedroom unit and in the review memo that he received it mentions that they also need to provide a three-bedroom unit. They currently don't have a three-bedroom unit laid out into the plan right now, but they did look and see where they could fit a three-bedroom unit and they have a large two-bedroom unit that is a corner that they could convert into a three bedroom with no difficulty. They could do that and easily comply. Mr. Madaio asked if all the units were fit finished quality the same. It doesn't matter which one is the affordable unit per se, because they all have the same faucets, they all have the look, they all have the same finishes and appliances. It's relatively speaking a uniform construction. In the event the town compels them to include a three-bedroom unit, they can do that. They have tried to stay as close as possible to what the prior approval was for smaller units. But if it is required under the settlement of Fair Share Housing, they will of course do whatever the town's planner tells them they are supposed to do.

Mr. Madaio called his next witness, Mr. John McDonough, 101 Gibraltar Drive, Morris Plains, NJ, who was sworn in by Mr. Stamos. Mr. McDonough is a licensed professional planner in the State of New Jersey. He has been licensed about 30 years. He has been a planner for some towns and well as some applicants. He has testified in surrounding towns, but not in Cresskill.

Mr. Madaio marked the planner's exhibit package that was handed out as Exhibit A8. Mr. McDonough noted that this is a nine-page exhibit and all it is really going to do is give the Board some orientation to see all the sites not far from where they are right now to create some context in terms of where this site lays, what the surrounding area looks like, and how this development that is proposed is well suited to accommodate what the applicant is proposing. The first sheet shows the two tax lots, Block 74, Lot 47.03, which is actually a vacant lot, and Block 74, Lot 47, which is developed as the bank, which under the original plan was to be retained and sort of forced the development under the prior plan, as opposed to now where they are really dealing with a clean slate and they are able to establish a much nicer solution when they are not forced to work around that bank that is there now.

As you have heard, there are a number of positives that come out of taking the bank out of the equation and starting from scratch. The lot is approximately three-quarters of an acre. It has that nice wrap-around around the corner of Union Avenue and Piermont Road. The building is going to nicely respond to that corner with a nice rounding that wasn't there before. You had some forced jogs in the building that are going to go away in terms of what the applicant is going to do now. Mr. Pereira has come up with a real nice classy look that is going to anchor this corner and be a gateway into your downtown.

Surrounding land uses are varied. You have a nicely comingled mix of uses here and this is going to create an accent on that corner, that sort of pops out when you look at the second sheet. It shows how the site, where one lot is developed with the bank which has a drive-thru, which is something that is undesirable

in a downtown setting, and is going away as part of this particular application, and, of course, the vacant lot, which is not doing anything to be productive in a visual prominent corner in the community.

The third sheet is a color coding that just shows the surrounding land use context. Everything you see in red is non-residential uses. Everything you see in gold, would be residential uses. This is going to be a nice blend of that which is around it, a combination of the gold and the red or a nice mixed-use development. The fourth page shows the surrounding zoning, and they are in the C Zone district, which actually spreads all the way down Union. Again, this is a permitted use in the zone. Mixed use is allowed in this particular district and that is exactly what the applicant is doing here. They are not asking for any deed level relief. You will actually hear as he goes through the application's compliance with the zone scheme, there is actually more variances that were eliminated that were granted last time than the applicant is actually seeking now. I would offer that the applicant has actually moved the needle closer to conformance with the zone scheme than what you had previously.

The next couple of pages are photographs that were taken over the weekend of what the site looks like. Page 5 shows what the bank looks like from Union Avenue. It shows the drive-thru. The applicant is going to fix that with the development that is now proposed. Frame #6 is a close-up of the drive-thru. This is not desirable in a pedestrian friendly area. Frame #7 shows a view from Piermont looking back to the east, getting a sense of the vacant nature of that land use in the front. Frame #8 gives a sense of the parking in the area to the rear of the existing building. Frame #9 shows that they do have a nice transit amenity here as well with the bus stop right in front of the site. That provides an alternative mode of transportation. It certainly lessens the reliance on the automobile, which is something that good planning communities want to do to create walkable, livable communities. This is exactly what the applicant is doing here.

In terms of the plan, the building is going to consist of two stories, as shown in the visual. There are 11 apartments over about 21,788 square feet of retail. Importantly, the applicant is going to provide for two affordable units here. It is going to be an inclusionary development, which is spot-on with the 2018 Fair Share Housing Plan. This site is called out in the plan for two units, so the applicant is helping the community, helping the municipality meet its Fair Share obligation, which he understands is also part of a settlement agreement with the folks at Fair Share Housing as well. This applicant is here, ready, willing and able, to contribute a realistic development potential opportunity for this anchor building in the corner. The prior development plan also had two units, so he is happy to report that that aspect is not going away, but what is better now is this is actually realistic, as opposed to the one from 2008. The only reason why he says that was not realistic is because, here we are 12 years later, and that development has never manifested here. We have gone 12 years without those affordable units. Now we have a developer that is ready, willing and able to make a bonified contribution for those two units, which are right there in the Housing Element and Fair Share plan in the ordinance.

In terms of the zone scheme here, the use is permitted, and the current plan eliminates virtually all the previously approved variances. The height variance that was there before is now gone. This is fully conforming with the height requirement in the zone. The front yard setback on both streets is gone. The side yard setback that was previously there is gone, and a buffer variance has also been eliminated. In terms of the compliance, the density is actually spot on with what the ordinance would require as well, below that threshold of 15 dwelling units per acre. If he looks at the other targeted inclusionary housing developments in the Fair Share Plan, those that are targeted in the unmet need portion, they are all 15 dwelling units per acre, which is exactly what the applicant is proposing here. So, there is certainly harmony with what the Fair Share Plan envisions here.

The relief that the applicant needs is actually two-fold. It's the parking variance, which is very similar to what was needed before, 26 spaces being provided, 83 are required. Previously granted was 37 vs. 80, so a shortage of 40 or so spaces before, essentially being carried forth again here. You heard about the legal mechanism to effectuate a positive parking situation here with the shared parking arrangement. Giving the availability of alternative modes of transportation, very walkable environment, they see this as an excellent spot where the proposed parking supply will meet the actual demand. Mr. McDonough thinks the Board can move favorably on the parking variance under the C2 balancing test whereby the benefits of the application as a whole would substantially outweigh the detriments. On the positive side, first and

foremost, they can look at aesthetics. This is going to be a very extremely attractive building. It is not going to be reliant on retaining the bank, so again, a nice clean slate here. Planned benefit of circulation and eliminating that conflict point with vehicles and pedestrians and the drive-thru component going away. Of course, affordable housing, which they know the affordable component is inherently beneficial in an inclusionary development project. This is going to provide units that would go towards the town's realistic development potential count.

Of course, revitalization here as well, taking what is there, elevating it, upgrading it, again creating a very attractive downtown anchor and certainly a resident population infusion of residents and consumers to support those local businesses as well. All of the above promote purposes of the Land Use Law, especially Purpose A – the promotion of the general welfare, Purpose G – the provision for a variety of uses in appropriate locations, Purpose H – the free flow of traffic, Purpose I – the promotion of a desirable visual environment, and Purpose M – the efficient use of land. On the negative side, relief can be granted without any substantial detriment to the public good. Parking supply will meet the actual demand and is very similar to that which was found to be appropriate before. Alternate modes of transportation are available as they said, pointing back to the bus. Finally, relief can be granted without substantial impairment to the zone plan. As he said, this is going to move the site more in line with the zone scheme than that which was previously approved. The parking relief is very similar to what was previously approved.

Mr. McDonough stated that you heard through Mr. Pereira's testimony that there was also relief requested for the signage. If you take the linear footage, the sign package relates to the linear footage of frontage on the roadway. If you take it in strict numbers, it actually comes down to 100 square feet or so is allowed. The applicant is asking for 300 square feet for front and back. The application is asking for three times the amount of signage. That is an analytical number. Whenever they are dealing with signage relief, he always looks at the visual, and he thinks the essence of the relief here is clear cut from the visual that the sign package is going to be very tasteful and very elegant and the planning goals of providing or protecting against overbranding or visual clutter are certainly met by the very beautiful signage that is put forth before the Board now. All said, it is a very good application regarding very, very minor relief and he is very happy that he has an applicant here that it is willing to make a significant investment in the downtown and particularly on a very important prominent piece in the community.

From a practical standpoint, this is certainly reasonable appropriate relief. From a statutory or from a legal framework standpoint, the statutory burden has been met by the applicant, tests were met and approval is warranted.

Mr. Madaio asked Mr. McDonough if what he is suggesting is that this incarnation of this building actually requires less variances than the 2009 approval. It is more conforming to the zoning code than what the town already granted. The significant difference, of course, is the four additional units. Mr. McDonough noted that that is a quantitative difference, but that does not change anything from a relief standpoint except for the parking. Mr. Madaio stated that the addition of the four additional units does not need any additional variance. It does not need a D variance for the more units. Mr. McDonough agreed. It meets the borough's density requirements. There is no density prohibition against those four additional units. Mr. Madaio stated that the only prohibition, to the extent that it is one, on the four additional units, is that it increases their parking variance by three. Previously, they had 26 spots and the demand was 80. They now have 26 and the demand is 83. That is the only reason that the four additional units are not permitted as a matter of law. Mr. McDonough agreed. He also noted that this is not overdevelopment in the form of undersized units. The applicant is not squeezing in units that are conducive to a wholesome living environment. They meet building code standards with no relief from the ordinance as well.

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting to the public. No public wished to be heard. Mr. Morgan closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Steve Lydon, Burgiss Associates, who reviewed the plan for the Borough in place of Mr. Azzolina, who had a conflict of interest on this application, had a few questions for the applicant's representatives. Mr. Lydon asked Mr. Muller about some housekeeping issues. His review memo is from mid-May based on a previous set of plans. This morning he received the revised engineering plans but did not receive the

revised architectural plans. He asked Mr. Muller about the parking standards and if he applied the RSIS standards for the apartment parking standards. Mr. Muller stated that he didn't calculate the parking standards. He is going by what they had on the site plan. He did not do the calculations. Mr. Lydon asked if he was aware of the Residential Site Improvement Standards since 1993 in the State of New Jersey. That regulates parking in residential developments. He asked if the standard from the RSIS is 1.25 parking stalls per apartment. Mr. Muller stated that he did not know. Mr. Lydon believes that it is a higher number and, in fact, it is based on the number of bedrooms in a particular apartment. Mr. Muller said that he would be surprised if that were the case. Mr. Madaio stated that they would accept whatever number is the correct number. Mr. Lydon said that that would increase the number of required parking spaces. Mr. Madaio said that they would not dispute that. He asked if it would increase the ones from 2009 also. No matter how you slice it, there is a difference based on the additional four units. Mr. Lydon stated that we don't know if the 2009 numbers were calculated using the RSIS standards or not. The differential is the four units if the bedroom count remained the same. Mr. Madaio agreed.

Mr. Lydon did do a report based on the earlier architectural plan and the earlier engineering plan. Since both sets of drawings have been revised, he is not sure if it is worth the Board's time to go through that because it may not be relevant anymore. As far as parking, he feels that there was a lack of analysis by Mr. McDonough. He just said that it works and therefore, the variance should be granted. He didn't hear anything as to why it worked. Since we are having a discussion as to what the required number of spaces are, he thinks that testimony was a little on the light side. Also, the signage, he thinks if the ordinance allows roughly 100 square feet, and the applicant is proposing 300 square feet, that is a big delta, that is a big difference. You heard that the testimony was that the signs along Union and Piermont are the same size as the ones on the back wall. Allen Street is quite a distance from the back wall of the building as opposed to the other two streets. He was wondering if there is any potential for making those rear wall signs smaller, because when you have a situation like this when you have a building with frontage on the street and then access to a parking lot in the rear, typically the ordinances will allow rear building wall signage but really they are more for identification than anything else. Those rear wall signs are usually allowed but at quite a bit smaller dimension. Here you have the same dimensions and he wondered if there is an opportunity to make those signs smaller. He also thinks the sign ordinance actually works fairly well as he reads it, it says one sign per tenant space, not one sign per building. Any suggestion that the ordinance doesn't really work for this kind of building he is not sure really passes muster. He thinks there might be opportunity to make some of the signs smaller. The most northern side along Piermont Road seems that that requires a variance. He believes they called it a site identification signage. There is a provision in the ordinance that says, signs have to be parallel to the building. That sign may be parallel to an awning but he doesn't believe it is parallel with the building itself. He thinks there may be a variance for that.

To touch on the affordable housing, there are two affordable housing units required. In the housing plan, which was approved before, and if your plan gets approved, it's the same two units. He doesn't think this plan is enhanced in that regard. But the settlement agreement with Fair Share and the UHAC, which is the Uniform Housing Affordability Control, which is referenced in our Housing Element and Fair Share Plan and settlement agreement and the court approval, does call for bedroom distribution consistent with what's in the housing plan, which would require, in his estimation, a three-bedroom unit and a two-bedroom unit. If this plan is to be approved, he would think that those units should be identified on the plan and that is based on experience, not necessarily in Cresskill, but in some of the larger communities in the State. It is amazing how fast those affordable units can move from floor to floor, from left side of the building to the right side of the building, to someplace out of town. The current thinking is to make everyone's life easier, and it's much preferable to have the affordable units identified on the plan and it also makes it easier to write the deed restrictions because those units will actually have to have 30-year deed restrictions and it is easier to make reference to the plan and the resolution and just have them shown so everyone knows where they are, not quite so fast in the way they move around the building.

Mr. Madaio noted that they don't have a problem changing the signage at the rear of the building to the parking lot. They don't have an objection to that. The idea here, in his estimation, but the town makes those choices, nobody goes up to the one in Woodcliff Lake, Tice Market, and is appalled by the signage, because no one is looking at the size of the signage. You just love the way it looks. But if they can save

square footage of signage in the back so that people that park their car just have to figure out which one it is, they would be happy to do that. They would do that in compliance with Mr. Lydon's choices. As to the sign that's now parallel to the face of the building, the project or facility identification sign, they will amend their application to seek that variance that it is not parallel to the front of the building. The architect is saying it is parallel. If a variance is needed, they will amend that. As far as the marking of the affordable units, they will mark them. They will be whichever ones Mr. Lydon wants. Having said that, they will be exactly the bedroom count that the town planner requires to satisfy the settlement agreement. He did want to offer the architect to calculate the parking as apples to apples. In other words, however they did it in 2009, whatever shortfall they had, however they did it, the same way whether RSIS or local, admittedly they added bedrooms, they will calculate it that way. They will come up with what it is. Their position is that it is a relatively a de minimus change. They were approximately 50 spaces short. If they are talking about three or four or five spaces, it is a very small percentage of what their prior shortfall was. Again, he wants to emphasize that there is no legal prohibition against the four additional units, except to the extent that it's parking. It is fully conforming except for the fact that those units have to be parked and they will explain that when they get that out.

Mr. Lydon stated that he is not sure that how it was done in 2009 is particularly relevant for two reasons. One, if it was done wrong, it is 12 years later or whatever, and we should do it right now and get it right the second time. And two, the other approval isn't relevant. Mr. Madaio agrees.

Mr. Pereira stated that they have no issues reducing the signage on the rear of the property. They were already smaller than the signs on the front. They were not proposing to have them as large as the signs on the front. The signs on the front average 31.25 square feet. The ones in the back they were proposing to have them at 19.7 square feet, and they don't have an issue reducing them even further in the back. For six signs in the back they had a total of 118.2 square feet. The signage on the front had a total of 218.75 square feet. The sign that indicates the building is approximately 12 square feet and it is parallel to that part of the building. In terms of parking, the RSIS requires 1.8 parking spaces for the one-bedrooms, two spaces for the two-bedrooms. If you are looking at the current plans, they have five two-bedrooms, at two per, that is 10 units. The prior project had two two-bedroom units, so that would be four. So, they have a difference of six spaces there as of now. The current project has 6×1.8 for 10.8 (rounded to 11 spaces). The prior project was five at 1.8 or nine spaces. The prior project had a total of 13 for the residential component and the new project has a total of 21 for the residential so they have a difference of eight parking spaces for the residential. The commercial space is essentially the same size, and he believes they increased it by one space. So, to correct the record, they increased the residential by nine total spaces. The total correct spaces needed now is 90 spaces and they are providing 26 spaces. The balance is the shared parking.

Mr. Madaio confirmed that in 2009, the correct requirement was 83 and they had 26 spaces. On the current proposal, they have 26 spaces on a requirement of 90. They added a seven-space parking demand, less than 10%. The parking spaces provided remains the same. They never had enough spaces. They are seven further away from what they have.

Mr. Madaio stated that his position remains where it was when they started. There is no prohibition whatsoever to these four additional units. It doesn't violate the density, it doesn't violate the conditional use ordinance, it doesn't violate anything that you've done. The only thing that it causes is a slightly greater variance on parking. They believe that the seven additional space parking variance, which is what the net is of all these differences, seven additional space shortfall, when in fact they only had about 30% of 80 anyway, they had 26 on 80, something less than 30%, but no one had a problem with that in 2009 when they were fulfilling the Affordable Housing requirements and they were providing the town with a valuable piece of the downtown parking demand and helping make what they believe would become downtown Cresskill. So, the parking issue of them providing 30% of what's required or 29% of what's required is in his estimation, respectfully, not the issue here. The issue here is that there are four additional units. They are permitted. They don't even violate the density. If someone says we are trying to cram too many units in there, they are not. They actually fully comply with the ordinance. The difference is what they are trading here is about a million times better building that will actually get built. They are getting a seven additional space parking shortfall, which equals how they get those four additional residential units, and the tradeoff

is they eliminate a bank drive-thru, they eliminate a by-pass lane, they provide a sidewalk over on that side now that they have eliminated those two things, they eliminate the old bank building, which 11 years later doesn't look any better, and, they then build the affordable units, which he thinks at some point the town will do their mid-point report, and they are going to start to ask why these units are not built. They are happy to build them and they want to build them. And you want to build them in a better building than the one approved in 2009. The tradeoff is that they will be granted a slightly bigger parking variance to build those four additional residential units. Other than that, they don't need permission for those four units. He doesn't say that belligerently, he says that because you may not even realize how close it is to being in conformity with what you have. In addition to eliminating the bank drive-thru and all that that brings, they also eliminate the problems associated with not getting those units built and providing a realistic opportunity to get those units built. That is where they stand. A much better building that actually gets built with no drive-thru in exchange for an imaginary seven space greater parking shortfall, which they were never close on anyway and never seemed to ruffle a feather in the last eleven years.

Mr. Madaio stated that he believes they met all the criteria, they believe, of the affirmative criteria for these simple bulk variances. They are asking for a parking variance. That is the only control on these units. They believe they demonstrated why that is a much better idea in this context than in the prior context. He really doesn't think any of them want to say that those prior approvals have expired. The town is not going to amend their COAH approvals. They remain married to those approvals. Their hope is that they can demonstrate that by building these units with a much better project. For that reason, they would like very much if the Board would consider approving this project this evening.

Ms. Tsigounis stated that she respectfully disagrees with Mr. Madaio and the planner's conclusion that the benefit of the lack of parking outweighs the detriment. She also is not in favor of the comparison to 2009. She believes that there are more cars on the street in 2020 than there were in 2009. Mr. Madaio noted that the RSIS standards are the same as they were in 2009. Ms. Tsigounis noted that he was looking at things from a book rather than the vitality of the community. We are trying to house people here. People that need low income housing, which is in great demand in Bergen County. We are not looking to stuff them into an area and not provide parking. She is a landlord and cannot rent an apartment unless her tenant has a parking spot. She is talking about quality of life. The testimony was that the benefit outweighs the detriment. We are trying to prove, as our planner had mentioned, that statement. In reality, there are book numbers and then there's the people that are living in our community. We want to work with the Fair Share Housing Community to build low income housing for the benefit of the people that live there. She doesn't know where that bus stop goes to, but it is an ideal location for affordable housing. To say you gave two units in 2009 so we are going to give them two units in 2020, give them four units. You are asking for a 50% increase in apartments. Increase the amount of affordable housing so that we can bring these for people to work in our downtown and have a livable community. Who is going to occupy the spaces? The plans were dated February 6, 2020. There was a revision date of July 6, 2020. Has anything in those revisions been done to address the COVID-19 pandemic. What have they done to provide more livable communities, more space rather than cramming people together. We would like to see not things that are done according to the book or according to the code, but things that can exist in reality. We want to build this downtown. We want to make a livable, workable community and we want to have residents here to play upon the diversity of Cresskill. She doesn't see any of that addressed, but there's comparison between 2009 and 2020, which are just numbers and not reality. Yes, there are more cars on the road today. Most every family has children that have parking spaces. This project will not be successful unless parking is addressed respectfully in her opinion. She disagrees with the benefit outweighing the good to our community.

Mr. Sutera wanted a better idea on the retail space and what the possibilities could be. There didn't seem to be much analysis in terms of practically speaking. He doesn't really have a sense of 10,000 square feet to the bigger picture to the downtown area. How will that impair some of the commercial success of the incumbent businesses in that area. Mr. Madaio stated that it doesn't. They are fully complying with the zoning ordinance. Mr. Sutera stated that it is less of a land question and more of trying to understand how that retail aspect functions. The reason he is saying that is you can describe it as an anchor location, it is the first vista that most people see when they come into town. Having empty spaces there would present a very significant challenge. He understands the demand on the residential side. He is just trying to get

some understanding on the how the space is laid out realistically and what type of businesses would actually live there when this is approved. Mr. Pereira stated that his client owns a lot of retail throughout the state. When they size these, they went by his experience from all the other retailers that are looking for spaces in their other locations, the width of the retail, the square footage. They have a mix. Most of the retail is about 24 feet wide. The spaces are adjoining so they can be combined into a larger space. All the math was done to provide retail for a downtown like Cresskill's and the type of tenant's that would be looking to be put here. The corner unit is the largest retail. He thinks they did a great job for what is being sought for from the marketplace. And they designed the building to accommodate what his clients are requesting from retailers in terms square footage, width, height and all of that. He thinks the retail caters to the marketplace right now.

Ms. Bauer wanted to say that to her it is aesthetically not appealing with the flat roofs. It reminds her of something from the '30s. Mr. Rummel likes the building, but he is with Ms. Tsigounis about the parking. You add all those apartments in there. Between 2009 and now, you go from six or seven to 11 and it is just a lot of density. Mr. Madaio stated that it doesn't bother the density ordinance. You have a density ordinance that they comply with. Ms. Tsigounis stated that the parking is the issue. Mr. Madaio noted that that is not density, it's parking. And there is no COVID-19 ordinance, they are completely to the density. Ms. Tsigounis said, with all due respect, you don't need to have an ordinance to think commonsense. It's commonsense. You have to design for our community. The architect agrees, the planner agrees and she is sure the builder agrees, you don't want to have empty buildings, and we don't want to have an empty downtown.

Ms. Bauer asked about parking overnight. Mr. Madaio stated that the tenants can park overnight. That is in the easement agreement. The Borough enforces and they build to the zoning code with the ability to get certain variances when they believe they presented a cogent argument for those variances. They do not have to, and in fact, cannot build to things that are not in the zoning code. They can't build to COVID, not that they don't have to, but because it doesn't exist. The only thing that is standing between this being built and not built is a seven-space parking variance which is less than 10% of demand. That is a slight variance in the big picture here in their opinion. They believe that the benefits to the purposes of zoning outweigh the detriments. The detriments have to substantially outweigh the benefits. Again, the parking variance, they were providing 33% or 34%, 26 on 80, now they are providing 26 on 90. That is an infinitesimal change. The building otherwise fully conforms to the ordinance. There is nothing else you can apply to it. You can't apply a COVID standard that does not exist.

Mr. Pereira stated that he has worked on a lot of projects with this client. All of the clients are concerned. To address COVID is larger windows and more ventilation. For air conditioning they agreed that they are going to be central air units that they can bring additional fresh air into the units. The materials that they are using, they are choosing materials that are easy to clean. In the hallways there are key fobs for entrance that you don't need to use your hands so you can use the key fob and push with your elbow. These are all the things that they are applying. There is no clear guidance on what to do. But his client has spent quite a bit of money getting a market research done. Ms. Tsigounis noted that she is sure they have, but it still doesn't address the parking and it still is not addressing the fact that we have vacant buildings right now. Where are we going to get these tenants? Mr. Madaio stated that that is not a consideration of zoning. Ms. Tsigounis stated that it is a consideration for the community. The reason to deny a parking variance is if you can't accommodate what's needed. There is a need for something here and the detriment is not outweighed by benefit. She disagrees with the testimony that was presented.

Mayor Romeo noted that the Magnolia in the front of the building is 60 years old and he watched them plant it. Unfortunately, they will have to cut that down. But that's progress. As far as the COAH requirement, he doesn't care if they build it or not, it is deed restricted and it will stay there forever. If you build or don't build, for the next thirty years we have credit for two units, you don't have to build it. The thing that he is worried about is the number of apartments. He understands exactly what Ms. Tsigounis is saying. This COVID thing came up and you are going to see a lot of retail fold. We are seeing it right now in the middle of town. They are bringing in seven stores and he doesn't have a beef with that because they agreed to that in 2009. If they think they can rent them, and he prays they can rent them because they are going to be so highly visible that if they are not rented it is going to look like a shambles, but he has a feeling that

the gentleman that is building it knows what they are doing and he thinks they will get them rented. The objection he has is the number of units of apartments. We agreed to seven and you came up with 11. That is too many apartments.

Mayor Romeo stated that we already have another project going for the next round of COAH, so we are in very good shape for even the next round in 2025. We had an agreement for the new project for so many new units and everything was all set. All of a sudden, Shirley came back and said no, you are not getting one-bedrooms anymore, now she wants twos and threes. So, what could happen here is, even if you went in with this 11, she could turn around and say "no." They could change the agreement since you (not you, but the previous owner) didn't fulfill it so she could say that she wants all three-bedroom apartments or she wants five threes and four twos and we have to go by what she says. So, his thought is instead of his 11 apartments, you may be better off going for seven apartments and make several of them, maybe two threes and two twos, and get to your seven and maybe get a little more rent from those seven units and be done with this. Stop dickering over parking and all this other stuff. It really comes to 11 apartments. It's too crowded here. Mr. Salvatore, may he rest in peace, spent endless hours trying to chase these people around just to get these easements. Then we found out that one of these easements was signed by somebody that didn't even own the property. Now the parking is all done and all legal and done exactly the right way. He is only speaking for himself. He thinks the Board has all good issues. We can't blame it on COVID, but it is on our minds now. The ventilation is well taken care of. The number of apartments in his mind is too many, it's too crowded. It took a long time to build that parking lot and it costs over \$1 million to get it done and we put that parking in to service all of the units that they are going to build and all of the rest of the downtown. That is why there is two ways to get in there, over by the liquor store and by this building. If he was building this, he would be going with the seven units and make them larger and get a little bit more rent. That is his opinion. He is only speaking for himself.

Mr. Morgan agrees with the Mayor. He was on the Board nine or ten years ago and we argued from six to seven units. To be honest, he is going to vote no because of the 11 units.

Mr. Madaio appreciates the feedback. Ms. Tsigounis wants to know how we are going to vote on this. There isn't even a three bedroom on the plan. Mr. Madaio stated that they have a two-bedroom that can be made into a three-bedroom. It can be voted on "subject to." If they have to make a three-bedroom, that is their responsibility. Ms. Tsigounis stated that we know which ones are low-income designated. Mr. Madaio stated that he indicated whichever ones Mr. Lydon wants. Ms. Tsigounis noted that it takes a while to reconstruct and reconfigure, because you are housing people here, because you take an oath and you work for the benefit of the health, safety and welfare of the public. And it is not just a matter of numbers or how many units. She would like to know how many units we are voting on and what the mix is. Mr. Madaio stated that the Board is voting on 11 as is, however, it would be subject to COAH approval and Fair Housing approval and the plan is approved. If it comes back that they need three, they will convert one to a three and they can tell the Board which one that is. They know which one that will be. Ms. Tsigounis noted that it would still be a total of 11 units and one of them would be a three-bedroom unit instead of a two-bedroom unit. Mr. Madaio agreed, that if required, yes, but the amount of units would not change.

Mr. Madaio had a discussion with his clients and decided that they would like to adjourn the matter. They simply can't come to decisions on the sidewalk without discussions that include other players. He would like to try to make this better and try to listen to what the Board said as best as they can. He would like to schedule a continued hearing for August 25, 2020. Mr. Morgan announced that this Public Hearing will be carried until the August 25, 2020, meeting without further notifications.

New Business

None.

Other Business

None.

Mr. Morgan opened the meeting to the public. No public wished to be heard.

Motion was made by Ms. Tsigounis to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 PM, seconded by Mr. Mandelbaum. All present were in favor. Motion approved.

The next four regular Planning Board meetings are scheduled for August 11, August 25, September 8, and September 22, 2020, at 7:30 PM in the Borough Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn M. Petillo
Recording Secretary