

**TOWNSHIP OF MOUNT OLIVE
PLANNING BOARD**
Reorganization Meeting & Public Meeting
Thursday, January 21, 2021 at 7:00 pm
Remote/Virtual Meeting

In accordance with Township Ordinance # 26-09 the Mount Olive Planning Board is authorized pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-25(c)(2) to hear all variance applications including the six variance categories set forth in N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d.

MINUTES

Reorganization Meeting & Public Meeting / Remote Virtual Meeting of the Mount Olive Planning Board of January 21, 2021 commenced at 7:00 pm.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Open Public Meetings Act Statement was read into the record by Mary Strain, Board Secretary.

Roll Call

Present: Mr. Schaechter, Mr. Forlenza, Ms. Natafalusy, Mr. Mania, Mr. Nelsen, Mr. Ottavinia,
Mr. Batsch, Mr. Ouimet, Mr. Weiss
Excused: Mr. Scapicchio, Ms. Mott

Board Professionals in attendance were:

Chuck McGroarty, PP/AICP, Board Planner
Michael Vreeland, PE, Board Engineer
Jeffrey Keller, PHD, Board Environmental Consultant
Walter Lublanecki, Esq., Board Traffic Consultant
Edward Buzak, Esq., Board Attorney
Susan Crawford, Esq. Board Attorney
Mary Strain, Board Secretary

Mr. Weiss: Thank you Mary. For the Record, David Scapicchio did call and said he might be running late. He might be joining in. When he does, we'll note that for the Record.

Ms. Strain: Thank you.

Committee Reports

Mr. Weiss: Before we get into the agenda tonight does anybody have any committee reports. Anything they would like to talk about? Kim usually talks about Open Space. She is not here. I have nothing for street naming. John, anything from Ordinance?

Mr. Batsch: Nothing at this point.

Mr. Weiss: Catherine, anything from Environmental Commission?

Ms. Natafalusy: Nothing.

Mr. Weiss: Brian, anything from Board of Education?

Mr. Schaechter: Board of Education has nothing. I checked with the Superintendent this afternoon.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Did we forget...John, anything from Council?

Mr. Mania: Budget hearing Saturday morning.

Mr. Weiss: Ken, anything from the Mayor?

Mr. Forlenza: Nothing to report this week.

Mr. Weiss: All right. Good. Lets get into our...approval of prior meeting minutes. Before I do that, I am going to jump back. Ed or Chuck, do you have anything that you wanted to chat with us about, from your perspective?

Mr. Buzak: Not from me.

Mr. Weiss: And I give the same thing to Walt or Mike. Anything?

Mr. Lublanecki: All good.

Mr. Vreeland: No.

Meeting Minutes

August 13, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's get into our approval of the meeting minutes. First one on the agenda are the meeting minutes from August 13, 2020. Copy has been sent. I would entertain a motion for someone to please move those minutes.

Mr. Mania: I'll move that Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, John. Second?

Mr. Schaechter: Second it.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you Brian. Any conversation? Any comments? Seeing none. Mary, roll call?

Roll Call:

Brian Schaechter	Yes
Ken Forlenza	Yes
Catherine Natafalusy	Yes
John Mania	Yes
Dan Nelsen	Yes

Paul Ottavina	Yes
John Batsch	Yes
Joseph Ouimet	Yes
Howie Weiss	Yes

August 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weiss: Next minutes for approval are those from August 20, 2020. Same thing. They've been sent out. Everyone has had an opportunity to review them. Any questions? Lets move them. Before I do that. Someone, please make a motion to move those.

Mr. Mania: I'll move them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, John. Brian, it looks like you Second it. Thank you very much. Anybody have any questions or comments? Seeing none, let me close it. Mary, roll call please?

Roll Call:	Brian Schaechter	Yes
	Ken Forlenza	Yes
	Catherine Natafalusy	Yes
	John Mania	Yes
	Dan Nelsen	Yes
	Paul Ottavina	Yes
	John Batsch	Yes
	Howie Weiss	Yes

Resolutions

Conflict Engineer

Mr. Weiss: On our agenda we do have a Resolution for the appointment of the Conflict Engineer. Just a quick question, that was done once before. We have to do it again because he'll be with us at our next meeting. which will be next month?

Mr. McGroarty: No, Mr. Chairman. The only reason we are continuing this is because he'll be involved in the preconstruction meeting and the inspections for the Solar Farm. Mike, I guess you are still, your firm would still be conflicted out on that one?

Mr. Vreeland: I believe so, Chuck. That sounds correct.

Inaudible

Mr. Weiss: I thought it was the Solar Farm. And then I started to think maybe it was Saxton Falls. But okay, it's the Solar Farm and that's because we need him to sit in on the meetings.

Mr. McGroarty: Yes and actually we are following Mr. Buzak's advice on this, to another Resolution for this year. Actually they are coming back to the Board but it's just for the preconstruction meeting and the other stuff.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. I guess even if its duplicated, its better safe than sorry.

Mr. McGroarty: That's Ed's direction to us, yes.

Mr. Weiss: That's fine. Its, okay. So we have Resolution to appoint our Conflict Engineer, Joseph Vuich from Finelli Consulting Engineering. Would someone please move that Resolution?

Mr. Batsch: I'll move that Resolution, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Mr. Batsch.

Mr. Ottavinia: I'll Second.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Paul. Any comments or questions?

Mr. Mania: Second.

Mr. Weiss: We got it already. Thank you very much. Seeing no comments or questions, roll call, please.

Roll Call:	Brian Schaechter	Yes
	Ken Forlenza	Yes
	Catherine Natafalusy	Yes
	John Mania	Yes
	Dan Nelsen	Yes
	Paul Ottavinia	Yes
	John Batsch	Yes
	Joseph Ouimet	Yes
	Howie Weiss	Yes

Mr. Weiss: Okay. So lets get into our developmental applications and maybe...

Ms. Strain: Inaudible...sorry to bother you. We have The Rules and Procedures. We made that addition to it and the zoom meeting information.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Mary. Thanks, I forgot about that.

Mr. McGroarty: Mary, also, Susan Crawford is here. She was...as an attendee.

Ms. Strain: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: So, if you recall from our last meeting, last week, part of the re-org, Catherine had made some comments and we had agreed and we wanted it added...we wanted it updated and Mr. Buzak did that, so we do have the new rules and procedure. We were sent that. What I'd like to do is ratify that. Lets move that into our part of the re-org meeting. The change was made. We had an opportunity to review it. I suppose we'll make a motion to accept the new Mount Olive

Township Planning Board rules and procedure for 2021, based on the submission by Mr. Buzak. Does anybody have any concerns about what I said? Otherwise someone please move that.

Mr. Nelsen: I'll make a motion to move that.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Dan.

Mr. Schaechter: Second.

Mr. Weiss: Second by Brian.

Mr. Mania: I'll Second.

Mr. Weiss: Done already. Any comments? Okay. Mr. Buzak, Thank you for doing that so quickly. I appreciate it.

Mr. Buzak: You're welcome. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: With no comments or concerns, let's do roll call on that one, Mary.

Ms. Strain:	Brian Schaechter	Yes
	Ken Forlenza	Yes
	Catherine Natafalusy	Yes
	John Mania	Yes
	Dan Nelsen	Yes
	Paul Ottavinia	Yes
	John Batsch	Yes
	Joseph Ouimet	Yes
	Howie Weiss	Yes

Development Applications

PB 20-11 Keinan, Yorum, 6 Bartley Chester Road, Block 6900, Lot 19

Mr. Weiss: So now, as we get into developmental matters, for the benefit of the public, I think what we should do is take a look at the agenda and let's go over a couple of things. There are some applications that are not on the agenda this evening. The first one PB 20-11, Yoram Keinan. That meeting has been carried through March 11th. There will be no further notice. That application will be heard on March 11, 7:00pm, during the same process as we are doing now. No further notice. Will be 7:00 pm on March 11th.

PB 19-25 Hunkele Equities, LLC, 160 Gold Mine Road, Block 4400, Lot 85.02

PB 19-28 Hunkele Equities, LLC, 160 Gold Mine Road, Block 4400, Lot 85

PB 19-29 Hunkele Equities, LLC, 160 Gold Mine Road, Block 4400, Lot 85

Mr. Weiss: We have three other applications on the agenda. I know Chuck wanted to explain on the Hunkele Equities, LLC we have PB 19-25, PB 19-28, and PB 19-29. Chuck, why don't you give us a quick explanation as to what's going to happen.

Mr. McGroarty: Okay, thank you. Can you hear me all right?

Mr. Weiss: Yes.

Mr. McGroarty: Mr. Hunkele's attorney and I have been talking. They will be returning to the Planning Board but for a different application than the one that they filed. So if you want to follow along with this, there are three applications filed. They are asking the Board to carry two of them and the third one they are going to withdraw and that will later be replaced by a different application. The first application that is on our agenda, the minor subdivision, the applicant is requesting to carry that until April 30th. Now, before I get to far along in this, I said to Mr. Dwyer, very likely he is going to have to re-notice because this has been carried a number of times. As a matter of fact the application is changing to a d variance and he agreed. So, he will be re-noticing. I asked him to give the Board at least until the end of April. Again they are asking for an extension on the minor subdivision. The next application on the agenda is for a preliminary and final site plan. They are withdrawing that. The third one is an amended site plan. Again all for the same tract of land. They asked to expend that to April 30th as well.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Chuck. And that's how I have it. So again, we're going to remove PB 19-28. That's going to be withdrawn. Both PB 19-25 and PB 19-29 will be carried through April 30th. It will be re-noticed for that time and again, the rest of it will be noticed by the applicant. I don't believe I need to say much more about that. Mr. Buzak?

Mr. Buzak: Will both of them be re-noticed, Chuck? I heard you said that with the minor subdivision.

Mr. McGroarty: Yes, because what they're doing is...they're going to come back with a use variance actually. The minor and the amended are still going to be necessary so they are going to have to re-notice for all three, yes.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Thank you. Nothing more Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Mr. Buzak. Chuck anything else? Thank you for jumping in on that.

PB 20-10, Budd Lake Storage LLC, 89 Route 46, Block 4100, Lot 85

Mr. Weiss: Okay. So, let's move on from that one. We have our first developmental application of the evening which is PB 20-10, Budd Lake Storage, LLC, here for combined

preliminary and final site plan. Property located 89 Route 46, Block 100 Lot 85. This hearing is carried from November 19, 2020. Looks like Dane had brought up the applicant's attorney, Matt Capizzi. Welcome tonight, Matt.

Mr. McGroarty: I have the attorney and his engineer, Matt Welch. I don't see wither of the yet.

Mr. Capizzi: I don't know if you can hear me?

Mr. Weiss: Matt, I can hear you now.

Mr. Capizzi: For some reason my video hasn't been enabled.

Inaudible

Mr. Weiss: As I introduce, and it looks like we see both Matt Welch and Matt Capizzi, let me review...and you can let me know if you see otherwise...when we las left our meeting and we introduced five exhibits. The last one was A-5. So anything that we go on from here will become A-6. Again, you can summarize where you'd like to bring us to tonight, Mr. Capizzi and we can go from there. Let me turn it over to you.

Mr. Capizzi: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, just for the Record, Matthew Capizzi on behalf of the applicant Budd Lake Storage. This was an application that was originally before the Board on November 19, 2020. Just as a reminder this is the former location of the Budd Lake School site, which has been unoccupied for quite some time. We are proposing to redevelop the site with a self-storage facility consisting of four buildings. The building closest to Route 46 will consist of three stories and the three other buildings will consist of one story in height. Preliminary and final site plan approval, some minor variances relative to really design waivers. Because of the nature of the use, we are seeking a parking variance. When we were before the Board in November, we had presented a testimony of Matthew Welch from Langen Engineering who took us through the site plan considerations, operational testimony and the variances waivers that are necessary. When we were before you in November, there was some open ended house-keeping items that needed to be addressed that were in the Board's professional's review letters. December 18th, to be precise, we submitted a revised packet to the Board, revised engineering plans dated December 10th, and revised architectural plans...the architectural plans had a slight typographical error on the revision date but those were revised December 11th...in an attempt to address a majority if not all of the Board professional's comments. The Board professionals had issued a series of updated review letters in response to our updated submittal and then the Board professionals were kind enough, today, to spend some time with myself and Matthew Welch, to go through open comments in their respective review letters in an effort to help move things along this evening. Our objective tonight is to bring back Matthew Welch and talk about the revisions made in his December plan set, revisions proposed to address comments that we had in the discussion today with the Board's professionals, then to turn the table over to Scott Daniel from Ware Malcomb to go through the architectural testimony. Then lastly to conclude with our planner, Sean Moronski to touch upon the waivers of variances that are necessary in this application.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Mr. Capizzi you mentioned it, we all have copies of updated reports from all of our professionals, so all of us should have a second Van Cleef report from Mike. We

certainly have a second report from Chuck. We have a second report from Walt Lublanecki and of course now we have a report from Habitat by Design from Dr. Keller. We all have those. If you wanted to address Matt Welch, go through the engineering report, the changes that's discussed. Mike's report and then we can have a conversation about that.

Mr. Capizzi: Absolutely. So Matt, you were sworn in last go around. I would leave that he would remain sworn?

Mr. Buzak: Yes.

Mr. Capizzi: Great.

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Welch you'll remain sworn.

Mr. Capizzi: Thank you, Mr. Buzak. Matt, if you want to share your revised plan set and take us through how you revised the drawings since we were last before the Board in November.

Mr. Welch: Certainly. So before you write down...inaudible...that was submitted as part of that...inaudible...its dated December 10, 2020. I just want to highlight a number of changes that were made as part of that submission. Then I'll go into at least some of the additional changes that we will be agreeing to make based on the time we were able to have with your professionals this afternoon.

Inaudible

Mr. Weiss: Matt. Hang tight for a second. Ed?

Mr. Buzak: Yes. Before you go on, are these the revised plans? Is this a sheet of the revised plan?

Mr. Welch: Yes. This is a sheet...this is a site plan sheet. Its sheet CS-101. It's the same exact sheet that was made...inaudible.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Here's the thing. We can mark this A-6 and continue with the markings as you put additional exhibits up. In that sequence. Or, we can...I believe this is A-2, which was the site plan rendering that we had. Am I correct?

Mr. Welch: So this is part of the updated site plan set. I think we previously introduced. But it was part of the package.

Inaudible

Mr. Buzak: Why don't we do this...lets mark this A-6 and we can refer to it as A-6. We'll proceed from there.

Mr. Welch: Okay.

Mr. Weiss: Of course Matt, you said A-6 is page CS-101, which is...is that correct? You said sheet CS-101?

Mr. Welch: Correct. Its sheet CS-101 of our revised site plan set. This sheet was revised December 10, 2020.

Mr. Weiss: And this sheet is entitled what? Does it have a name?

Mr. Welch: It's site plan.

Mr. Weiss: Site plan. Fair enough. Okay, go ahead.

Mr. Capizzi: Matt, just be cognizant that your internet connection maybe has a little bit of a pause to it. So if you wouldn't mind, just slow it down just a little bit to make sure the internet catches up with you.

Mr. Welch: Understood. I upgraded my internet, I might be a little too quick for it. Moving on. Some of the changes that we made as part of that submission...and these were all changes that we discussed...one of which was incorporating the 18 foot emergency access isle to the west of Building A. That's a paved isle. In accordance with the Fire Marshal's comments. The second change that we made was to maintain buffer around the cell tower. We shifted...inaudible... closer to the easterly property line and narrowed the isles around it. Which allowed us to maintain almost all of that evergreen...out in his review letter, there is one evergreen tree that will need to be removed. Its on the easterly corner...inaudible...to Building C, but there is a pretty substantive bay, so its not going to create any more visibility of that cell tower. Its not going to increase the visibility of the cell tower, I'll say that. The third change that we made and I'm going to refer to...I guess we'll mark this A-7?

Mr. Buzak: Yes.

Mr. Welch: It is the landscape plan. Sheet LP-101. That was also previously submitted. It was last revised December 10, 2020. Part of that same re-submission set. What you'll notice is that we added a row of evergreen of various sizes. Both along the southerly property line and along the basin inter-wrapping up the westerly property line. Anyone who has been to the residence next door, knows...inaudible...they are all deciduous trees. You can see right through them. Inaudible, during the fall and winter months. Having a row of evergreen will certainly enhance the buffer to the site and will also add some buffering on that side of it today. As part of our review letters, as part of the discussions with your professionals...inaudible...enhance that buffer to have two rows of evergreens and if we can a berm in that southerly area to further buffer that up and significantly improve on the limited buffer that exists today. We are going to make those changes and we'll agree to add that additional buffering to the satisfaction of your professionals. Another change that we are going to agree to make is, our basin currently has a spillway that is directed towards the westerly property line. We are going to be revising our basin design and relocating that emergency spillway so in the event of a basin failure, it will spill onto the paved areas of the side and will be maintained on the site solely finding its way along the westerly pavement to Route 46. So that removes the issue that your planner raised in his letter regarding the spillway draining into a residential property to the west. That spillway will drain onto our own property and ultimately out to Route 46. A third thing, change, that we will agree to make...inaudible...to lighting. As I stated last year and we don't have any...inaudible...say on to the adjacent property but because there is no light spillage, no light throw, obviously...inaudible...when you look at the site you'll still see lights when they are lit. So

there's two aspects that we are going to do to further mitigate light spillage. The first is all lights on this site will be able to be dimmable and the rear of the site is not going to be able to be accessed after hours. Only the front building is...so during those after hour periods, we can dim all the lights in the rear of the site. We're currently proposing to dim them to 50 percent of their designed strength. But these are dimmable. Inaudible...could be adjusted. Additionally, the one area light that is to the west of Building D, it's the closest one to the adjacent residential property, we are going to change that mount to be able to be a tilt mount. These are all LEDs. They are full cut off fixtures. The LEDs themselves are, you can call them almost internally shielded...glare issues. We have the ability to tilt that light fixture, angle it more into the site to mitigate any potential glare, that might be seen, post construction.

Inaudible.

Mr. Buzak: That's just a single lamp post, Mr. Welch?

Mr. Welch: I'm sorry can you say that again?

Mr. Buzak: Yes. Is that just a single light pole that you are going to have tilt mounted?

Mr. Welch: Correct. There are only...these buildings themselves are predominately being lit with building mounted lights. Most of the area lights are along the easterly property line and in the northerly portion of the site. There is only two area lights that really could be visible to residents. Once is proximate to the cell tower. That's going to be buffered by the evergreens around the cell tower and the evergreens that we are putting around the basin. The second area light is just to the west of...inaudible...property lines. That's the area light that we are going to look to put that tilt mount. So that way we have the ability, post construction, if there are any issues to adjust that light.

Mr. McGroarty: Can I, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Weiss: Sure. Go ahead, Chuck. I don't know where you are in all this.

Mr. McGroarty: I wanted to just see if...this might be a moment to jump in here with Mr. Welch. I think that is something...that's talked about today, I think that would be a good solution to a potential problem, If necessary. The reason I'm jumping in, is that the ordinance, after we spoke today, I realized, our ordinance requires all light fixtures to have a ninety degree angle. So, in this situation, it would be, not a variance but an exception. You just heard Mr. Welch's testimony as to why if necessary that particular fixture wouldn't be at a ninety degree angle, if it's necessary to tilt it up. For what its worth I think that would be a great solution to a potential problem. But the Board...we've got to put that on the record and the Board will have to act on that exception request.

Mr. Weiss: Thanks Chuck. That's good advice. Then we are going to look at that as an exception, not a waiver?

Mr. McGroarty: Yes. We're...my crusade is to eliminate the term waivers. Our ordinance calls it an exception as does the Land Use Law.

Mr. Weiss: Then we'll refer to it as an exception as well.

Mr. McGroarty: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Matt, you can continue.

Mr. Welch: Thank you. Really those are the highlights. In general, based on the discussions with your professionals, based on...inaudible...there from a site standpoint, we can...inaudible...your professionals to address all of their comments as a condition of approval.

Mr. Capizzi: Just a quick question, Matt. You may have touched upon...The base of the retention basin, are we going to be swapping out for that?

Mr. Welch: Correct. Yes we are going to be changing that up based on the recommendations of Dr. Keller.

Mr. Capizzi: Okay so principally the mulch is going to be removed and we'll add some other kind of base for that. Correct?

Mr. Welch: That's correct.

Mr. Capizzi: Okay and just, I think the one last design change as far as the site plan was considered, we now have a refuse area at the property?

Mr. Welch: Correct. So, as part of our last submission, we did add a small dumpster enclosure adjacent to Building D. This is really, its only used for office related items associated with the operations of the self-storage facility by the two full time staff. Its not for use by tenants for throwing out boxes or anything. They are required as part of their lease agreements to take anything off the presence with them. This use typically don't generate a lot of trash but obviously we need a place to put it. Trash enclosure that would be relatively isolated. And again its only going to be for the minimal trash, general use of the site and also would have a private hauler to take that away.

Mr. Weiss: Let me ask a question. Are we opening up a can of worms by putting a dumpster back there? Sometimes a dumpster might be an open invitation to get rid of maybe that old mattress or a lamp...and you know what...there is a dumpster, let me throw it in. Will it be secured? Will it be visible? Tell me about that. What's the size of it?

Mr. Welch: Inaudible... Sometimes it becomes an operational item but its going to be gated and obviously there's going to be cameras throughout the site so if ownership sees any issues, any tenants throwing things in there, that they shouldn't be doing...

Mr. Weiss: Again, my concern, its really one of the furthest points away from your staffed office. So that means whoever is throwing out the trash has got to walk a long way and I still think its kind of an attractive nuisance back there.

Mr. Capizzi: Mr. Chairman, we'll have a golf cart type of vehicle on site for the employees to travel around the property for regular maintenance and just to check up in the buildings, so we understand that it's a distance away from the main Building A, where the personnel office is but

there is a means for them to travel about the site without having to walk. And that refuse area is going to be secured. It will have to be unlocked by the personnel for disposal of really just nominal paper goods. Its really just very light use. And once a day at the end of a shift, somebody will go to the refuse area to dispose of the items and then lock it back up. And if it becomes an issue relative to a customer using it for purposes not permitted under their lease, we certainly, number one take enforcement on that and number two we certainly dispose of that refuse right away. Its not our intention to take care of refuse associated with customer belongings. The lease requires them to cart away anything that they bring to the site. So we certainly don't want that becoming an issue for ourselves as well.

Mr. Weiss: Maybe just a general question, was there any way to move that closer to Building A, where the office is staffed?

Mr. Welch: We can look at it. I mean there is not a lot of location opportunities. But...inaudible...just outside of building A. The only other area that strikes me is kind of next to the cell tower but that's not really moving it much closer. We can take a look to see if there is an opportunity to move it closer and also speak with ownership again and make sure they are comfortable on the location. If an opportunity exists we'll move it but I don't really want to commit because I know there's kind of a lot going on in that front area. The other... I think the other benefit of it...having it back here is, its out of the way, so that vehicle coming to...inaudible...ingress in and out...inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Mania: Mr. Chairman, did you get an answer as to what size dumpster that was?

Mr. Weiss: Matt, can you tell us again what size dumpster that was?

Mr. Welch: Yes. I think it was...let me just confirm on our...I believe this was a 10 by 20 enclosure but let me just confirm on our site plan. It is designed for a 4 cubic yard receptacle. Like I said it generates minimal trash because we are really only talking about the office operations not customers.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. The fact that its secured and locked might resolve that concern. Okay. So that was the scope of all the changes that you made. Correct, Matt?

Mr. McGroarty: He forgot a few things. He probably should...Matt you should probably tell the Board you did...I requested you get rid of the chain link fence in favor of a solid vinyl. You've done that.

Mr. Welch: Correct.

Mr. McGroarty: And that'll be around the perimeter?

Mr. Welch: Yes. The entire perimeter will have a 6 foot vinyl fence that will, in addition to the landscaping, that'll add to the visual buffering. There is also a 6 foot split rail fence that goes around a portion of the basin just to keep that secure. Inaudible.

Mr. McGroarty: Mr. Chairman, may I?

Mr. Weiss: Sure Chuck, go ahead.

Mr. McGroarty: You should address, Matt, you're proposing a gravel driveway to the equipment compound for the cell tower. Again, technically that's an exception from the standards in the ordinance where driveways and parking areas should be paved. I know why you did that. I think you should probably explain that to the Board and add that to the list of exceptions that you are requesting.

Mr. Welch: Certainly. I'm not sure if anyone has the opportunity to be at the site recently. But currently there isn't even a driveway to provide access to that cell tower. Its entirely a grass area. And you can see that...inaudible... I guess maintenance or other vehicles have to access it, you'll see the vehicle ruts in the grass. So we wanted to provide something there to make that access a little more customary. However, we are up against a limit of impervious in terms of what we are allowed. Currently we have a lot coverage...whereas 60 percent is the max allowable. That includes the additional pavement that we had to add for that 18 foot wide emergency access road. So we thought about requesting that impervious coverage variance when we initially had this as...inaudible...but given that its grass today so this is an improvement of design. Checked the lease, there is no requirements in the cell tower lease that say it needs a paved area and obviously it doesn't have anything today. So for those reasons and to remain under the allowable coverage we opted for a gravel driveway. Which I think serves it well and and keeps us from having to request that variance.

Mr. Weiss: Chuck, do you have a problem with that?

Mr. McGroarty: I have no problem, Mr. Chairman. I did ask, I think I asked in the review letter, they should just tell us who will be responsible for maintaining that. Will that be your client or will it be the owners of the compound?

Mr. Welch: No. The property owners responsible to maintain that.

Mr. McGroarty: The property owner of the self-storage?

Mr. Welch: Yes.

Inaudible.

Mr. Welch: Either one. Whoever is responsible for the site as a whole, will be responsible.

Mr. McGroarty: We need to know when there is a problem, who we go talk to and we don't have any arguments about, I don't think there will ever be a problem but we just want to make sure it stays clean and orderly. Right?

Mr. Capizzi: Absolutely.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Matt was there anything else? Any other changes, additions? I know we are kind of hitting from a couple of different reports.

Mr. Welch: No, those were the main things. I think...

Mr. McGroarty: I have a few others.

Mr. Welch: I haven't had an opportunity to go through the report. There was certainly more comments. I don't...I could take the time to go through all of them, but from a general standpoint we are going to agree to comply to their satisfaction.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. So, Chuck, you said you found a couple others?

Mr. McGroarty: Well, Mr. Chairman, just based on some conversations that we had today, we had concerns, the royal we, here but concerns about parking perpendicular to Building A, up in the front. Matt, can you direct your cursor up there?

Mr. Welch: There are...as the Board may remember from last time, a portion of the building A frontage is where we have...inaudible. The isle widens from 25 feet to 35 feet. In general we found these self-storage uses, patrons will park parallel to the building to load and unload. However, there are...inaudible... refuse to park perpendicular, obviously that may cause concern in terms of just general circulation. So what we can do to further reinforce it? Obviously there are going to be cameras. There is going to be staff that will be able to observe how customers are parking. But we can add some signs that will further reinforce that parallel parking in front of the building. So that will be exact wording in terms of the condition of approval. We'll agree to put signage on the building that directs customer to park parallel.

Mr. Weiss: Chuck, tell me there was another thing, I think?

Mr. McGroarty: I don't know if there were any major other changes. The Board should be aware, and you probably are, since you've all had a chance to see the plans. There is a water tower being proposed next to Building A. Matt very helpfully pointed out to me it's a circle next to it. I was actually able to see that earlier. The tower itself is reflected on the architectural plan. Which perhaps the architect later will testify about it. Its almost 27 feet high and its 18 feet in diameter. So its not a small structure. You know this property is up on a hill. So, there was some discussion, you know, do they need to have water? So that's why its there? Mike had some thoughts about an alternative system, I don't know if that's going to happen or not? One thing I suppose we can get to it when we get to the architectural discussion is that's going to be a prominent structure there and we'll discuss the color of the buildings in a few minutes, I guess, does the Board want to give some consideration to any colors for this water tower?

Mr. Weiss: I suppose we take that a couple steps further. And the maintenance, because I think we all know what happens to these things over a couple of years. So if you paint it a nice pretty blue, we know if it becomes kind of rusty looking. So we certainly want to make sure we address the maintenance of such a tower if we go forward with it. I'd like to consider other options. But like you said, we'll address that with the architect.

Mr. Capizzi: As far as the water access, there are no other options. We don't have access to the municipal system because I understand the municipal system is at capacity. This water tower is not for potable water. Its for the fire suppression system. Which is why its being proposed at the site. Its going to be a pre-fab water tower that we would have dropped shipped to the site. And its our plan to have it painted gray to match a portion of the building exterior. But as far as other options, unfortunately this is a necessary component to the project in order to service the fire suppression system. And Matt, perhaps you can talk to us about why that is and from a vista perspective the change in grade from the roadway to a point at the water tower area and how much if any of that would be visible?

Mr. Welch: I'll just add, I've been to the site a number of times and it does sneak up on you as you are coming down 46. You have the grade change. There are a lot of trees. The east of the site and it's the old school building that's onsite today. You really almost don't see it until you are right in front of the site. At least in my experience. Obviously, you've been there many more times than I have. But it...really until you are almost in front of the site, does it become visible. The water tower is going to be set back further than the main building. The architect is going to have some additional testimony in terms of it and what's proposed. But I want to offer in terms, my personal experience in terms of...We did try to intentionally push it back a little bit so it wouldn't be as visible. When you look up...inaudible... its actually makes it harder from the front to see things when you go onsite. I wanted to add to that a bit, but I think the architect has some more that he is going to include in his presentation.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Schaechter: I have a question, Howie.

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead.

Mr. Schaechter: The school that's there today, they don't have a take for a sprinkler for fire suppression, is there another system that can be used for this that's not a tank?

Mr. Welch: I'm sorry sir. I was having a little trouble hearing you.

Mr. Schaechter: I said, the school that's there today, has a fire suppression system in it and they are not using a water tower for fire suppression. Why is the water tank needed?

Mr. Capizzi: I think it's the scale of the suppression system. But perhaps Matt Welch can speak to that.

Mr. Schaechter: Okay.

Mr. Welch: Speak to what's there today? I can say, with the project MEP, obviously it would be great to ...inaudible...but my understanding is in terms of, to get the adequate...inaudible...a tank is needed. The site is fed from a well. Not from the public water. Obviously there is...if you think about...inaudible...so if there is a power outage...inaudible.

Mr. Capizzi: Matt? Your audio is coming in and out frequently. Maybe hop off the internet so the audio is a little more fluid. The audio is coming out and it is hard to hear you.

Inaudible.

Mr. Welch: Obviously we would prefer to not have a tank based on the fire person's design and discussed with...inaudible...I have...have him take a look at it because I'm sure our client would rather...inaudible...the expense. Inaudible. My understanding is that's required.

Mr. Capizzi: I apologize, Mr. Chairman, that the testimony isn't going through totally cleanly. But we'll have the architect address that to the extent that he can.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. I guess that's what we should really do because I understand that we can get the answers...inaudible...from the architect. I know Matt has gone through the reports. I'm going to just maybe take a minute to turn to Mike. I know he referred to your report as well as Jeff's report. Mike, do you find that there is any open issues, in your report, that we should talk about while we have Matt?

Mr. Vreeland: I think the revised plans and the discussions we had earlier today, and the changes that he talked about, the additional changes they talked about making, addressed pretty much all the open comments that we had.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. And if you find something else, because I know your second report was quite lengthy and rather specific, so Mike as we close up, if you find anything else we will certainly give you the floor back.

Mr. Vreeland: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: I do also want to then turn to Dr. Keller's report...and I did read the report Jeff...and I know that they touched upon some of your recommendations, which is very much appreciated. It does look like you made more suggestions than Matt had identified. So let's do the same thing. I know I marked up your report a little bit. Let's make sure your concerns are addressed and spoken to. And then let me know if you are satisfied with the results.

Dr. Keller: Thank you. I had the impression from our discussions this afternoon, that the applicant was prepared to comply with all the recommendations that I made. There was the issue of the use of mulch. A 3 inch bed of mulch across the entire basin area and we discussed that and I offered my thoughts on why I don't think that's necessarily a real good idea. The fact that in the Regs, New Jersey Stormwater Management Regs, it's not a requirement to use mulch, it's recommended. And so we discussed why there may be a better alternative and my sense was we were going to go with the alternative recommended. Matt, the only thing that I noticed that we didn't really discuss this afternoon, basically I have the understanding that you were in agreement with all of the recommendations, I just wanted to double check on Item 8. Comment 8 that I made about a deer enclosure. At least taking a look at that possibility of putting in an enclosure around the entire reforestation area around the basin as opposed to simply using a tree shelters for the individual deciduous trees. The deer enclosure would also protect all the shrubs that you are going to have in there. And would probably reduce the need for replacement if there is a deer problem. I don't know how many deer are still using this area now that the major development has taken place next door and kind of opened up the landscape over there. But generally within the Township, deer have been a problem, historically, with plantings that have been put in. The enclosure, I think,

offers a good alternative and it may just be...I think it might be cost beneficial in the long run. I just wanted to double check and make sure that was on the table for you to at least take a look at.

Mr. Welch: Yes. Inaudible...By not going through individually, we are going to comply. I think you had good recommendations in the letter so we are going to comply with them.

Dr. Keller: Great. Looking forward to working with you. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: I appreciate that, Matt. And Dr. Keller, on Page. 2, Number 2, was another item that I noted, that your comment is an inconsistency with the ordinance, on the planting schedule. That's been addressed as well?

Dr. Keller: Yes. Rather than using all smaller materials, they will switch and use the three different sizes that are noted in Schedule A, in the ordinance.

Mr. Weiss: Excellent. Then my only other comment was, I know it was addressed earlier about the additional row of trees, you certainly answered my questions on the report and I do appreciate the cooperation from Dr. Keller's report, Matt. And...inaudible...I appreciate that. I think what happens then...and Dr. Keller, do you have anything else in your report you wanted to chat about?

Dr. Keller: No, I...like I said, I looked at, so far, things have been very cooperative and I look forward to assisting the applicant to achieve the goals of their program and ours.

Mr. Weiss: Okay and then I guess to finalize some of the engineering we did have a second report by our Traffic Consultant, Walt Lublanecki. Walt, did you have any input? I know you also did the same. You sent in a report. I take it you were part of today's conversation as well?

Mr. Lublanecki: No, I was not. I had some minor comments though. One, I'll just go over them. I only had 3 comments. The first, just a little bit of housekeeping there. There was an error in the traffic report which I assume the traffic engineer has to correct. You're going to have to submit that report to the DOT anyway. Probably you should submit a revised report with that error corrected. Its just a matter of reversing some traffic volumes. Again, very minor comment. Next comment was, I wanted some type of a sign that identified the emergency access at the site, so people wouldn't think turning into the site, they wouldn't go straight ahead and think they could get through that gate. I had suggested an arrow that would direct people to the left. I don't know if you are fighting to put something like that in, or maybe even some kind of sign that identifies that that is an emergency access and not to be used by the public.

Mr. Welch: Yes. Is the short answer. I don't know if we'll...I think we'll take a look at some of the options but we agreed to install some type of signage so its obvious that that isn't a public gate. That it's for emergencies only.

Mr. Lublanecki: Okay, that's good. And then the last is...I'm sure you are going to do this...whatever this is done but this is more for fire and police that the gates are definitely breakaway or something that they wouldn't restrict access. Even for a police car, in an emergency, if those gates were locked. And that's a detail that you would get into a little bit later?

Mr. Welch: Correct. And we'll...I think that was raised in one of the other comment letters, as well, is to make sure the gates and allowance for emergency access is satisfactory with fire, police, other emergency personnel. So we will of course make sure we have sign off from them. What we are proposing will work in case of emergencies. We will agree to comply.

Mr. Lublanecki: Okay. That sounds good. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Walt, thanks' so much. Matt, once again thank you for that cooperation. Chuck, obviously at this point its enough with your report. And I know if there was anything dealing with the engineering that you feel is open...Matt Capizzi did you tell me you do have a planner?

Mr. Capizzi: We do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, Chuck tell me how you want to handle your report?

Mr. McGroarty: I think, Mr. Chairman, I think Matt Welch has answered a lot of the questions that I had and certainly has responded...I think before their planner testifies, well of course its up to them, but we do have some concerns about the architectural plans. Specifically about some of the features on the buildings.

Mr. Capizzi: It was my intention to call the planner last.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. That's fine. I think, if anybody from the Planning Board has any questions for the engineer, we spoke about a lot of different angles, lets...Dan Nelsen, go ahead.

Mr. Nelsen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure Dr. Keller addressed this but Matt, I just had a question. You mentioned before, talking about the spillage from the basin. That you hopefully thought it would make its way slowly to Route 46.

Mr. Welch: So, and I'll go into a little more detail in there. So, after reviewing the review letters, after discussing with the professionals, we spent a decent...inaudible...probably this afternoon looking at a redesign of that basin. Based on what we...nothing is ever 100 percent, but our intention is to redesign the basin to redirect the spillway to instead of spilling towards the west, to spill onto the paved areas of the site and then any overflow from the basin will be maintained on the paved areas until it ultimately find by...down to 46.

Mr. Nelsen: Okay.

Mr. Weiss: Anybody else from the Planning Board?

Mr. Mania: Mr. Chairman, I have the concern over the gravel drive roadway. When its plow snow, they also plow the gravel. It's a concern. Is there anything we can...inaudible...

Mr. Weiss: Why don't we...inaudible...gravel only on the small access to the cell tower?

Mr. Welch: Correct. The gravel would only be on that small access driveway to the cell tower. The entire rest of the site will be paved.

Mr. Weiss: I don't know if we know the answer but I'm just kind of thinking out loud, that previously if it was all grass and a big snow storm they probably weren't going for general maintenance on the cell tower. I would imagine the same thing would happen if its snow covered? They'd probably just will stay away. Its not an everyday path that won't be used by anybody except by the maintenance folks, correct?

Mr. Capizzi: Correct.

Mr. McGroarty: And by the way, Mr. Chairman, in the event as Mr. Mania says, that that area does get plowed and the gravel gets pushed out onto the grass and so on, that's why we mentioned...I mentioned earlier about the maintenance. I think it would be pretty infrequent but if that happens it's the owner's responsibility to clean it up some time after the storm.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Thank you John. Anybody else from the Planning Board? Mr. Buzak.

Mr. Buzak: Yes. Just one question regarding the buildings. When you were talking about the lighting, Matt, you said that only the front building will be accessible at night. Number one, how is that going to be done? Will there be fencing or gates to prevent access to the other three buildings? How do you accomplish that objective?

Mr. Welch: Correct. So there is a gate on the northeast corner of Building A. I can...based on my connection I'm trying to minimize what I share but I can pull back up the site plan.

Mr. Buzak: Is that opposite the emergency drive?

Mr. Capizzi: Correct.

Mr. Welch: Correct. The emergency drive at...inaudible...actual gate that leads into the site...inaudible...and essentially that gate is, after 10:00PM, you are not going to be able to go through that gate. Its going to be locked...inaudible... So the only customers that'll have access to the site are inaudible...the storage lockers that are in the...inaudible...directly along the front isle. Or patrons that have storage lockers inside of building A. Which is only accessed from the main entry along the northerly side of the site.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. And can you just, now that you have it up, point out that gate.

Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: We're looking at exhibit A-6.

Mr. Welch: I'm referring to exhibit A-6.

Mr. Buzak: Yes.

Mr. Welch: Is just off the east side of that building. So there is no customer access anything south of Building A between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. And where is the gate, I'm sorry I'm still missing the gate to, I see Building A and I see the drive. Is it up on the...

Mr. McGroarty: Do you see the water tower? Do you see the circle?

Mr. Buzak: Yes.

Mr. McGroarty: Go up a little bit. Go up about an inch.

Mr. Welch: If you look on our site plan, there's that proposed 5 foot sidewalk X, on the isle. You can see the diagram of a gate right above that. We show a swing gate. It might end up being a sliding gate. Those details will be provided prior.

Mr. Buzak: Okay, I see it now. And the related question is when you say at night, what are the hours that you're planning to have that gate locked.

Mr. Welch: 10:00 pm and 6:00 am.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Just one other question, since I have you here and we have the water tower. Is this a water tower where there is a structure and a tank on top? Or is it a tank that runs from the ground up?

Mr. Welch: It's my understanding and the architect will provide more. From the ground up. Its not your welcome to Mount Olive water tower. This is...inaudible...to the ground.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Well it could be a welcome to Mount Olive water tank. Inaudible. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Okay Matt. You can take this down.

Inaudible.

Mr. McGroarty: By line of succession here, I'm going to ask, can we take a ten minute break? Until we get the chairman back?

Mr. Schaechter: Lets say we reconvene at 8:20.

Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. 8:20 pm. We are back on the record. I do apologize for that. Matt? When I was last here, I was seeing if anybody else had any questions? I think the Planning Board has asked some questions. What I want to do is open it to the public. If anybody from the public has any questions? I am looking at our list of attendees. When we open it to the public, if anybody has a question you simply push the raise the hand button. I don't see anybody from the public.

Mr. Westdyk: Wait. Mr. Simoff.

Mr. Weiss: Mr. Simoff. If we can bring up Mr. Simoff. When this happens, Mr. Simoff, you are going to state your name, spelling your last name for the record, with your address.

Mr. Simoff: Can you hear me?

Mr. Weiss: Yes. Don't see you though.

Mr. Westdyk: I only allowed him to talk. Do you want me to promote him to a panelist?

Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: Hal, go ahead if you would, state your name and spell your last name for the Record. With your address.

Mr. Simoff: Hal Simoff. S I M O F F. My address is 2 Shunpike Road, Madison New Jersey. As you all are aware, I represent as an engineer the project adjacent that surrounds this property on the three sides. The first question I have is, Matt, did you look at or have you been apprised of my copy...my site plan approved? Have you seen the site plan?

Mr. Welch: I have. I'm not intimately familiar with it. But I am aware of it.

Mr. Simoff: My concern, if I can raise the issue, is my concern is this plan does not plot the location of the residential units on three sides of the property. I think that the Board is getting...without that information the Board is not the full picture.

Mr. Weiss: If I could just ask Mr. Simoff to ask questions. He's free to make questions. If he wants to make a statement I would think that would come later on in the application.

Mr. Simoff: Well, did you...you did not plot or determine the location of the units that surround the property? That's the question.

Mr. Welch: I am aware of the units that are constructed and the ones that are still under construction to the south of the site.

Mr. Simoff: What about the east and the west?

Mr. Welch: The east I think is...inaudible. I am going to bring up an exhibit that we...and which exhibit it is...that we did present at the...inaudible. It was a site plan rendering of the site.

Mr. Weiss: Exhibit A-2

Mr. Welch: This is exhibit A-2. A re-scenario. As part of this you can see some of the residential units that are under construction. You can see the detention basin that's been constructed to the south of the site. You can't see anything further south than that but there are additional res...inaudible...basically where the title block is. So, just off the page and then there is

further future development off the corner. We are aware of the proximity of this side due to the adjacent residences and obviously we were sensitive to that. Its actually one of the reasons why we placed our retention basin in the back instead of the front, was a lot of the activity of the site closer to 46.

Mr. Simoff: What sizes is the landscaping proposed? What plantings are proposed along the property line and the buffers?

Mr. Welch: There is a variety of evergreens. We are going to be putting in some more deciduous as well. Right now there is virtually no evergreens. So, even though it looks like a nice...inaudible...from above. When you are at ground level you can see directly through the site. We've enhanced the landscaping and based on discussions with your professionals, will be enhanced more to their satisfaction.

Mr. Simoff: And what are the height of the landscaping you are planting?

Mr. Welch: They vary. Anything from shrubs to taller evergreens. I can bring it back up.

Mr. Simoff: If I can remind you, they are six foot evergreens.

Mr. Welch: At planting. And they will grow from there.

Mr. Weiss: Mr. Simoff? Do you have any other questions?

Mr. Simoff: No. Oh, yes. What is the walking distance from the trash enclosure to the office?

Mr. Welch: Discussed previously, there is a little cart on site. Bringing any trash from the front to the back.

Mr. Simoff: What is the driving distance?

Mr. Welch: If you give me a moment I can measure it. I'm going to be referring to exhibit A-6. There is a service area behind Building A. Measuring the approximate distance along the path. Full distance is about 815 feet, plus or minus.

Mr. Simoff: Did you consider other locations?

Mr. Welch: We did. We thought for a variety of reasons that this was, worked out the best. There's not a ton of other areas to speak of. We could put it adjacent to the cell tower, but I don't really think that decreases the distance. And that area would be along...closer to the westerly property line. This is kind of like a nice tucked in area...won't be visible. The opening in the trash enclosure faces into the site. So its not really a nuisance to residences.

Mr. Simoff: And how far is that from the residences?

Mr. Welch: I don't have the proposed residential buildings on our plan. But if I had to mention approximate distance of the trash enclosure to the property line, its roughly 78 feet.

Mr. Weiss: Matt, you told us it's a 4 cubic yard container that's going to be secured, locked, for paper products.

Inaudible.

Mr. Welch: Four cubic yard container is what's proposed.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. So that's...any other questions about that Mr. Simoff?

Mr. Simoff: No. Not at this time.

Mr. Weiss: All right. Thank you. You would then close the screen again. No, I didn't get lost. I have it open to the attendees. Does anybody else, anybody else from the public have any questions? If so, raise your hand. I see none, so let me close it to the public. Mr. Capizzi, I will turn it back over to you. You'll bring up your next witness.

Mr. Capizzi: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our next witness is Scott Daniel, our site architect.

Mr. Weiss: Mr. Daniel was not part of last application, so let's have Mr. Buzak swear him in.

Inaudible.

Scott Daniel was sworn in for the Record.

Mr. Buzak: Please state your name and business address for the record, spelling your last name.

Mr. Daniel: Sure. Scott Daniel. D A N I E L. Business address is 110 Edison Place, Newark, New Jersey.

Mr. Buzak: That's DANIEL.

Mr. Daniel: That is correct. DANIEL, yes.

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Capizzi.

Mr. Capizzi: Thank you, Mr. Buzak. Mr. Daniel, can you take us through your educational and professional experiences, please?

Mr. Daniel: Sure. I have a Bachelors of Architecture from the New Jersey Institute of Technology. I am a registered architect in New Jersey. I have thirty years' experience in the field of architecture. My experience with...inaudible...I've done multiple personal self-storage facilities, in New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Capizzi: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we off him as an expert in the field of architecture.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you Mr. Daniel. Your licensing is accurate and up to date.

Mr. Daniel: Yes it is.

Mr. Weiss: Have you ever appeared In front of the Mount Olive Planning Board?

Mr. Daniel: No. I have not.

Mr. Weiss: Does anybody, Mike or Chuck have any questions.

Mr. McGroarty: I have none.

Mr. Weiss: Well, Mr. Daniel we're going to accept you as the expert architect for the application and welcome to Mount Olive.

Mr. Daniel: Thank you.

Mr. Capizzi: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Capizzi: Scott, if you can take us through, in a general sense, the proposed building arrangement. And then if you can take us through Building A and tell us the interior layout as well as the façade materials.

Mr. Daniel: Absolutely. I will share my screen. Hopefully you can see my screen right now.

Mr. Capizzi: Yes.

Mr. Buzak: Yes.

Mr. Daniel: There are 4 buildings on the site. One is a 3story building. The other 3 are a 1 story facility. It's a total of 95,000 square feet of floor area.

Mr. Weiss: Mr. Daniel, I just want to slow you down a little bit. We have a new exhibit in front of us.

Mr. Buzak: We'll mark this as A-8.

Mr. Weiss: Yes.

Mr. Buzak: And is this one of the sheets of the architectural plans that you submitted,
Mr. Daniel.

Mr. Daniel: Yes it is.

Mr. Buzak: Is it sheet three? It looks like...

Mr. Daniel: This is...yes. I'm sorry. This is page three and its dated 6/17/2020.

Mr. Buzak: This sheet was not revised. I think you submitted revised architectural. Is that correct?

Mr. Daniel: Yes we did. Actually this was revised. I don't see...their revision date but I think it was in December.

Mr. Buzak: Yes. Let me take a look because I have them here.

Mr. McGroarty: That's the...that was one of my comments. Your sheets did not bear the revision dates.

Mr. Daniel: Okay.

Mr. Buzak: The cover sheet refers to revisions on 11/16/2020. Does that sound about right?

Mr. Daniel: Yes.

Mr. Capizzi: Mr. Daniel, that was the original set.

Mr. Daniel: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

Mr. Capizzi: The supplemental set that was filed by my office, I received them on or about December 11th. So, although they don't bear a revision date, would you say its safe to say that the plans were revised on or about December 11th?

Mr. Daniel: Yes. I would.

Mr. Capizzi: We apologize for the confusion there but the plans that should be noted as being last revised December 11th, 2020.

Mr. Buzak: I guess, Mary, these are the plans that were received by the Board? You have it stamped, or Chuck, as December 18, 2020.

Mr. McGroarty: Correct.

Ms. Strain: Yes.

Mr. Buzak: Okay.

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead Mr. Daniel.

Mr. Daniel: Okay. What we are looking at right here is the 3 story building. This 3 story building it is composed of...each level is 18,000 square feet. We have some external units. We have

11 external units in the front. We have 24 external units in the back. We have a total of 472 internal units, which comprise all 3 floors.

Mr. Capizzi: On the first floor, there, you have a little personnel office?

Mr. Daniel: Yes we do. We have a personnel office. We have a janitor's closet, bathroom, trash room and elevators for vertical transportation.

Mr. Capizzi: Since we are still on the first floor, can you tell me how people are able to enter the building and exit the building?

Mr. Daniel: Yes. People will enter the building through the front doors into the lobby area. They will then enter an automatic sliding glass door where they will enter the internal corridor. We have egress on either end to conform with code where they can access each of the internal units that are within the property. To go up to the second and third floor, we will utilize two stairways. One at the corner and one towards the center of the building and also two elevators. These will go up to the second and third floor.

Mr. Capizzi: So, the second floor plan that we see on the bottom of the sheet, the third floor mimics that at the third floor level?

Mr. Daniels: Yes it does. They are...they mirror each other. Yes.

Mr. Capizzi: Okay. Your next sheet, if you want to take us through the exterior of Building A and tell us about the façade materials, etcetera, about the exterior.

Mr. Daniels: The exterior materials, the white and the blue are metal panel...

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Daniel, I'm sorry. Lets mark this as A-8. Sorry, A-9.

Mr. Weiss: A-9. And we are going to title it the exterior of Building A? Is that what this is?

Mr. Daniel: Yes it is. Page 2.

Mr. Weiss: Got it. Okay go ahead.

Mr. McGroarty: It's a rendering. It's not the site, correct?

Mr. Daniel: Right. It's a rendering. But it shows the façade. So, the materials on the face that fronts the road, are metal panel. It is the colored panel. The color that you see in blue. Also the color that you see in white. The material that is in the brownish-gray tone is actually concrete modular unit, which is concrete block. These will be the garage doors. These will be the ones that are accessible from the exterior and the front. On the back, is primarily the same elevation without the false windows that are in the front. These false windows are spandrel glass, which means they are frosted glass. They are fake windows. They do not see into the building. The...this is the entrance way right here, which has a canopy, a metal clad canopy. Above it are windows that look into a three story clear space as you enter into the lobby.

Mr. Capizzi: As far as the color selection for the building, that is still subject to change, correct?

Mr. Daniel: Yes. I mean the final color is open to change. The client would like to have some type of color so that it is visible from the road. As part of their scheme.

Mr. Capizzi: So the color may change but the overall patina of the façade material would be in line with what we are seeing here?

Mr. Daniel: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Let me interrupt real quick. I'm just going to give you my opinion. That that blue doesn't really work for me. I understand you want it to be noticeable. At the same time, we don't need this thing sticking out like a sore thumb. So, we are going to need to come to an agreement as to a color that is workable for both of us. Personally the blue doesn't work for me.

Mr. Natafalusy: I have to agree, Mr. Chairman. I mean, if that is sitting at a higher elevation that is going to stick out. We are going to be back to the McDonalds with the red roof.

Mr. Weiss: That is exactly what I'm thinking. The blue doesn't work obviously for Catherine or myself. There has to be a more subtle color. We are not running a circus around here. Might as well put the spotlights on it and a ferris wheel. That's just not an acceptable color to me.

Mr. Capizzi: We'll get there Mr. Chairman. I hope we'll get there. Ultimately we are not...I don't believe we are in a position, at this point, to agree on a final color, because we don't have an end user yet. Depending on who the operator may be for this facility, they'll have a brand that goes along with their other portfolio and we really are looking to file steam with that. So we are certainly not trying to be, certainly, uncooperative we've been very cooperative with the Board, Board's professionals. And they've been cooperative with us and we certainly appreciate that. We're certainly looking to continue that relationship of cooperation. Certainly the façade material is an important element to us, for branding purposes. We appreciate the Board's opinion of that but it is certainly an important facet to us to fall along with the branding of the end user to attract customers to the site. Ultimately to make sure the site is a successful one.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, but we are not going to be...

Mr. Buzak: Can I raise a question here, Mr. Chairman? If I might?

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead.

Mr. Buzak: I'm concerned about this end user. I think all of us, let me speak for myself. I've seen a number of the facilities in different Boards bought effectively by the end user or where the end user is known and I think Mr. Capizzi is correct, they all seem to have their own brand. You know if you look at the main ones that you see in multiple municipalities, they generally look the same because that's the intention. It's the McDonalds, you know you want to see the golden arches. I'm a little concerned, Mr. McGroarty mentioned that, correctly so, that this a rendering. This is an architects rendering of a typical space. We are talking about false windows and an atrium. We're

talking about a canopy and it looks like we have a section of the building and the façade elevated beyond the other third floor and all that. What I'm concerned about is and I know the Board members have all seen this. We look at this and think that's what we are getting and then the product in the end, it may have the same number of units but it doesn't resemble at all what we were shown.

Mr. Capizzi: Mr. Buzak, If I can just clarify. I apologize. I think the only element that's subject to change is really whether the blue is some other color. The windows that Mr. Daniel just spoke about, the frosted windows will be in that location. They will be frosted windows. The portion of the building that is white, will be white. The entry way will be the entryway as it's designed. The only element that has the potential to change is whether the blue turns to a different color. That would be the only exception.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. I'm glad you clarified that Mr. Capizzi, because this way the Board knows of what we are dealing with. Thank you. I'm sorry Mr. Chairman, I interrupted you.

Mr. Weiss: Catherine, go ahead.

Ms. Natafalusy: How do we clarify how this end user...I mean I'm very confused. I thought Budd Lake Storage was the end user? How are we ever going to find out what color is ultimately, will be on this building? Would they have to come back to the Board?

Mr. Buzak: We could pose that as a condition. I'm sure they don't want to do that. I would think they would not want to do that. So maybe we can come up with an alternative.

Mr. Weiss: I'm open for suggestions but we certainly...I certainly can't sit here and allow the end user not tell us what color it's going to be.

Ms. Natafalusy: I agree.

Mr. Weiss: I'm open for suggestions and again, Matt, I do truly appreciate the cooperation. This is one of those things that the Planning Board at least, through my words, I've seen it too many times. We're going to come to an agreement on the color. That we agree upon. Chuck?

Mr. McGroarty: I have a suggestion. In my less than subtle ways I took a shot at the blue color also. I was suggesting that it's kind of stark. For the reasons that both you and Ms. Natafalusy just said. Here is a thought. They are proposing a monument sign down at route...I'm a little distracted by this because it's not Mount Olive. A monument sign down at the entrance off Route 46. Which is conforming, again this is probably not helpful...inaudible.

Mr. Capizzi: Scott, can you change to a different plan so we can see what Mr. McGroarty is referring to, please?

Mr. Daniel: Yes.

Mr. McGroarty: Yes. Let's go to the site plan. That's a good idea. Or show us your monument sign. Mr. Daniel if you would show us your monument...there you go, perfect.

Mr. Weiss: Let's refer to this as A-10. Chuck, we are going to refer to that as A-10.

Mr. McGroarty: Exhibit A-10. Okay. My thought was this. The monument sign conforms to the town standards in terms of size, setback, it's down by Route 46 entrance and it meets all our standards for setbacks and size and height. That sign is going to truly attract attention to this building and that is the testimony from Mr. Welch, told us earlier...inaudible...that his position was that you don't see the building until you are basically on top of it. So I don't think the color of the building is going to attract people as much as this sign. If they want to have this sign in their color scheme, whether it's this color or something else, perhaps that's maybe a compromise. Say sure why not have that color with whatever the tenant or user's name is and perhaps the applicant might want to agree to a more neutral earth tone color of the building tonight. And if that changes then they can come back to the Board and attempt to persuade the Board that a different color is more appropriate.

Mr. Capizzi: Mr. McGroarty, what if we did a more subtle blue? A lighter blue? Something not as bold as what we are showing on the building at present?

Mr. Schaechter: I would like to, for one, see the color. Because what you describe as a lighter blue, there is many shades of blue. As we all know. I wouldn't be prepared to vote on this without seeing a full color.

Mr. McGroarty: Bear in mind, you're right next door, now, to a new residential development which is going up and particularly, based on my own observation and my own opinion, the apartment buildings up in the front of the complex...not even the market units in the back, but the apartment buildings in the front, that will be the affordable housing...the developer of that is taking, in my opinion, great care to design those buildings very nicely. So it would be nice if this had some, we're not asking you to design your building the same as theirs but this would be such a stark contrast in terms of the color. And it is at such a higher elevation along 46, I just don't think a blue is a good fit here.

Ms. Natafalusy: Howie?

Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead. Just real quick. It's very hard for me to see. So, I only see a couple of you at one time so if anybody has a comment please just maybe be more vocal. Catherine, go ahead.

Mr. Capizzi: Catherine...inaudible...can you take this plan down so the Board can see everybody, please.

Mr. Weiss: Thanks for that Matt.

Mr. Capizzi: Sure. Just stop screen sharing for a moment please.

Ms. Natafalusy: I was just going to say, I don't like the color on the sign, definitely. That is, that royal blue does not fit in with neighborhood. I think Village Green across the street, did a lot

of work on their buildings, very muted kind of earth tones. The new development next door, kind of the same colors. I would not go for this royal blue. I think it has to be muted or some kind of earth tones.

Mr. Capizzi: What... Would the Board find a light grey to be suitable?

Mr. McGroarty: Yes.

Mr. Mania: Believe it or not I was going to suggest grey.

Ms. Natafalusy: Better than that blue. Tell you that.

Mr. Mania: Grey is not so obtrusive.

Mr. Weiss: Well there's got to be some kind governing decision maker because I think Catherine hit it right on the head, between Village Green and Mr. Simoff's development next door, you're seeing...muted grey would work fine. I think if you look at some of the colors that are over at the Village Green, the idea is to be in sync with what's in the neighborhood. Obviously blue doesn't work. Red won't work. Pinks don't work. If the applicant has a certain colorway I'm all for the sign being their logo, their color, their thing. But the building sits so high and you can see that for miles. You have to come up with some kind of agreement and then some kind of final decision. There has to be a process.

Mr. Capizzi: Well, we certainly appreciate the signs along 46, following in with whatever style is associated with the brand. And then the building, doing light grey and if the Board was inclined to approve the application, the tone of the light grey could be subject to Mr. McGroarty's review and approval. Certainly we can submit a revised plan prior to the adopting a Resolution. We'd work out an arrangement with Mr. McGroarty relative to the color. If he was to report back to the Board that they found that to be acceptable, perhaps that could be an arrangement that works?

Mr. Weiss: Yes. I would almost hate, Matt, to put you into a corner and force you into a light grey because what would happen if, I don't know, a moss green and a brown is their color and those are certainly acceptable colors. I think maybe we should generalize and say muted tones. Final decision could be approval by Chuck and Mike? I don't know. I don't want to put more work on Chuck's plate, But I don't want to force you into a grey, when a brown and a green might be just as acceptable. I don't want to get caught up on this minutia but I think we are all agreeing, where we want to go.

Mr. Capizzi: Certainly, I like options. I'm trying to just...I'm sorry my clients are trying to send me some input. So I mean that would work fine with us, Mr. Chairman. Like we had said, have some freedom relative to the sign on 46 and the building would be an earth tone, lighter muted tone finish.

Mr. Weiss: You know its interesting, Chuck, if we go back many years ago the veterinary building that's in the area, we closed that meeting where there was a color...we ultimately, I think I went over and saw it and I reported back to the Board. I showed a picture and we all accepted that that was a good color. I don't want to spend all night going back and forth. There is a way to

handle this. A muted earth tone, I think is a nice clear message. Final approval whether its Chuck or a Board member, we can figure out how to get that approved. I don't get any other suggestion on how we do that, but I'd like not to spend all night talking about different colors. I don't want to put the applicant in a corner to give us grey. I do think they are hearing us loud and clear that some kind of muted earth tone that fits into the flair of that neighborhood is what we are looking for.

Mr. Schaechter: I have a question though, Matt, to that rendering. It looks like the building that was proposed, first of all it looked like an Ikea. Just so oversized for that parcel and I know it was a rendering. How much bigger is the building that you are proposing than what's there now as far as the school?

Mr. Capizzi: Building A?

Mr. Schaechter: Yes.

Mr. Daniel: Well, it is pretty comparable to what the school is right now. The size of the building is actually about the same size which is 54,000 square feet. As the original building going forward. What we are adding, what we are adding is just more floor space with the two additional buildings. So the original building was relatively the same size.

Mr. Nelsen: Excuse me, did you say 4,000 square feet?

Mr. Daniel: 54.

Mr. Nelsen: Okay.

Mr. McGroarty: The footprint of the Building A is much longer than just the school, is it not?

Mr. Daniel: It is.

Mr. McGroarty: I think that is what Mr. Schaechter was getting at.

Mr. Schaechter: That's exactly what I was getting at.

Mr. Daniel: Yes. It is.

Mr. Schaechter: About how much longer?

Mr. Daniel: Off the top of my head, I'm not sure to be honest.

Mr. Schaechter: Chuck, can you see if you can pull that out?

Mr. McGroarty: I can scale it.

Mr. Nelsen: Mr. Welch, would you have those numbers?

Mr. Schaechter: Thanks. It didn't look like the rendering was to scale.

Mr. Welch: I can provide a visual if that will help. I don't have the numbers off hand.

Mr. Weiss: Hold on. Chuck's got an answer for us.

Mr. McGroarty: The school building is 130 feet in length.

Mr. Weiss: And the new Building A?

Mr. McGroarty: 180 feet, I'm sorry.

Mr. Weiss: Okay so currently 180. Do you know the size of the new proposed Building A?

Mr. McGroarty: Building A. The school building is about 180 feet. Building A is 300.

Mr. Schaechter: Twice the length.

Ms. Natafalusy: That is a lot of blue.

Mr. Weiss: Okay so Brian, I think you got your answer. It was 180 its now going to be 300.

Mr. Schaechter: It's twice the size. It looked very large on the rendering.

Mr. Weiss: Lets get back. Let Mr. Daniel continue with his testimony.

Mr. Daniel: Moving on to Building B. Building B is approximately 20,500 square feet.

Mr. Capizzi: Mr. Daniel, can I just trouble you to bring that plan up for the Board please?

Mr. Daniel: Yes. Its...are you not seeing that?

Mr. Capizzi: Correct. You are not screen sharing. We have to mark it before you testify to it please.

Mr. Daniel: It's Page 6.

Mr. Weiss: We are going to call that A-11, which is Building B.

Mr. Daniel: So this is a one story building. Its got 164 units. Eighty of which are external units. What you see in the white. The blue are climate controlled which are accessible in the interior of the building. The façade is a grey metal panel.

Mr. Weiss: We are going to refer to this as A-12 and this is the façade, correct?

Mr. Daniel: Façade of Building B, yes. You are correct.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Daniel: It's a grey metal panel. The height of the building is 12 feet, 6 inches. As you can see. Its got the overhead doors as you normally see in a storage facility. This is Building C. Building C has a total of 99 units.

Mr. Capizzi: Let's just mark this real quick for me. A-13?

Mr. Weiss: A-13 correct.

Mr. Capizzi: And what page is this Scott?

Mr. Daniel: This is Page 8 and this is Building B, C and D.

Mr. Capizzi: C is on the top of the page?

Mr. Daniel: This is Building C on top of the page. And Building D is along the bottom. Building C has a total of 99 units. Forty-four are external. And 55 are internal units. You access through the rear and the front and egress is also through each side. The Building D is a single story and it contains 23 units. All of which are exterior accessible. No interior accessible. These are the same as Building B. They are grey and metal panel on the facades. They are 12 feet 6 inches tall.

Mr. Weiss: Scott, you are testifying to exhibit A-14 at this point?

Mr. Daniel: I'm sorry. Yes. I am. I'm going to fast.

Mr. Weiss: That's okay.

Mr. Capizzi: Can you take us through the finish for the building, please?

Mr. Daniel: Yes. This is a grey metal panel. Which is the same as Building B. C and D are the same grey metal panel and they each are the same height of 12, 6.

Mr. Capizzi: And just for clarification, all the buildings are sprinklered, correct?

Mr. Daniel: Yes they are.

Mr. Capizzi: Anything else on your plan sheets relative to the self-storage buildings?

Mr. Daniel: No, that's about it.

Mr. Capizzi: How about the water tower? What do you have on that, that you can illustrate for the Board?

Mr. Daniel: The water tower, this is what I have on the water tower. It is a 15 foot diameter. Though it says 18 on the site plan, its actually 15 feet.

Mr. Weiss: Let me stop you again real quick. We're looking at A-15, which is an image of the proposed 40,00 gallon water tower?

Mr. Daniel: That is correct.

Mr. McGroarty: Just to clarify though, this is not on the architectural plans, correct?

Mr. Daniel: No, it's not.

Mr. McGroarty: Okay.

Mr. Capizzi: Here is a little bit of background, Scott, about where this is going to be acquired from? How you got to the number of gallons, storage, etc.?

Mr. Daniel: Sure. Code required that if there is a fire it needs to be extinguished for 60 minutes. Doing the calculations, the 40,000 gallon tank is what is needed to extinguish the facility for 60 minutes. We had to locate that fire tank, since we did not have the capacity from the town for the water. This is a preselected unit that would be delivered to the site and then hooked up as it is delivered. It'll rest on a concrete foundation. The color will match the color of the grey metal panel which will match the grey color of the CMU on Building A. It will blend in with the color and with the building.

Mr. McGroarty: Would you say that again? I'm sorry. The color will match what?

Mr. Daniel: It'll match the grey metal panel, which will match the grey concrete block, or CMU, of Building A.

Mr. Capizzi: Scott, since we were talking about the color being subject to change and working with the Board to ultimately come up with a muted color scheme, this tank can be finished in any number of colors, correct?

Mr. Daniel: Oh yes. It comes in some pre-finished colors but it can also be matched by painting to match the building. Or, to match whatever color material it needs to be.

Mr. Weiss: Scott, I think I heard that it was 27 feet tall. Is that accurate?

Mr. Daniel: It's actually 30 feet tall. The prefabricated unit.

Mr. McGroarty: This is the concern. Now, we are seeing here tonight is a 15 foot diameter verses an 18, so that's fine. It's a little bit more narrow, but it's higher than what we have on the architectural plan. We have 26.9 or 26 feet 9 inches on the plan. This will be 30, I guess? What we are hearing.

Mr. Daniel: That's correct.

Mr. McGroarty: What is the height of Building A?

Mr. Daniel: The height of Building A is 40...it is 43 feet to the top of the parapet.

Mr. Capizzi: Scott, just while the Board is looking at some of the material. The tank itself, is that made out of like a high density plastic? Is that correct?

Mr. Daniel: It's actually made out of fiberglass. That's a typical tank that they make. Its out of reinforced fiberglass.

Mr. Nelsen: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead, Dan.

Mr. Nelsen: I have a question. Mr. Daniel, what is the difference between a tank and a tower? A water tank and water tower?

Mr. Daniel: Well a water tower would be at a higher elevation and it would be elevated on columns or stilts. The reason for that would be that you would need head pressure. So that head pressure would be able to for lack of a better word, drive the volume of the water through the pipes.

Mr. Nelsen: Okay. So this is a tank, not a tower?

Mr. Daniel: This is a tank. It sits on the ground.

Mr. Nelsen: Thank you.

Mr. Daniel: You're welcome.

Mr. Schaechter: So it sits on the ground and then there is a pump to get this through the pipes?

Mr. Daniel: That is correct.

Ms. Natafalusy: I think I missed it. Did you say this tank was going to be the same color as the building in the front? That you were going to match it? Or is going to be the grey that matches the buildings in the rear?

Mr. Daniel: Well, with the scheme that we have right now, it was going to be the dark greyish-brown color to blend in with the base of the building and the Buildings B, D and C. So, what our attorney is, what we are agreeing to, is that whatever colors we come up with we will match that color so it becomes part of the entire scheme of the building.

Ms. Natafalusy: The front building, we are talking about?

Mr. Daniel: That's correct.

Ms. Natafalusy: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Can you tell me a little bit about the maintenance of this product? I know its fiberglass verses maybe some others are steel. Is there a maintenance concern about this?

Mr. Daniel: No and that's why its fiberglass. The fiberglass, as you know, does not rust. It patinas but not at the degree of a metal panel. It does not heat up as much as a metal panel would. It definitely has more longevity than metal. So, fiberglass is a much more durable material and it actually keeps the water cleaner or purer as it sits in the tank.

Mr. Weiss: Is there routine or recommended maintenance from the manufacturer?

Mr. Daniel: The manufacturer does have a suggested maintenance program for that. I do not have that information with me right now but I'd be happy to provide that to the Board.

Mr. Weiss: Mr. Daniel, your opinion...maybe it's a better question for Matt...that at 30 feet it really won't be seen from the highway as Building A is 43 feet?

Mr. McGroarty: Well, it'll be next door to the building, not behind it, though.

Mr. Daniel: If Matt maybe can pull up the site plan, we can discuss that because I think that it will be shielded by the Building A as you drive northbound. Then as you drive southbound you have a ridge of trees that will also shield it as we go through.

Mr. Weiss: I think your testimony means driving east and west but we understand.

Mr. Daniel: Okay, east and west, okay.

Mr. Weiss: That's okay.

Mr. Batsch: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead, John.

Mr. Batsch: I have a question. What is the capacity of that tank? Is it 4,000 or 40,000?

Mr. Daniel: Forty. Four zero.

Mr. Batsch: How will that be then filled? From the town's water? I thought there was an issue with that availability of water?

Mr. Daniel: That will need to be filled externally.

Mr. Capizzi: Like a tanker truck, you mean, Scott?

Mr. Daniel: Yes.

Mr. Batsch: Thank you.

Mr. McGroarty: I know Dr. Keller had a question, Mr. Chairman, but one thing...whatever tank gets approved, I'll say again, I've said it in several of the reports, we need to see the details on the plans. Preferably the site plan. If its on the architectural plan, we have to have the details of the

sort we're seeing tonight. We don't want...I don't think the Board should be approving a tank that's 26 feet 9 inches and then wind up with a 30 foot tank.

Mr. Capizzi: We would certainly have to update the plans sets in order to conform with any amendments that we have agreed to make as well as the updated information on the storage tank.

Mr. Welch: If it helps again, I have pulled up exhibit A-2 which I thought may help the Board, just again visualize the location of the tank relative to the front of the building and the surrounding area.

Mr. Weiss: All right. So you would see it heading west, perhaps? Driving on Route 46.

Mr. Welch: Perhaps. I mean there is, again, a very significant grade change.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. McGroarty: You'll see it.

Mr. Weiss: That's about where home plate is currently and you can see that from the highway. All right. I don't want to take the thunder away from the architect. Scott Daniel, if you had anything else for us?

Mr. Daniel: Yes. Well no, actually I do not. The only thing that I'd like to add is that...we may have touched upon this before, but each building will have its own security on the inside of the building. I think Matt touched upon this earlier, about the 10:00 pm and 6:00 pm for the accessible units that are not 24 hours. That's really about it at this point.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Does anybody from the Planning Board have any other questions for Mr. Daniel?

Mr. McGroarty: I do.

Mr. Weiss: Chuck, go ahead.

Mr. McGroarty: Just to clarify then, for both the façade sign and the free standing monument sign, what you've provided to us is the template for the type of sign. But since you don't know the user yet so you don't have the details of the sign. Not sure about illumination yet? Is that correct?

Mr. Daniel: That is correct.

Mr. McGroarty: Okay. The façade and the free standing sign do comply with ordinance standards. So, the size is fine.

Mr. Weiss: And I suppose the illumination of such sign would also conform to Township standards?

Mr. Daniel: Absolutely. Yes Sir.

Inaudible

Mr. Weiss: So we could leave it alone. Anybody else from the Planning Board have any question for Mr. Daniel? Go ahead.

Mr. Ottavinia: Howie, I have a question.

Mr. Weiss: Paul, go ahead.

Mr. Ottavinia: I'm just curious, why they chose to have the building out front. The one that's closest to the highway be the multi story building. The reason I'm asking is because now that I know it's going to be 300 feet long and 43 feet high, seems to me that regardless of the color its going to be an eyesore.

Ms. Natafalusy: It's going to add to the eyesore.

Mr. Daniel: Okay. Well, I think they wanted to make a presence. It is part of their branding to do that. The color, if we can think about not the color, the architecture of the building, will not disrupt as much as the color. Its about a presence on the site, to be known where it is.

Mr. McGroarty: If I may...

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead.

Mr. McGroarty: Paul, to your point, I think in some ways, its very subjective on my part but I think having the multi-story building up front actually looks better because it hides the one story buildings behind it which are very typical looking self-storage garage type things. Even though it's a very big building, if its done right and the color scheme works and so on, I think it will look better than having just throws of garage doors up front.

Mr. Ottavinia: Okay.

Mr. Weiss: Interesting way to look at it Chuck. Thanks for that. Anything else Paul?

Mr. Ottavinia: No that's it.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Dan Nelsen, go ahead.

Mr. Nelsen: Mr. Daniel, just clarification on the hours you mentioned before. You mentioned 10:00 pm and 6:00 pm.

Mr. Capizzi: He misspoke. The balance of the site is not accessible from 10:00 pm to 6:00 am.

Mr. Nelsen: Okay. I thought so.

Mr. Daniel: Sorry, my mistake.

Mr. Nelsen: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Thanks for picking that up. Anybody else?

Mr. Schaechter: Has the applicant thought of maybe reducing the size of Building A down to something...inaudible...of what's there?

Mr. Capizzi: No. We haven't considered that.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. You asked the question Mr. Schaechter.

Mr. Schaechter: I got the answer.

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead, Mr. Buzak.

Mr. Buzak: Are there any signs proposed on the buildings themselves? Because on the rendering I don't recall having seen a sign on the building.

Mr. Capizzi: There is one, centrally located.

Mr. McGroarty: There is, not to answer for the applicant. There's two signs. One is free standing. One is on the building, the façade, on building A. And it just says tenant sign, right now.

Mr. Buzak: Oh, okay. I'm sorry.

Mr. McGroarty: But its, on the architect's, on Mr. Daniel's plan it meets the ordinance...in fact its less than the ordinance permits for a façade sign.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: I got to take it too, Mr. Daniel, there be some kind of internal signage for directions? Pointing people to Building A, B or C. Is that correct?

Mr. Daniel: Yes Mr. Chairman. There will be what we call way finding signage to direct all of the occupants throughout the inside of the building. Interior of the building.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Anybody else from the Planning Board? Okay so let me do this.

Mr. Ottavinia: Inaudible...if you get approvals, do you plan on selling the site? What's the timeframe do you think that somebody will actually buy it and start building? If its approved?

Mr. Capizzi: I apologize. I don't have that information. Scott, maybe as far as building out the site do you have an estimation? How long it may take to build out a site of this nature?

Mr. Daniel: It will probably take at the most 6 months to build this site. It's a modular unit site. They've engineered these units so that they can be modular. By modular, I mean its building blocks. So really its probably what will take the most time is the groundwork as far as

the...Matt can probably talk to you about this...is the civil work. Foundations, things like that. Once that is done then the units come in and the cladding goes up relatively quickly. So I would think that at the most, once its approved, once we get permit, a building permit for the building, we will...it will take about 6 months for it to be about 100 percent complete.

Mr. Capizzi: If I may just add supplement to that. My client was just sending me some input. So its our intention to build out the site. We may end up having some kind of arrangement with an end user whether we ultimately operate the facility. Whether we license it out. Whether we sell it. The ownership of the as built facility is unknown at this point and time. But we are going to be building out the site. Its our intention to start construction as soon as practical upon getting all the required approvals and the time table for the buildout is approximately 12 months.

Mr. Ottavina: That was my question. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Thanks. Dan?

Mr. Nelsen: Going back to Mr. Schaechter's question, have you considered reducing the size of Building A? Just a thought...if you were to consider maybe making that a two story building and making up the lost units, that you'd loose from a two story to a three story, you could make Building B also a two story building. And, it wouldn't be really seen from the road. It would just seem to be a less of an impact. Just a thought.

Mr. Weiss: Well, Dan, I guess your thoughts are just that. I don't think the applicant had any intent to change. But you threw it out there. Anybody else? Let me do this...

Mr. Vreeland: Mr. Chairman, I had one quick question.

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead, Mike.

Mr. Vreeland: It looks like on the architectural plans that there could be some roof top equipment? Its that what the intention is? Mechanical equipment on the roofs of some of these buildings?

Mr. Daniel: Yes sir. Since its climate controlled, there will be rooftop equipment to control the climate of the interior of the building.

Mr. McGroarty: Are you done Mike?

Mr. Vreeland: Yes.

Mr. McGroarty: Mr. Chairman, I forgot...I'm glad Mr. Vreeland brought that up. What about noise from rooftop units? Particularly the air conditioning units and the impact on the adjacent residential areas?

Mr. Daniel: The units will be within the code for the decibel level. Our engineers have carefully looked at the coordinates and the code. Each of the units, combined, will be within the ordinance.

Mr. McGroarty: The ordinance too, should...and to the extent the ordinance is not updated, It will match the State standards?

Mr. Daniel: Yes. Yes sir.

Mr. Capizzi: That's correct. And Its also important to know that Buildings B, C, and D only have one roof top unit on each building. I'm sorry just building B and C. Building D isn't conditioned.

Mr. McGroarty: Mr. Chairman, may I?

Mr. Weiss: Sure, Chuck.

Mr. McGroarty: I forgot to actually put this in the report, but some years ago the Planning Board recommended and the governing body adopted some changes to the zoning, to re-allow a rooftop treatment that would not count against your, up to a certain point, would not count against your height. Inaudible...around the roof to not only to control some of the audio impact but the visual impact. Perhaps you can, when you're going back, take a look at that? Particularly for Building A.

Mr. Daniel: Yes. If I could speak to that? There is a parapet that is on the exterior perimeter of the roof and because of the height and the way that its situated on the site, and the way they're placed, they're placed more towards the center if not directly in the center of the building. You will not see the rooftop units.

Mr. McGroarty: That parapet that's shown on the elevation, right, that doesn't go across the entire frontage of it? Does it? It doesn't appear to.

Mr. Daniel: Yes. I would have to respectfully differ with you. There is a slight parapet on the lower portion of what you're seeing. Not the white but perhaps the...what is now blue, right now. What we are discussing as blue. There is a parapet right there that is...

Ms. Natafalusy: Can you bring that up?

Mr. Daniel: Yes.

Mr. McGroarty: And that goes around the entire building then?

Mr. Daniel: Yes it does.

Mr. McGroarty: Okay.

Mr. Daniel: Let me dial in here. So, you can see that there is a parapet.

Mr. Capizzi: You're not sharing yet, Scott.

Mr. Daniel: See the units? When you can see that this is a higher parapet out front, so you would not see it from the road going this way. Here we have another parapet but since your

sight line, even your site line as you are closer to here, you're going to be at an angle that you're not going to see these units since they're far away from the edge of the building.

Mr. McGroarty: Yes, but I was talking about to the south and west, where the residential areas are. That's where, if there is a parapet, it looks like a foot or two. Which is not going to shield those units. In other words, I'm talking about behind Building A and to the west of Building A, which is where the residential development is going on.

Mr. Daniel: A parapet can actually, we can build a parapet that's larger or we can build screening if we need to.

Mr. McGroarty: Screening work too. We've done...the Board has done that for some buildings around the units themselves. I would suggest to the Board, something up there should be done.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Capizzi: We don't have an issue, Mr. Chairman, with certainly providing screening for those units.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you for that. So let me do this... Scott, you can minimize that if you would. You can stop sharing.

Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: So what I'm going to do, I think the Planning Board and our professionals have asked all the questions of Mr. Daniel. I want to open it to the public. If anybody from the public has a question you can simply raise your hand. I see Mr. Simoff has a question. So Dane, if you can bring up Mr. Simoff, who will be here to ask a question of Mr. Daniel based on the testimony that Mr. Daniel just presented. Okay Mr. Simoff, you're up.

Mr. Simoff: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What is the roof elevation of Buildings A, B, C and D? The elevation?

Mr. Daniel: The elevation is 43 feet to the parapet. The parapet is according to code needs to be 42 inches. So, that would be 41 feet 6 inches.

Mr. Simoff: My question is the specific elevation. How does it compare to the residential units behind?

Mr. Daniel: Well the lower units are 12 feet. So I would think that they would be lower than the residential units behind. The upper building like I said, the top of the parapet is 43 feet so, it would be probably larger than the units behind.

Mr. Capizzi: He's asking the height above grade. So whatever grade is around the perimeter of the building and then the grade...and then the elevation of the roof as compared to grade.

Mr. Simoff: Correct.

Mr. Daniel: Compared to grade in the rear of the site?

Mr. Capizzi: You can start at least at the perimeter of the buildings at issue, and if you know the grade of a certain residential unit, you can speak to that. If you want to defer that question to Mr. Welch, you can do that also, Scott.

Mr. Daniel: I don't know the grade of the residential units.

Mr. Capizzi: Matt, can you jump in to help us out here?

Mr. Welch: I don't have the grade of the residential units. I just as a visual, the grade around storage Building C and storage Building D is going to be approximate level. The finish grade is going to be roughly the grade of the baseball field that's there today.

Mr. Simoff: What is that?

Mr. Welch: The proposed finish floor elevation of C is 977. And a proposed finish floor of Building D 977.52.

Mr. Simoff: So, the roof of C and D will be approximately 99?

Mr. Weiss: Is that a question?

Mr. Simoff: Yes, that is a question.

Mr. Welch: There was an inflection at the end. Yes.

Mr. Simoff: I put a question. We are not playing jeopardy. So at 99, the elevation of the first or the second floor of the units behind?

Mr. Welch: I don't have that.

Mr. Simoff: Well I can tell you it's about the same. It's about 99.

Mr. Weiss: Unfortunately it's question time. Not testimony time.

Mr. Simoff: Okay. And what is...the questions were asked about the width of building A. What about Building B?

Mr. Daniel: The width of building B...let me get that for you, bear with me...

Mr. McGroarty: You asked about the width or the length, Hal?

Mr. Simoff: I'm sorry, east to west.

Mr. Weiss: We'll refer to that as length.

Mr. McGroarty: I don't know if someone else is going to answer but it's about 400 feet.

Mr. Welch: It's dimension, as 410 feet on the site plan.

Mr. Simoff: But the water tower would be visible to the units behind, correct?

Mr. Daniel: The water tower would be visual to the units behind, uh...

Mr. Buzak: You mean the storage units behind, Mr. Simoff? Is that what you're referring to or...inaudible.

Mr. Simoff: No, the residential units.

Mr. Buzak: Okay.

Mr. Daniel: Thirty feet. If we are...I'm sorry Matt, what was the elevation of the residential units in the back?

Mr. Capizzi: We don't have that data, Scott.

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Simoff, testimony...we're not at testimony...Mr. Simoff suggested they're about the same elevation 977 or so.

Mr. Simoff: Right.

Mr. Buzak: Is that correct Mr. Simoff?

Mr. Simoff: The first floor is about 99.

Mr. Buzak: Of the residential units?

Mr. Simoff: Yes. Adjacent to the rear of the property. The rear of this property. So the second floor would be approximately 10 feet higher I would assume?

Mr. Weiss: I'm not really enjoying the way this is going. If Mr. Simoff is testifying... inaudible... stop him. We haven't sworn him in and the meeting isn't really here to hear about Mr. Simoff's testimony. I know he is trying to supplement but you can ask a question. If we don't have the answer, we don't have the answer. I don't think we can take that testimony from Mr. Simoff.

Mr. Buzak: I agree, Mr. Chairman. I apologize, you're right.

Mr. Weiss: It's okay. Any other questions, Hal?

Mr. Simoff: I'd like to make some statements at the end.

Mr. Weiss: Absolutely, without notice. That being said, no problem. We'll come back to that. Anybody else from the public? Anybody from the public has any questions, you can raise

your hand. I see none from the public. So, let me close it to the public and I'm going to make a suggestion. Its 9:30 pm. It's after 9:30 pm. We have more testimony to come and we have another application. I think we should end this hearing tonight. Let's schedule a follow up. We can conclude it with our next meeting, I'm sure. We need to come up with a date to schedule this that would finish our agenda with and end up with the other application.

Mr. Capizzi: Mr. Chairman, just so...if I may, the planning testimony is going to be rather brief.

Mr. Weiss: That's okay. Its 9:30. Its 9:30 and you have some changes to make on the plans. Nothing is brief at 9:30 when we have another application. We've been working together since 7:00 pm, its 9:30, I think we've been more than fair. We do have other business at hand and I'm going to look to close this and look to reschedule that, some other time. I left my schedule in the other room. Mary, so if you could help me come up with some available dates?

Mr. Weiss: I'm going to have probably go to March. Maybe March 18th? Chuck, do you have the schedule in front of you?

Mr. McGroarty: I do. I guess the question...Here's a question. I don't know when the applicant is ready next but on the 11th of February...Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Weiss: I'm sorry Chuck, I was just scanning my schedule. I'm here.

Mr. McGroarty: Okay. We have Saxton Falls Sand and Gravel. Now, they are returning with plans that they've submitted to Mike and to myself for review. I haven't looked at them yet, but I don't know if Mike has, but I don't think that's going to be...It certainly shouldn't be as long as it was the first hearing. And then we have a variance for an addition to a single family dwelling. The other application, 5 New Street, is off. Mary am I correct on that?

Ms. Strain: Yes. There is the certification for the existing two family home?

Mr. McGroarty: I'm sorry, what?

Ms. Strain: The certification for the existing two family.

Mr. McGroarty: That's on that night?

Ms. Strain: That's on February 11th.

Mr. McGroarty: That won't take long.

Ms. Strain: Okay.

Mr. McGroarty: It's up to you Mr. Chairman, and the Board. I think we can fit this in on the 11th.

Mr. Weiss: That's fine with me. It looks like its fine. I have the schedule.

Mr. Capizzi: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Does that work for you and your team? We can schedule that right away.

Mr. Capizzi: Absolutely.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, great. So we are going to carry this application to February 11th. No further notice will be required. 7:00 pm, using the Zoom method of hearing. Carried to February 11th. No further notice. Gentlemen, thank you for your understanding, cooperation and patience.

Ms. Natafalusy: Just a quick question?

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead, Catherine.

Ms. Natafalusy: In the meantime, can they look at the color of the building and just maybe come back with some suggestions at that point?

Mr. Capizzi: Absolutely.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. We can continue that conversation. All right thank you everybody.

Mr. Batsch: Do we need an extension?

Mr. Capizzi: If one is necessary, we certainly will grant to one to the February 12th.

Mr. Weiss: We could make it to the...

Mr. Buzak: We'll go to the end of February, at least.

Mr. Weiss: Yes, the end of February.

Mr. Capizzi: That's fine.

Mr. Weiss: Matt, if Mary needs it she'll send it over to you.

Mr. Strain: I'll send it over tomorrow, okay?

Mr. Capizzi: Very good, Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. So, let's move on to the next application. Jeff Keller, I think at this point we can excuse you as well. Great to see you we'll see you again on February 11th.

PB 20-16 Muthulakshmanan, Murali, 62 Elias Drive, Block 4407 Lot 49

Mr. Weiss: Let's bring up the next applicant. as I introduce the application PB 20-16 for Mr. Murali Muthulakshmanan, and I'm sure he'll help me, I do apologize for messing that up. They

are here for a variance at his property at 62 Elias Drive, Block 4407, Lot 49. Good evening. You're muted. I apologize for the long delay. Thank you for your patience.

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you for updating the case. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: One second. Okay, so what I need you to do...we are going to swear you in. I'm going to have you state your name and address for the record, spelling your last name. And you are going to help me, the best that you can, to help me with your name because I know nothing is better than having your name said properly. I know I'm going to mess it up. So maybe we...if he gets up before me that we could speak without messing up your name.

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Murali Muthulakshmanan was sworn in for the Record.

Mr. Buzak: Please state your name and address for the Record, spelling your last name.

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes sir. My name is Murali Muthulakshmanan. So I'm going to spell my last name. M U T H U L A K S H M A N A N. And the address is, 62 Elias Drive, Budd Lake, New Jersey 07828.

Mr. Buzak: Thank you very much, sir. Now I see someone else with you. Are they going to be testifying as well?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: No. He is just my son who is supporting the IT in case if I have some issues.

Mr. Weiss: I like to see that. Very nice. Fine young man. Can I call you Mr. Murali?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Sorry, my last name is...inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: No need to apologize for your name. It's just, I take great pride in calling people by what they are born with and I'm struggling this time of the night. I appreciate your understanding. So we have a report, Mr. Murali, as to why you are here. We have some pictures. So why don't you just tell us, briefly, why you are here.

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes Mr. Chairman. Thank you. So my request, Mr. chairman, I am in a single family home in Morris Chase community. It's a new construction built by Toll Brothers. Now I have a back yard...I have a...that is already an existing deck and steps. I have in the back, three doors. Now they, unfortunately, the builder has used some...inaudible...that was not the efficient way. He has put one steps for one door and he has connected two doors with a small sort of thing, so that is from a safety ways we don't fall and we can land properly to the ground. So I wanted to just...because the existing condition, it is not useable to me because the depth is too narrow. I wanted to remove the steps on one side and connect all of the doors. Mr. Chairman, I can show you the current deck and explain you if you'll allow me to share the drawing of the existing photo of the current deck? And in order to do that, unfortunately the rear lot is diagonal and it's... I cannot extend the deck based on the...without a variance because the rear of the yard line is very

diagonal. Its not rectangle. I can share the diagram I...inaudible...to you. So my humble request is allow me to extend the deck so that it is a useable. So that we can use during the summer time and the spring time. So that is the request, Mr. Chairman. I can go into the detail with the diagram and share it if you permit me.

Mr. Weiss: Yes. I don't want to hold back anything. We do have the pictures. We all have a copy of your survey. I think we are seeing the unique, I'll call it a unique shape of your current deck. Let me ask you a question and I think you said that this was...when you purchased your house, this was the deck that was provided by Toll Brothers, correct?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Exactly, Mr. Chairman. Exactly.

Mr. Weiss: Unfortunately, for the Planning Board, we have addressed very similar situations in your neighborhood with decks. Mostly staircases that Toll Brothers put in. I don't know what they were thinking when they put the staircase, long staircase, jutting out into the middle of the yard. We've seen it before. I think we can cut down a lot of our conversation by referring to testimony and facts as we've already addressed them. I want you, if you have anything else you want tell us? I think you were just going to give us some more explanation?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So, nothing like...I just gave the drawing of inaudible...proposed deck is going to be 20 by 28 and its going to be a rectangular shape because that is a reasonable proportion. And then there is a quite lot of stairs in the back. Thirty-three...inaudible...and I don't see any use to, with the neighbors and other things. So, I merely request you to permit me to extent the deck so that we can use it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: The only variance, Chuck, if you just correct me and I have it from your report, is into the rear yard? This deck is going to extend into the rear yard setback. I suppose and I don't want to testify for you but would it be accurate to say that the reason you need a deck of this size would be to logically connect all three of the doors? Inaudible...the one useable deck? I don't disagree with you at all, for one second that a four foot wide deck is a very practical deck. I agree with you there 100 percent. Request to put in a 20 feet by 28 foot wide deck makes a lot of sense. It's useable and it connects the doors which is why you need the 28 feet.

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Exactly.

Mr. Weiss: So, again I'm not going to testify for you but I think I can help here, a bunch. I don't personally think your request is excessive. And, I think based on the fact that we've seen it before, there is a couple of questions I have as I'm going to ask you to make some proofs to the positive and the negative. I'm not sure if you had a chance to review Mr. McGroarty's report where we talked about the need for the Planning Board to create a record, for you to make the proof to the positive and the negative. So, Chuck, I don't want to take away any of his time and Mr. Buzak I know you'll kill me if I testify for him but I think in the past when we've spoken about these Morris Chase properties and the staircase out in the middle of the yard, which is just not good looking.

Mr. McGroarty: Right.

Mr. Weiss: I believe that in the past we've corrected the c-2 variance under the positive criteria? Determine that maybe getting rid of that staircase helps everybody?

Mr. McGroarty: If I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Yes, please.

Mr. McGroarty: We have certainly, I think in this case though, this lot, as I look at it qualifies for under a c-1 type of variance. That c-1a variance because I don't know if this is unique, but it is unusual that the rear lot line of this property which is Lot 49, is not at a right angle to the side yards. And it angles and as a result of that angle of the rear yard, which I think everyone has had a copy of the survey. What that does is that makes the setback line, correspondingly, at an angle as well. To fit a deck into that angled rear yard setback becomes really impractical. One thing I'll point out too, I was wondering why we are having these issues? I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, for the life of me I don't know what Toll Brothers was doing putting the stairs out like that. I mean it serves no purpose other than emergency access. But I went back to the original subdivision plans and the generic footprint for the homes, on this lot in particular, and all of the lots in there, the homes were going to be much smaller. And so there was never an issue of fitting everything. But, when Toll Brothers maximized the building envelope essentially, it created this situation where if anyone is going to have amenities like decks, it almost forces people into variance conditions. So, I think, I agree eliminating those steps into the rear yard, esthetically, will improve the situation. I think in this case because of that rear angle in that property it created a c-1 type of variance and then talk to the negative criteria as you said Mr. Chairman, you've talked about it before, a more conventional looking deck is really an asset to the property and its more in conformance with the character, I think, of the neighborhood.

Mr. Weiss: Well, you know what, Chuck, I think that's wonderful direction you've given me but I think its best for both of us and all of us on the Planning Board to turn that around and have Mr. Murali make that comment. Let him create the record based on what we kind of talked about. And I don't disagree. I thought that a c-1a would work because of the fact that the property is slanted as we talked about. So, let me ask you a question, sir. Would you say that your property is square or is it an unusual shape?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes. I don't say is an un...the property is that but the setback line is an unusual shape. So, that will because of that I will not be able to build a deck in a diagonal way. It's not practical for me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, I don't think anybody is going to disagree with you. I wanted you to get that on the record. Mr. Buzak, are you comfortable with that?

Mr. Buzak: Yes, and also this is a corner lot, I guess. Is that right?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Mr. Buzak:

Mr. Buzak: So right now, those stairs are not only...what's behind you sir on Lot 47 as shown on the survey? Is that another single family home?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir.

Mr. Buzak: Is it fair to say right now, if you are driving down Madison Avenue...

Mr. McGroarty: Ed, let me interrupt you though. It's not a corner lot. Inaudible.

Mr. Buzak: Oh I see. I'm sorry. I see it's a vacated...I'm sorry. I see that. Okay.
Chuck or Mr. Murali, what is to the south of you where it shows Madison Avenue?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: The south of Madison Avenue. So I have homes on both the sides.
So I don't know if you if...when you say south of Madison Avenue is that referring to the back side?
Back of the deck?

Mr. Buzak: Well, if we are facing...if I'm standing on Elias Drive and facing your house.
To the right, I assume there is another house. Is that correct?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Buzak: And what do you have to the left?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, so that on the left side there is also another house but they are
not part of the Toll Brother community. That's a totally separate house but they are not within the
community.

Mr. Buzak: Okay, and how close is that house? Do you know how close that house is to
your side line?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Around 20 feet approximately. To be honest I don't know the exact
number.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. I understand. I'm just trying to get an approximation.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have anything further.

Mr. Weiss: So, I think as we are trying to just accomplish your ability to testify to the
positive. There is no doubt that you've proven the positive criteria in a couple of different ways
and we are going to rest our hat on the fact that you have an irregular shape property which gives
you kind of a...directs us to the c-1a variance request. Now we are going to need to talk about the
negative criteria. Touch upon that. Couple of different questions for you. Would you say that
putting a deck of this size onto your house would negatively affect the zone plan? That being a
residential neighborhood with homes. Would the addition of a deck hurt the neighborhood?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: I suppose during this negative criteria we can also talk about, as Chuck and I
had mentioned the staircase that's there now. I still think that would still come in positive criteria
Chuck, right? That removing that staircase makes the whole place just that more pleasing.

Mr. McGroarty: Yes. I think that deck needs the c-2 type of flexible c variance.

Mr. Weiss: Yes. Okay well, I think we know this isn't really brain surgery. The fact that you are putting in a deck in a residential zone, it's not like you are doing something that's not seen elsewhere. Do your other neighbors have decks? Any neighbors that have homes in the neighborhood?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes. My...there are a lot of people within the community have a deck. But my next door neighbor has patio because he's little bit lower and not that much space. So, he has patio. And then the other neighbor also has a patio.

Mr. Weiss: Would you agree with me if I said things like decks and patios and sheds are common structures to be found in a residential zone?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Yes, Sir. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Weiss: And so the construction of your deck really wouldn't impair the zone plan, correct?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Sorry Mr. Chairman, I...

Mr. Weiss: The deck that you are proposing would not impair the zone plan?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: No, not at all. Not at all.

Mr. Weiss: I don't think we really need anything else. I'm satisfied with that answer. If anybody from the Planning Board has any issues otherwise I think...

Mr. Buzak: I just have one question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead.

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Murali, will the staircase that you were building from the deck, right? That shows on your plans, will that extend beyond the 20 foot deck to that...

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: No, Mr. Buzak. No it won't extend beyond the 20 feet. I will be...inaudible.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. All right. So we will be eliminating this staircase that sticks out beyond the deck?

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Absolutely.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: I like what I've heard. Does anybody on the Planning Board have any questions? I don't see anything from the Planning Board. Chuck, did you have anything else you might want to ask?

Mr. McGroarty: Nothing.

Mr. Weiss: All right. I think we've accomplished what we've wanted to do. I looks like my opinion is that what you are going to do is make the property better. You're going to get rid of a non-pleasing...I don't want to use the work ugly. But it's a non-pleasing looking staircase and you are going to make is an absolutely beautiful deck connecting all three of your doors and I'm looking forward to just pass it to see to see how lovely it comes out. I think what we can do to is open it to the public. If anybody from the public has any questions? Don't see anybody. Mr. Nicastro has nothing to say tonight. Must not be feeling so well. So let me close it to the public. I'll turn to the Planning Board to see if someone would please make a motion?

Mr. Nelsen: I will make a motion to approve PB 20-16.

Mr. Mania: I'll second it.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Dan. Thank you, John. Do we have any comments or questions?

Mr. Forlenza: One question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Go ahead.

Mr. Forlenza: Just to confirm. There will be a staircase from the deck down to the ground level, or no?

Mr. Weiss: You can see on the survey, he drew it in.

Mr. Forlenza: It's not very clear on the survey that I'm looking at.

Mr. Weiss: Oh, okay.

Mr. Forlenza: So if I'm looking down at the survey, it's down on the right hand side of the existing deck?

Mr. Weiss: Right.

Mr. Forlenza: Or the new deck? Going down the same way that the staircase that projects out today, currently. Correct?

Mr. Weiss: Yes.

Mr. Forlenza: All right. Just wanted to confirm. No other questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: All right, thank you. Anybody else? All right, so the motion was made and seconded. I closed it to the Planning Board. Mary, let's get a roll call.

Roll Call:	Brian Schaechter	Yes
	Ken Forlenza	Yes

Catherine Natafalusy	Yes
John Mania	Yes
Dan Nelsen	Yes
Paul Ottavinia	Yes
John Batsch	Yes
Joseph Ouimet	Yes
Howie Weiss	Yes

Mr. Weiss: So, Mr. Murali, I certainly hope that you and your family have many hours of enjoyment on your new deck. I like the fact that you got your son engaged in the process. What's going to happen now, we are going to have the Resolution signed. At that point we'll get you a copy of that and then you can go forward with your building permits. Certainly have your deck built as the warm weather approaches. I thank you again for your patience and thank you for your clear testimony and lovely addition to your home.

Mr. Muthulakshmanan: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman and all the Board members. Thank you, I really appreciate your approval. Thanks a lot. I'm very happy about this. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you very much. Before we break. Before we close tonight, I just want to have a quick conversation with us about our next meeting which is on February 11th. I believe in a move we don't normally do, we are going start a meeting on February 11th, in a closed session. I think that's what we wanted to...Chuck, so if any point if I'm speaking out of school just interrupt me. We're going to start on February 11th, on a closed executive session with Mr. Buzak. We need to go over some procedural issues that are just more in general. Not necessarily in regards to any single application. So, it's important that we do it. I was going to do it today but Chuck convinced me not to. I'm very glad that you did convince me, Chuck because I think most of us are exhausted. So we are going to start February 11th and in conversation with Dane, I think what we are going to do is do a conference call. We are going to do it by audio. So what we are going to do is start a public meeting using the same procedure that we do now. We are going to go to Zoom and get ready. We are going to open the meeting. First order of business is that we're going to close. We are going to go to executive session. We're going to keep this Zoom meeting open. Dane is going to put up a presentation, a slide that's going to say that we are in executive session, and then we are all going to mute our screen. Dane is going to assure that we mute it. Then take a phone call. If we can walk away from the screen, even better. We're going to take a phone call that will be given a second set of instructions on how to make a conference call. Then we are going to have executive session by audio only. I think that process seems to work. It shouldn't be very long but we need to go over some things with Mr. Buzak. Ed, that works for you I guess? Right?

Mr. Buzak: Yes. Yes. I think that will work and then we'll reconvene when we're finished with that.

Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: And then, exactly right, after our phone call, Dane, I'll come right back to you in a second. After our call, we simply hang up, come back to the Zoom meeting, bring the public meeting back to session and we can continue from there. Dane, go ahead if you had some input on that.

Mr. Westdyk: Executive session does not need to be recorded, right?

Mr. Buzak: That's correct.

Mr. Weiss: It's not recorded.

Mr. Westdyk: Okay. All right. Then no problem.

Mr. Weiss: I think that was our back and forth today with you and me and Chuck. I think that's the best way to do it. And we'll handle the business at hand. We'll take care of it and will come back into session and start our meeting. Again, I said we normally do these things at the end of the meeting for the sake of the public but in this case its not going to go very long and its something that we really need to do and we will make sure our addenda is noticed that we will start in executive session. So, if anybody wants to plan their evening accordingly, from the public, they can. Anything else, Chuck? Did I miss anything?

Mr. McGroarty: No, not at all, Mr. Chairman. Mary, please make a note of that. That this will be first and Howie, we'll send out, and Dane will tell us what to send out, but I'll send something out to the Board in advance so you'll have your phone number. Just like a typical conference call. The phone number, the password, the code. So you'll have all that.

Mr. Weiss: It's important to remember that we are going to start through Zoom. So everyone is going to come on as it's a regular meeting. And then we are going to keep the Zoom meeting alive and then go take a conference call. So obviously all of us are using a computer, it should not be a conflict. We are going to walk away from our computer, pick up the phone and have a phone conference. Okay. I think everyone on the Planning Board pretty much gets it. We have some time. It's not until February 11th. We'll go...we usually get our panelist invitation. We'll get the same thing. And for next month we will have a second notice with this conference call. Just keep in mind that we'll start on Zoom and then go to conference by phone.

Inaudible.

Mr. Weiss: I don't have any other business on our agenda so unless anybody else does, or if anybody from the public has anything that they wanted to speak to the Planning Board about, I'll open it to the public. Now I'm going to close it to the public. Someone from the Planning Board please make a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Schaechter: Motion to adjourn.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you Brian.

Mr. Mania: Second.

Mr. Weiss: Second by John. All in Favor?

All: Aye.

Mr. Weiss: Good night everybody. Thank you.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:00 pm
Transcribed By: Karen Grill

Mary Stuenkel
Signature

October 14, 2021
Planning Board Meeting Date Approved