

**TOWNSHIP OF MOUNT OLIVE
PLANNING BOARD**

Public Meeting
Thursday, July 16, 2020 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

Public meeting / Remote Virtual Meeting of the Mount Olive Planning Board of July 16, 2020 commenced at 7 pm.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Open Public Meetings Act Statement was read into the record by Ms. Strain, PB Secretary

Roll Call

Present: Mr. Schaechter, Mr. Forlenza, Ms. Mott, Ms. Natafalusy, Mr. Mania, Mr. Nelsen, Mr. Ottavina, Mr. Batsch, Mr. Ouimet, Mr. Weiss

Excused: Mr. Scapicchio

Board Professionals in attendance were:

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

Resolution

PB 19-17 Flanders Investment Properties, LLC, 95 Bartley Flanders Road, Block 6801, Lot 2

Mr. Weiss: First item on our agenda tonight is Resolution PB 19-17 which is Flanders Investment Properties, LLC. They came in front of us for preliminary and final site plan with a d variance for the property located at 95 Bartley Flanders Road which is Block 6801, Lot 2. You all have a copy of that Resolution. I'm going to look to move that, if someone would please do so.

Mr. Schaechter: I'll make that motion to move it.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Brian. Second?

Mr. Batsch: I second.

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

Ms. Mott: None.

Mr. Weiss: Kim, nothing?

Ms. Mott: No.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. I see none. Mary, roll call, please.

Roll Call:

| | |
|----------------------|-----|
| Brian Schaechter | Yes |
| Kim Mott | Yes |
| Catherine Natafalusy | Yes |
| Dan Nelsen | Yes |
| Paul Ottavinia | Yes |
| John Batsch | Yes |
| Howie Weiss | Yes |

Development Applications

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 85.02

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

Mr. Weiss: For tonight's development applications, I just need to make an announcement. If anybody is here for the Hunkele Equities applications, there are three of them, PB 19-25, PB 19-28, and PB 19-29. That applicant is removed from the agenda this evening but they are rescheduled for...Mary, help me with the date. I believe it was September 11th?

Ms. Strain: September 10th.

Mr. Weiss: September 10th. Those applications will be heard on September 10th at 7:00. There'll be no further notice. The meeting will start at 7:00. It will be until further notice, it will be held via zoom, and like I mentioned no further notice. Mr. Buzak, is there anything else that we need to add to that public notice about the Hunkele Equities applications?

Mr. Buzak: Nothing further, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. So if anybody is here for that, that application will not be heard.

PB 19-14 New Jersey Foreign Trade Zone Venture, LLC, ITC East, Block 105, Lot 1; Block 106, Lots 2 & 3; Block 202, Lot 1

Mr. Weiss: That brings us to the lone application on tonight's agenda which is PB 19-14 New Jersey Foreign Trade Zone Venture, LLC, in care of the Rockefeller Group for their General Development Plan for the ITC East. It is Block 105, Lot 1; Block 106, Lots 2 and 3; and Block 202, Lot 1. I know for the applicant tonight we have Mr. Selvaggi. So Dane if you would bring Mr.

Selvaggi up as a panelist and before...well as soon as Mr. Selvaggi gets there, I just have a couple of announcements.

Mr. Westdyk: Mr. Selvaggi, you'll see yourself leave the meeting and then you'll get right back into the meeting. Just follow the prompts.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, Michael, it sounds like...

Mr. Selvaggi: Good evening.

Mr. Weiss: So before I turn it over to Mr. Selvaggi for his presentation this evening, I'm actually quite pleased to see that we have quite a few participants. Whether it's folks from the public or other individuals that are interested in the program. So I thought what I should do before we get into our meeting is just go over a little bit of protocol, give a little bit of background. It's not my intention to testify to give any information because that's not my position. But I wanted to go over what the purpose and what the goal is for tonight's hearing. This is a General Development Plan. So the question is what is a General Development Plan? A General Development Plan...GDP...you might hear is called as such, it's by statute. And it's essentially very simply, it's a comprehensive plan...it's a comprehensive review for and of a development of a planned development. It's very simple. It's a comprehensive review that the statute says that we are to do. During this hearing, you're going to hear the number of homes, you'll hear the number of acreage. This is not a site plan. This is not a subdivision hearing. This is General Development Plan. So for those who have attended Planning Board before, you're used to hearing certain types of testimony. That's not going to happen tonight. So why are we here? And why are we looking as I've been advised by many people...why are we looking at another housing development. And so a little history into what's going on here this evening. Most people are unaware...completely unaware that the State has mandated to all municipalities in the State that there is an obligation to provide for a certain number of affordable housing units within the municipality. The township had certain responsibility to put a plan in place that addresses the State's mandates and the initial request from the State...or the demand from the State...was that the Township of Mount Olive was to provide 1,200 units of affordable housing. And so through the effort of our Planner, through the effort of our Council, and through the Planning Board, we were able to put together a plan that was approved. We were one of the earlier municipalities to provide such a plan. And by doing so we are able to reduce our obligation to the State of New Jersey by 50 percent, and so we now are on the hook, if you will, to meet this obligation. And if we don't, the state will certainly step in and help us meet that 1,200 unit obligation. They have their means of doing it. But again, it's our obligation to provide a plan and carry through on our desire to meet the state's affordable housing plan. You'll hear in detail tonight about the property. And what I wanted to do was I want to try to eliminate mistruths. I want to eliminate rumor, and I want to kind of set the record straight. So as you're listening to the hearing tonight, you're at least hearing it from me before it starts of what the reality is. Essentially in 2017, the township council, based on the input of many different sources, modified this property, modified this property...the parcel was FTZ-4. That's how it was zoned. And it was modified then, which permitted residential use through the form of a planned unit residential development. And again, we'll let some of the experts explain that. The Planning Board has no option not to hear this. The Planning Board has no option to put in their own opinion. We're simply following through what the council and the governing body has provided for us. This property is in the Highlands, as many of you are concerned about, but it's in the Planning Zone, it's not in the

Preservation Zone, because if it was in preservation, we wouldn't be here tonight. There would be no conversation. The property is in the Highlands Planning Zone. So we're here tonight and we just want to make sure, what is the goal for this evening? Well, the goal is to have the applicant introduce the project. It's essentially, the applicant is going to provide a Master Plan of his proposal that he has on the table. And their objective is to get an overall approval of the plan, but not to necessarily submit details, as you would normally see in the site plan. Those plans will come at a future time when the applicant takes the guidance from the evening's application, this evening's hearing, and they'll come back to the Planning Board in a public manner and present all of the details that you'd normally see in this subdivision and or site plan. Tonight, we'll hear from the applicant's engineer. We're going to hear from the applicant's planner and they will give us a general overview as to what's going on. There will be, like I mentioned, there'll be no testimony tonight regarding anything, regarding variances or setbacks or density or anything else, usually, again, you see that during a site plan and tonight is not a site plan. I just have some commentary that I want to kind of leave you with as we get going. There's a lot of information out there on social media. Most of it, if not all of it, is misleading and not based on any facts whatsoever. The process this evening is such that we are going to work in reality, we're going to deal only in the facts. Anything that's said will be factual. Obviously, the experts will be sworn in under oath and the goal is to lay out a ground with the facts. Those that are interested in pursuing the issue, I do recommend that you take the information delivered tonight as gospel rather than information that's being spread all over social media. We have to understand, as we do every time we meet as a Planning Board that the landowner has rights and his right to develop must be respected. This process that the Planning Board goes through actually gives the municipality control so that we can oversee what the applicant does, so we can have control over how this project, if approved, ultimately gets built out. It will be a continuous open exchange of ideas and opinions between not only the Planning Board, with the applicant. There will be time for the public to be heard as to what they want and some of the things that they think. Keep in mind, the Planning Board Members are not allowed to comment about a pending application, including this one. So for those that feel that they can reach out to the Planning Board Members and speak to them, please don't do that because the Planning Board Members will not reach out or respond or react or answer your questions. So, let me just end by going over the process of which we're going to handle the planning board meeting, because many people in the audience have never been to a planning board. And so let me explain what's going to happen. We're going to hear from Mr. Selvaggi and his team in just a couple of minutes. And they're going to do exactly what I laid out. After each witness comes up and throughout the process, the Planning Board is going to ask questions as we see fit. As soon as the applicant, as soon as the expert has spoken and delivered his testimony, I will open it to the public for very specific reasons, and that is to ask questions of the expert based on the testimony that he gave. It's not an opportunity for you to give your opinion, it's not your opportunity to debate. Your opportunity is to ask the expert a question based on the testimony that he delivered. If the question has been asked and then answered, but you don't like the answer, I'm going to ask you in advance to not ask the question again. It's not going to change. You have the right to ask the questions again. I'm going to repeat myself of the expert based on the testimony that he has previously given. There's going to be a time at the end after Mr. Selvaggi and his team have rested, then I'll open it to the public for general commentary, questions or anything that might have to do with the application as we're hearing it tonight, keeping in mind it's a General Development Plan. So I don't expect questions about density or variances or setbacks or any of those things because now is not the time for that. This is a virtual meeting. So it brings on, it brings on different challenges for us. Normally, I sit here and I could look out at the audience and if there is a question, you simply raise your hand and I call upon you.

Here, it's a little different and I do have...Dane is with us. He is the municipality's IT Director, and Dane is going to be an assist for us in that if you have a question, on your screen you have a raise-your-hand button. Dane will certainly help me if I don't see it, acknowledge you, and if you noticed as we brought up Mr. Selvaggi, you will be brought in so that you can speak. Again, I request that you honor the process that I laid out and if so, it will be a very smooth process. Keep in mind that the applicant will come back at some time. It would be upon his schedule. And at that point he will deliver his site plan, subdivision and all the details will follow. So I've gone over a lot of different things. I want to make sure legally that I gave good advice. Mr. Buzak, if you have anything you wanted to chime in on.

Mr. Buzak: I really have nothing to add to what you've stated, Mr. Chairman. This is a hearing just like any other hearing. But as you point out, it's a General Development Plan as opposed to a site specific development plan. So I have nothing to add. Mr. Chairman, I think we could proceed, just as you have said.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you. And I'm going to come to Mr. Selvaggi in a second. Chuck, I know I talked about a lot of planning and historical things, was I accurate, do you feel in my presentation?

Mr. McGroarty: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, and thank you, Chuck. So that being said, let me turn it to Mr. Selvaggi. First to say, Michael, if you have anything you wanted to add to my comments, please feel free and then I'll let you run with it as it is your application.

Mr. Selvaggi: I thought...Mr. Chairman, thank you and good evening to all the Board members and the professionals. I thought your overview was, from a planning perspective, accurate; from a legal perspective, accurate as well importantly, too, and I know interested parties in the public probably think that this is kind of a free for all type of approach. Your ordinance that the township, the council put together that you reviewed, and it's Section 550-103K lays out some very specific guidelines that the Planning Board will follow along with during our presentation. Those guidelines are intended to require the applicant to put forward the information it needs in order to show that this project and this application meets the standards for a general development approval. So we're going to be guided by that, as you hear from our engineer and from our planner and we will try to address this specific criteria that is in the ordinance, which, by the way, mimics the Municipal Land Use Law Section 45.2 of the Municipal Land Use Law. So this is not something that's done in a manner that is kind of nebulous or ambiguous or whatever the applicant feels is appropriate. There are guidelines that will help us with our presentation and then frame your decision-making. So and importantly, and I give the township credit, there were many municipalities with the low and moderate income litigation, were much more resistant, ended up getting settlements that weren't nearly as beneficial to the community as you guys did, but the General Development Plan really serves a significant purpose for the developer as well as the municipality, because now we have a framework that will guide the subsequent development of this 125 acres. So there's certainty that will be provided. And importantly, one of the criteria, and Mr. Buzak will expand upon it when it comes time for the Board to deliberate, is an agreement between the applicant and the municipality. So rather than see this large tract of land to be developed in a piecemeal fashion, a GDP helps control the growth, helps provide certainty for both the developer and the community as to know what to

expect. So with that and the comments from Mr. McGroarty, Chair and Mr. Buzak, what I think we should do is get right into, you know, what we're here for tonight is to present the testimony and the evidence that we think shows our entitlement to certainly a GDP approval. So, Mr. Chairman, our engineer, I don't know how you want to do it. We're going to have Paul Phillips, Ken Grisewood. I also have representatives from Rockefeller who may, you know, have to chime in. I don't know if you want all of them identified and brought in or do it individually, I will leave it to you.

Mr. Weiss: Well, it might be easier, Michael, to just, we will bring them up one at a time. If you need to bring somebody up, I suppose we could have Dane bring them up as a panelist. Logistically, I'm not sure what's easier, Dane?

Mr. Westdyk: Bringing them up as panelists will crowd the screen, but they'll still be able to speak. I can just allow them to talk and they'll be able to speak, but they won't be seen on video.

Mr. Weiss: Michael, let's take it one at a time. Let's take one of your experts...that might be smoother just based on the logistics we're dealing with.

Mr. Selvaggi: All right and I know, you know Ken bought a new tie for tonight, so I know he wants to be seen. So, if we could have Ken Grisewood come in as a panelist.

Mr. Westdyk: Sure. One second. Ken you're going to get dropped from the meeting and then you'll get right back in. Just follow the prompts and you should be fine.

Mr. Grisewood: Hi, good evening.

Mr. Westdyk: Ken, you there?

Mr. Grisewood: I am there I'm not sure why my video is not working yet.

Mr. Westdyk: If you go to the bottom left, you should be able to see the video.

Mr. Grisewood: Yes.

Mr. Westdyk: There you go.

Mr. Grisewood: All right. Here we go.

Mr. Selvaggi: There you are, you handsome devil you. All right. So, Mr. Buzak, if we could have Ken sworn before he begins his testimony.

Mr. Weiss: Ed, you are muted.

Mr. Buzak: It's difficult to give him an oath when you're muted. Sir, please raise your right hand. Do you swear that any testimony you will give tonight will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Grisewood: I do

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

Mr. Grisewood: Certainly. My name is Kenneth R. Grisewood. It's G R I S E W O O D. Our business address is 261 Cleveland Avenue. Highland Park, New Jersey. It's Menlo Engineering Associates.

Mr. Buzak: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Selvaggi: Ken, before you start your testimony, could you let the Board and members of the public know your educational background, professional licenses you hold, as well as your experience in testifying and land use matters in New Jersey?

Mr. Grisewood: Certainly, I received a bachelor's of science in landscape architecture from the University of Kentucky in 1980. I passed the Uniform National Exam for Landscape Architecture in 1983. I am a New Jersey licensed landscape architect as well as a New Jersey professional planner. I am also a registered landscape architect in Pennsylvania, New York, Delaware and Kentucky. I'm currently the principal at Menlo Engineering Associates. I have been with Menlo Engineering since 1993 in the capacity of a senior landscape architect. My responsibilities include conceptual master planning, site planning, site design, including grading plans, preparation of grading plans, landscape plans, lighting plans, site details. I'm also responsible for preparing environmental impact statements, conducting wetland delineations and evaluating regulatory permitting for particular projects. I oversaw the production of the General Development Plan set submitted by Menlo Engineering to the Township of Mount Olive for this application. I have testified before boards across New Jersey, including the Borough of Edgewater, the Borough of Weehawken, the Town of Richwood, the Town of Morristown, Townships of Holmdel, Boonton, Manalapan, Chester and several others across the state of New Jersey.

Mr. Selvaggi: And this evening, you're going to be testifying impassively as the licensed landscape architect on the project, correct?

Mr. Grisewood: Correct.

Mr. Selvaggi: All right. And not in your capacity as the professional planner, correct?

Mr. Grisewood: Correct.

Mr. Selvaggi: Mr. Chair, if the Board has any questions or the public about Mr. Grisewood's qualifications.

Mr. Weiss: I don't necessarily have any questions. Mike Vreeland, I know that you're muted, do you have any questions for the engineer?

Mr. McGroarty: Not an engineer, landscape architecture.

Mr. Weiss: I'm very sorry, I'm very sorry. Anybody else have any questions for Ken. Okay, so let's accept Ken as our expert in this evening's application and we will let you proceed.

Mr. Selvaggi: Thanks. Ken you have testified you oversaw the preparation of plans. Did you also have occasion to review the various reports that Mr. McGroarty and Mr. Vreeland had submitted?

Mr. Grisewood: Yes. I have.

Mr. Selvaggi: Okay, so why don't we start right in with your testimony and again, for members of the public and the Board, Ken and Paul Phillips's testimony is going to be guided by the GDP standards in your ordinance and we'll kind of move through in that manner and I think it'll just make a little more sense. So, Ken, we are starting with I guess the general land, which is the, you know, first criteria.

Mr. Grisewood: Right. Well, first I'd like to ask to share my screen, if I could, to post the exhibits that I want to refer to.

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Grisewood, before we do that, Mike, did you pre-mark exhibits before tonight or will we mark them as we go along?

Mr. Selvaggi: We had submitted them to Mary and to Chuck. We did not pre-mark them, no.

Mr. Buzak: Okay, that's fine. That's fine. So let's just proceed as you pull them up on the screen, we will mark it and Mary can mark the hard copy that she has of that same document for the record. Thank you. I'm sorry, Mr. Grisewood, I didn't mean to interrupt you.

Mr. Grisewood: Not a problem. Okay, I'd like to share this screen.

Mr. Selvaggi: Okay, we will mark that A1 and Ken, what is A1?

Mr. Grisewood: Okay, this is an exhibit entitled ITC East. It is labeled as Block 105, Lot 1; Block 106, Lots 2 and 3; Block 202, Lot 1, 123.9 acres. It's entitled Overall Plan Exhibit. It's dated March 12th, 2020. It's prepared by Menlo Engineering Associates. I'm going to refer to the plan set as submitted and go through each one of those sheets as the second set of exhibits and then the final exhibit that I'll be referring to tonight is an alternative development scheme for Block 202, Lot 1, which is The Crossroads. So to give you an idea of where I'm going with my testimony tonight, I'm going to start with a general background, the location, partial information, surrounding land uses and an overview of the proposal. And we'll describe how the application addresses the general development plan requirements through the submission plan set. That set includes the land use, circulation, open space plans, stormwater management plan, an environmental inventory, community facilities plan, housing plan and a local service plan. So that's the set that was submitted. And then the final portion of the testimony will be a quick presentation on an alternative layout study that we prepared for The Crossroads based on some guidance or concerns raised by the township professionals. So, let me begin with this overall exhibit and give you some orientation. North is to the left, east is to the top of the sheet, west is to the bottom of the sheet, and obviously

you can see through the middle section of the sheet, Interstate I-80. So the lands in question are along the east side of Route 80 at the intersection of Route 206 and International Drive at the interchange. The tracts front along both sides of Continental Drive as you can see over on the left hand side here. The property in question is 3 tracts of land. The first tract is The Ridge Tract. It's Block 105, Lot 1. It contains 87 acres. It's bounded on the west by Route 80. In the east, it is Continental Drive and Stanhope Union Cemetery and extends southward to a point at the New Jersey Transit Rail system commuter line. Tract 2 is The Canal Piece. It's on the east side of Continental Drive. It's known as Block 106, Lots 2 and 3, and it contains 23.2 acres. This property fronts on the east side of Continental Drive, extends east to a tract that's owned by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection that encompasses the Musconetcong River further to the east. To the north, it's bounded again by a parcel owned by the New Jersey DEP which separates it from the Route 206. To the south of the canal tract lies a parcel owned by the Borough of Stanhope and then various light industrial and commercial properties along Continental Drive. The third tract is The Crossroads. It's Block 202, Lot 1. It contains 13.6 acres. It also contains fronts along Continental Drive at the intersection of International Drive and Continental Drive and is surrounded by the ramp network of the Route 206 interchange. The combined land area of the 3 tracts is 123.9 acres. Now, with regard to the surrounding land uses, the international foreign trade zone lies along the west, further west, across on the opposite side of Route 80. It is comprised of various light industrial and commercial uses. As I mentioned before, on the east side of Continental Drive, there are property owned by the Borough of Stanhope as well as light industrial and commercial projects which line the Continental Drive and Love Lane. Further to the east is open space parcel owned by the NJDEP and then the Borough of Stanhope and the Borough of Netcong lie further to the east and they contain some single family residential homes. To the north is the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority Facility as well as the Residence Inn and Holiday Inn Express, which lie to the northwest across 206 and across Continental Drive from the three tracts. So that's the site in its context with surrounding land use. The overall plan is developed in compliance with the Township's Master Plan, affordable housing plan in the adopted zoning for the tract. As mentioned earlier, the tract is zoned FTZ-4 where planned unit residential developments are permitted. The overall development plan meets the required plan unit residential standards outlined in subsection 7 within the FTZ-4 district. So the total proposal is for 686 residential units, inclusive of 138 affordable housing units across the 123.9 acres, which results in a density of 5.54 units per acre. That density is under the allowable district standards as itemized in the ordinance. The 138 affordable housing units meets the 20 percent mandatory affordable housing provisions. So this project is a comprehensive planned unit residential development comprised of varying housing types, including single family dwellings, market rate one story and two story...one car and two car garage townhomes as well as two story low rise affordable housing units and three story market rate and affordable housing, multifamily rental buildings. So those buildings are tended to be three stories. The development integrates common open space and interconnects the open space elements via a network of sidewalks and pedestrian trails that interconnects the 3 tracts. We'll see that in greater detail on the circulation plan. The plan allocates 46 percent of the tract or 57 acres as open space, exceeding the 40 percent outlined within the district standards. The project's internal street network and the parking areas conform with the residential site improvements standards and the development will be served by essential water and sanitary sewer system, which also are district requirements for the General Development Plan. So that's the overview, as I said, this is a single family, we have multifamily in the southern half of The Ridge tract townhouses and low rise affordable housing and one and two car garages on the townhouse units on The Canal Piece and three story rental residential apartments and co-units on The Crossroads Piece. So now I'm going to

open the submission set. Okay. This is the set of drawings that were submitted as general development plans. It's the general development plans for ITC East, Township of Mount Olive, Block 105, Lot 1; Block 106, Lots 2 & 3; Block 202, Lot 1. This is the cover sheet. It's prepared by Menlo Engineering Associates. The entire set is prepared by Menlo Engineering Associates. The set is originally dated May 28th, 2019 last revised February 26th, 2020 and that's the same dates for the entire set. So this is just the location and vicinity maps to give the application some reference. Now, it's part of the...

Mr. Buzak: Excuse me Mr. Grisewood and Mr. Selvaggi, do you want to mark each of these individually as we go along as opposed to marking them as a package?

Mr. Grisewood: This is actually the submission set that...

Mr. Buzak: I get that, I get that. For the purposes of the record, for the purposes of your reference, the public and the record needs to have these things marked, so we can either mark the entire set as A-2 and then and then have sub numbers, I just assume, mark them separately sheet by sheet as we go along.

Mr. Selvaggi: Ken, let me ask you, are you going to go sheet by sheet or you are just going to go to some of the, you know, just a few of the sheets out of the submission set?

Mr. Grisewood: That depends on how the board would like me to present it. I have, you know, the application went in with a descriptive text that describes each sheet. If the Board doesn't feel I need to present each sheet, then we can mark it one set, one at a time. Obviously, we should...

Mr. Selvaggi: Why don't we do this? Let's mark each sheet. This way for the record, I know it's a little more tedious, but given the format in which we're presenting this, procedurally, it's a safer course of action to move ahead in that manner, so...

Mr. Buzak: Why don't we mark them then as we go along, as opposed to sitting here and marking all the documents every time you move to a new sheet? Mr. Grisewood, we will take a moment to mark that exhibit. So let's mark this cover sheet A-2 with the latest revision of 2/26/20, which, as you said, is the latest revision date for all the plans, and then if we're going to move to the next sheet or a sheet, whichever, you don't have to go in the order that is here, however, you want to present, it is up to you, sir

Mr. Weiss: If I can add, I think we can also just if we reference a sheet, we can reference into the sheet number of set.

Mr. Buzak: Good idea.

Mr. Weiss: Make it easy to follow as well.

Mr. Selvaggi: Okay, so Ken, then let's since we've marked the sheet you have presented as A-2, the next sheet, I guess we'll just go sequentially, we will mark this A-3.

Mr. Grisewood: Correct.

Mr. Selvaggi: And an A-3 is sheet 2.

Mr. Grisewood: It's entitled The General Land Use Plan.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Okay, good.

Mr. Selvaggi: So what are we looking at here on A-3, which is Sheet 2.

Mr. Grisewood: This is a graphic representation of the various residential densities, open space, the anticipated storm water facility and the major circulation connections throughout the overall development. So the color key, the yellow areas are open space. The pale blue area is the anticipated locations of the storm water management features or requirements. The off white areas are what's known as a low density residential portion. The darker beige to the south is a medium density and then the light orange brown would be classified as high density with the grey constituting the major...inaudible...roads through the overall development. The residential density classifications of low, medium and high were based on the RSIS intensity of development, so low intensity or density is less than or equal to four units per acre. The medium intensity or density was more than four units per acre but less than eight units per acre and then finally, the high density or intensity is more than eight units per acre. To give you, to just break down the quantities a little bit...

Mr. McGroarty: Do you mind, Ken? I'm sorry to interrupt you, but just to be clear, especially for the public, the fact that you're talking about these various densities, you're talking in terms of net density per the acre, but your gross overall density is, as you mentioned earlier, is just under six, so you're complying with the gross density, in certain tracts you're higher, which you're permitted to do.

Mr. Grisewood: Correct.

Mr. McGroarty: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Grisewood: Thank you. So to break down the quantities of residential units per tract, The Ridge is comprised of 427 total units inclusive of 104 affordable housing units. It consists of 160 single family units on the northern half with 163 market rate townhomes and 104 low rise affordable housing units on the southern half and that results in an overall gross density for that particular tract at 4.9 units per acre. The Canal parcel is planned to carry 93 market rate one and two car garage townhomes, and it results in a gross density of 4.0 units per acre, which classifies it as low. And the final portion, The Crossroads, a total of 166 rental apartments inclusive of 34 affordable housing units are distributed in six 3-storey structures shown on the overall plan in the housing plan and that results in a gross density for that particular tract at 12.2. The overall density is 5.54 units per acre, with 686 units across the 123.9 acres. The plan also includes 57 acres of open space throughout the three tracts or 46 percent of the overall land area, which also exceeds the district requirement that requires a 40 percent of open space. The project is one overall planned unit residential development, but will consist of two separate developers. The communities or sections or neighborhoods of each, however, will have cross access easement agreements allowing the residents of the different neighborhoods or sections to access the open space on all the tracts. Okay, moving on to the circulation plan, this is sheet 3.

Mr. Selvaggi: Sheet 3 A-4.

Mr. Grisewood: This is a circulation plan and it's the second component of a general development plan set. This plan depicts the general location and types of transportation facilities, including pedestrian access within the development and any offsite improvements to the surrounding transportation system. The plan to fix extensive pedestrian connectivity both internally and with the interconnections between the communities leading to surrounding public open space. So on this plan, the red dotted lines are the sidewalk network. The yellow or beige dotted line represents a 5 foot wide trail network, and the grey is obviously the vehicular access roads and parking areas within the three different sections of the overall plan. Each section of the development will have a connection point to the surrounding public trail system that extends offsite to the Allamuchy State Park and then to the Boroughs of Stanhope to the east.

Mr. Weiss: Ken, can I interrupt you? Can you show us where that is? So in The Crossroads...

Mr. Grisewood: Sure. Let me close up. So we have, there's an existing sidewalk trail network that parallels the Continental Drive, so their proposed connection points would be on the northwest corner to the existing trail and it would have sidewalks at the main entrance and then another connection point is planned at the southeast corner of The Crossroads tracts. So for The Canal parcel, the connection points are along an existing trail that extends from Continental Drive northeastward to the DEP property that abuts the site to the east and you can see the yellow trail network interconnects at two points. And again, we have the planned sidewalk, connections with the red dashes throughout the road network. For the Ridge Tract, the connection point, again, is at this northeast intersection or the northern intersection. This trail network for the Ridge Tract extends along its western boundaries all the way down to the southern limits of the property. An additional connection, future connection, is indicated on this plan for a possible connection to the Netcong train station. The New Jersey Foreign Trade Zone venture has indicated a willingness to dedicate Blocks 17, Lot 7 in the Borough of Netcong immediately across the Continental Love Lane for the purpose of a potential future pedestrian connection. And if I might, I'm going to refer back to the overall plan exhibit because it's easier to see where this potential connection will lie.

Mr. Weiss: You're looking at A-3 now.

Mr. Grisewood: So this was the exhibit A, the first one.

Mr. Buzak: A-1?

Mr. Grisewood: The A-1, correct. It's the overall plan exhibit. So the tract that I'm discussing is Block 17, Lot 7 in the Borough of Netcong and it lies between these two light industrial buildings and extends eastward and it abuts a parcel that is, we believe is, owned by the Borough of Netcong, which extends further to the east of Flanders Road, which is immediately opposite the westernmost edge of the New Jersey Transit property for the Netcong rail station. So by dedicating this tract of land, this affords the opportunity for public entity or the three public agencies to coordinate and construct a connecting pathway from The Ridge development all the way to the Netcong rail station.

So I'm going to go back to...I am referring back to now the circulation plan, which is sorry...let me go over.

Mr. Weiss: A-4 sheet 3.

Mr. Grisewood: I just want to finish off with a little...the plan also complies with the residential site and proven standards for parking and roadway network. The project requires 1,789 parking spaces based on the bedroom mix of the various units. The overall development plans provide a total of 1,849 spaces. The roadway network and vehicular access points of the overall development meet the required RSIS road width and sidewalks standards. Okay, moving on to the next sheet of the general development plan set, this is sheet 4. It's entitled Open Space Plans.

Mr. Buzak: So, we will mark that A-5 sheet 4.

Mr. Grisewood: Okay, the open space plan indicates the area and locations of land set aside for conservation and recreational purposes, whether passive or active. On this plan, it's the yellow areas throughout the developments. You can see the each tract has a substantial perimeter as well as interior open spaces. The overall development provides 57 acres or 46 percent of the tract area as open space. In addition to the open space, the entire development is interconnected with either by five foot wide walking paths as I indicated on the circulation plan or the sidewalk linkages along the street network. Each community or section of the development has direct access to the open space and/or a child's play or park area. Now just turn to one second...the ownership, maintenance and operation of all the onsite open space areas, the trails, the play equipment structures and associated parkings shall be through the individual development homeowners association. So the Homeowners Association will be obligated for the maintenance of the trail network, the open spaces and any interior features within those recreational opportunities. So breaking down that open space per tract, the Ridge provides 36.5 acres of open space or 41.9 percent. The Canal has 12.7 acres of open space or 54.6 percent site is open space and the Crossroads Tract, third one, with its green belt surrounding the development, it provides 7.8 acres of open space or 57.1 percent of the tract. So, the project cumulatively and individually meets the minimum 40 percent open space for each parcel or tract. The next sheet A-6 is the utility plan. It's sheet 5 of the submission set. Utility plan depicts the anticipated need and location of the proposed infrastructure improvements required to service the proposed development, both the onsite and offsite locations of sanitary sewers, drainage facilities, water lines are shown along with the proposed discharge or connection points to the downstream or receiving structures. The development will be served by public water mains and sewer, and offsite water extension is required and being coordinated through the New Jersey American Water. While the design for this offsite extension is not finalized, the plans have been submitted to the township and are under consideration with New Jersey America. That water extension would start in front along International Drive, extend eastward or north eastward along International Drive and then down southward along Continental Drive to service the Canal and Ridge developments. Additional items such as hotbox locations have not been determined at this point, those are site specific information that's not a part of the General Development Plan submission. So with regard to the sewer, the applicant has received confirmation that the receiving treatment work plant has sufficient capacity to service the development. So the Canal and the Ridge tracts sanitary sewer will drain to an existing sleeve that crosses under Route 80, which interconnects to...the sleeve is approximately in the midpoint of the Ridge's western property line, crosses Route 80 and interconnects to the sanitary sewer system within the International Foreign Trade Zone. To

accomplish that, the Canal and a portion of the Ridge will require a pump station and that pump station will be located north of the driveway connections from the Ridge and the Canal to Continental drive. The Canal portion of the development will drain to this pump station as well as a piece of the Ridge will drain to this pump station, and that will be pumped to a manhole within the Ridge development and flow southward to the low point and then the existing sleeve under Route 80 and interconnect to the foreign trade zone sanitary sewer system. Finally, water conservation devices such as low flow toilets and faucets will be incorporated into all the different housing types throughout the entire development including the Crossroad plans. Let me speak to the utility infrastructure for the Crossroads. This will operate independently of the Canal and Ridge portions of the development and is expected to have a gravity sanitary sewer system that will interconnect at a manhole in International Drive and it will also have a looping water system to service as its means of public water. Moving to the next sheet...

Mr. Selvaggi: A-7.

Mr. Grisewood: This is sheet 6. It's entitled The Storm Water Management Plan. The Stormwater Management Plan reflects the proposed methods of controlling and managing the stormwater produced by the new development. The plan depicts the anticipated locations of the onsite stormwater management basins and the downstream discharge and/or receiving structures. According to the plan sheet, the site's topography, which is the overall site's topography, is divided into four sub areas where the stormwater directed to four different surface tension basins. The first basin is located about at the midpoint along the western property line of the Ridge tract. The second basin is located at the northeast corner of the Ridge property. The third basin would be located on the Canal parcel, located again at the northern edge and then the fourth basin and final basin serves the Crossroads and that is also expected to be located at the northern edge of the tract. As indicated on this sheet, the storm water management plan will be designed to meet the NJDEP 80 percent TSS water quality standards and peak storm reductions and result in no net loss of groundwater recharge. Those systems have not been fully engineered. They're not required to be engineered at this point for the General Development Plan. They're just looked at in an overview as being adequate to service the general development. Inaudible...the General Development Plan submission requirements as an environmental inventory. There's not a specific plan sheet for that. It was not prepared for this inventory. Rather, two environmental reports were submitted with the original application, which contained written descriptions of the environmental inventories. These reports were prepared by two other consultants and will be updated as required as a portion of the site plan applications if necessary. So moving on to exhibit, the next exhibit, which is the community facilities plan. This is sheet 7.

Mr. Selvaggi: And it's exhibit A-8.

Mr. Grisewood: It is entitled The Community's Facilities Plan. This plan indicates the scope and type of supporting community facilities such as firehouses, police, emergency services, township facilities with the nearest recreational opportunities, transportation network and significant historic features. This is basically an inventory of the townships resources in relationship to the properties in question and the General Development Plan. So, on this plan, the site area that is indicated with a crosshatching and then the different features of the township are indicated with text and labeled. So this is just a guidance to understand how the development fits in with the community facilities. The next sheet is sheet 8.

Mr. Selvaggi:

Exhibit A-9.

Mr. Grisewood: This is the housing plan. It is again color coded based on the density configuration. The housing plan depicts the 686 total residential dwellings across the 123.9 acres, yielding a gross density of 5.54 units per acre. It shows 160 single family detached dwellings in the northern portion, northern half of the Ridge tract with the southern half of the Ridge comprised of 163-market rate and 104 low rise affordable housing units. The Canal parcel is shown with 93 townhomes, those are one and two car garage townhomes and then the Crossroads again is illustrated with a total of 166 market rate and affordable housing units located in the six 3 storey buildings. The Crossroad provides it's required 34 affordable housing units of the total number, there's a 104 affordable housing units on the Ridge property and 34 affordable housing units on the Crossroad property, yielding the 138, which is the 20 percent set aside. The plan depicts the compliance with the overall development standards that's outlined within the special district. In other words, it meets the General Development Plan standards that were outlined in the zoning. In addition to that, the different housing types shown on this plan. The plan also indicates generalized phasing lines, which are indicated on the sheet for the Ridge and Canal portions of the project. It needs to be understood that these phasing lines, however, are fluid and based on construction logistics. In general terms, each phase wants to include a diversity of housing types and each developer will construct the required affordable housing in a manner that meets the state requirements as the project progresses. So the Canal and the Ridge project is expected to be divided into three phases. The first phase is roughly 63 of the single family dwellings or the southern third of the 160 single family dwellings. The linear road that extends from the southern Continental Drive, a single family drive road access to Continental Drive, extending southward to Love Lane. That first phase will include 70 market rate townhomes and 74 affordable housing units. The second phase is tentatively planned to include 55 single-family homes in the northwest corner of the Ridge development. The remaining 93 townhomes, the market rate town homes, in the south end of the Ridge tract as well as the 30 affordable units that remain in the south portion of the Ridge tract. The third phase of the Canal and Ridge portion of the project is the construction of the 93 one and two car garage townhomes on the Canal piece, and the remaining 42 single family homes that are adjacent to the Continental Drive on the Ridge property. The Crossroads piece is actually expected to be constructed as a single phase, separate and complete from the Canal and Ridge phasing program.

Mr. Selvaggi: And Ken, just before you move on, as we had discussed earlier, prior to construction of any of these phases, there's going to need to be applications for site plans, subdivision submitted and, you know, we're going to go through a more detailed analysis of each of these phases, correct?

Mr. Grisewood: Absolutely. This is just a generalized anticipated view at this point of what might occur. It will be modified as necessary. Okay, moving on to the next sheet, which is the last.

Mr. Selvaggi:

A-10.

Mr. Grisewood: This is the last sheet in the general development plan submission set. It's the local service plan. This plan depicts the public services which the applicant proposes as a portion of

the development. The plan reflects water service extension and road windings along Continental Drive as offsite public service improvements.

Mr. Weiss: Let's take a moment and mark that A-10, which is sheet 9.

Mr. Grisewood: I'm sorry.

Mr. Weiss: That's Okay. I got it.

Mr. Grisewood: In addition the storm sewers, sanitary sewers and onsite water mains constitute infrastructure improvements, which will be maintained and operated by the various utility authorities. I do want to mention that the project also includes solid waste containment facilities that are depicted in conjunction with the multifamily communities, portions of the communities, and will be managed by private...inaudible...company. The individual single family units will manage their individual properties storage and are subject to the township rules and regulations regarding curbside pickup. That's basically what I wanted to present with regard to the General Development Plan Submission set and I want to move on to a quick review of the Crossroads alternative study that was prepared in response to some concerns over the Crossroads.

Mr. Selvaggi: I will mark this A-11 and Ken, what is A-11?

Mr. Grisewood: A-11 is entitled ITC East, Block 202, Lot 1, 13.62 acres. It's a three different plan views of The Crossroads parcel as proposed alternative development schemes. It's entitled Previously Submitted Plan Concept Plan II and IV exhibit. It is prepared by Menlo Engineering Associates. It does not have a date on it.

Mr. Selvaggi: So, what was the rationale for doing this, what prompted us to prepare this plan?

Mr. Grisewood: Well, there was some discussion as to how to generate, how best to generate a plan that yielded open space and a plan that everybody was comfortable with the layout and the facilities being shown. The original submission plan contained 192 units with 385 parking spaces, and that plan was considered to be too intense. With that in mind, the Concept Plan II, there was a Concept Plan III that was evaluated by the design team and it was felt that it was redundant to Concept Plan IV. So, we simply eliminated it. In fact, it was a very similar layout. It just yielded a little less open space than Concept Plan IV. So we as a design team decided that that version wasn't necessary. So Concept Plan II shown on this drawing is 166 units. It has 338 parking spaces. Based on the design team's discussion, it was determined that this layout best met the design objectives while addressing the township comments. It yields 57.1 percent open space. It has a 1.4 acre open green at the center with an area in the middle that's large enough to accommodate an informal active recreation, things like throwing a football, a Frisbee, maybe a lawn volleyball or lawn bowling and can be developed further as part of the site plan submission. The Concept Plan II also includes a dog run and a community garden area as well as an age-targeted play structure. Concept plan IV would have the same facilities. Its configuration is dramatically different. It moves more of the open space to the interior. It does yield a little bit more open space, yielding right around 60 percent open space. It provides the same 166 units with 334 parking spaces. The substantial difference between the two plans in our view as a design team is the long parking runs that are associated with utilizing

the perimeter of the tract as parking areas. Those long parking runs may cause some potential speeding problems, and it was basically from the design team's perspective, we felt those traffic issues were substantial enough to move away from this and represent Concept Plan II within the General Development Plans as the initial concept. However, my understanding is the developer is prepared to accept whatever scheme the board thinks is better. So we offer these two schemes as an alternate design scenarios, which can be and will be further developed as part of a site plan application at the time that that site plan application is made. That concludes my direct testimony on how the project fulfills the general development plan submissions.

Mr. Weiss: I just have a quick question. I have a quick question. On the alternative plans, are we missing a I and III? I know you have the proposed and then you go to II and then you have IV.

Mr. Grisewood: Right. Let me go back. Let me go back. Concept Plan I is basically what's labeled as the previously submitted plan up here in the upper left hand corner. This was what was on the design in the General Development Plan when we first submitted the project last year. Based on initial comments of the Township professionals, we thought that this concept was too intense. So we then were assigned the task of developing alternative scenarios. We developed a Concept Plan II and there was a Concept Plan III as well as Concept Plan IV. Concept plan III was a configuration that was similar to, so similar to concept plan IV, yet it yielded less open space. We did eliminated it as an alternative for consideration.

Mr. Weiss: That's fine. So we're not missing one.

Mr. Grisewood: No, you're not missing. The two under consideration are basically II and IV.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Are you looking for direction from the Planning Board as to which one we favor?

Mr. Grisewood: I suppose that's correct. Concept Plan II is incorporated into the general development plan submission. It's what the design team felt was the better solution.

Mr. Weiss: I'll defer that to maybe our experts. Is there maybe a better time for that? Chuck, do you think?

Mr. McGroarty: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think I know that Mike and I have talked about it and I've met with the Rockefeller...with the folks from Rockefeller. We have discussed this. I mean, I think II is preferable to IV, but I don't think the Board's ready tonight to give its direction unless I'm mistaken. And don't forget, we talked about this in the past, but first it was the weather and then, of course, with the current situation that we're facing, large gatherings are not really that possible. But it would be a good idea, I think, to go out to the site, to go to all of these sites. Given the fact that it's summer now, ticks, et cetera, could be a real problem. But I think there are ways to look at the Crossroads site without going through all of the weeds and so on. We can do it from the road. There are also trails through there that we can see it, and I think that would be very important because again when you're out there, the Board Members know this, you're going to be very, very close to the actual highway itself and so that may influence your thoughts in terms of how close the actual units should be to the highway versus another alternative that may provide some buffering.

But for what it's worth, and Mike can speak for himself, I think the Concept II was getting closer to what we were...you know...looking at as an alternative, and again, it shaved off a number of units in order to get some more open space in there.

Mr. Buzak: And Mr. Chairman, I think the other portion or the other thing to consider is the fact that we need to hear from the public. This is a hearing. I wouldn't ask the Board or the board to be making any decisions or directions until we complete the application itself and get some public input as well.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. McGroarty: Exactly, good point.

Mr. Weiss: So we'll just take it as there are multiple options to consider when the time is right.

Mr. McGroarty: Right.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Selvaggi: Okay, so for the Board, the public, the plan presentation and if you recall the names of those, I mean, they correspond with the criteria in your ordinance 550-103, we talked and presented a general land use plan, a circulation plan, an open space plan, utility plan, storm water. So there was as I said earlier, there's a methodology that we're following as prescribed by the municipality and its ordinances, and that's what we've done. What remains, you know, open after Ken's testimony, and that's where Mr. Phillips will come in is...you know...a fiscal report and then, Paul, also talked about a community facilities plan. He has submitted a report as well, and he'll testify to those. So that's how this kind of all comes together. So we're just not pulling this stuff out of thin air.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so Ken I think you had said that you concluded your testimony. Anybody from the Planning Board have any questions for Ken? Follow up to what he said. I can't really see everybody so might want to just speak out. Ken if you can shut down your plans, that will give us, bring us back to the screen.

Mr. Grisewood: Okay.

Mr. Weiss: Okay and thank you for that. So does anybody from the Planning Board have any questions for Ken? Brian?

Mr. Schaechter: Yeah, you talked about the sidewalks and the trails being maintained by the homeowners associations, how about the roads? Are those going to be private or they are going to be public where Mount Olive is going to have to maintain them?

Mr. Grisewood: My understanding is the interior roads are going to be private.

Mr. Selvaggi: Which means they will be maintained by the homeowner association.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, that's interesting and we'll certainly have more testimony to that when the time comes right, Michael?

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Anybody else from the Planning Board?

Ms. Natafalusy: Excuse me Howie. The open space...it's basically the perimeter of the property. There is no way to get more open space, but a trail and a walkway.

Mr. Grisewood: Let me bring up the, if I may...

Mr. Weiss: Sure, go ahead.

Mr. Grisewood: I think it's going to be best seen on this one. Okay, we will go back to the open space exhibit, if you don't mind.

Mr. Selvaggi: It was A-5 sheet 4.

Mr. Buzak: A-5, yeah.

Mr. Grisewood: This is the open space exhibit sheet 4, and again, the open space is depicted in the yellow coloration. So there is a...inaudible...open space...go ahead.

Mr. Buzak: That's not up yet...

Mr. Selvaggi: You have to share your screen.

Mr. Grisewood: Yes, here we go. See it?

Mr. Buzak: Not yet.

Mr. Grisewood: Here we go. I'm sorry. All right, again, this is sheet 4 open space plan within the submission set. So you asked about interior opportunities. Both the Ridge and the Crossroads pieces will have interior park areas. They range from 1.4 acres to 1.1 acres. The level of activity and how these parks or open spaces are developed remains to be seen. That's a function, again, of as the site plan comes forward and/or how that the community is developed, but both of these parcels have interior open spaces that are significant in size. The Canal piece abuts a massive open space to the east and it basically is kind of a secluded parcel. So its open space is wrapped around, but there is a substantial, and this is 5.1 acres of open space on the opposite side of the canal. So for the Canal parcel, it is a passive open space. It's not an active open space, but the two smaller park areas, the one on the Crossroads and the one on the Ridge, those interior parks have opportunity and large enough opportunity for informal recreation. They're not designed or large enough to accommodate full size sports fields and I don't think you'd want that inside of residential community of this size anyway. But they can be developed in a way that allows the residents to use them in an active and informal, active way. In addition, The Ridge tract has a large open space as the southern tail. Now,

unfortunately, there's some geo-tech work that I understand needs to be done yet on this southern tail. So there's no commitment yet as to how to work this out. That'll be, again, a portion of the site plan application. So I just want to reiterate that there are open space parcels internal to the perimeter of the overall development.

Mr. McGroarty: Mr. Chariman?

Mr. Weiss: Yes go ahead.

Mr. McGroarty: If Catherine is...I want to follow up on that point of hers, if we can. Well, I don't think, I don't need the plan up. I don't know if the Board does.

Mr. Weiss: So, go ahead Chuck.

Mr. McGroarty: Right. I actually, again, we've raised this issue in our meetings with the applicant prior to submission of the plans, and I raise it again in both of my reports, my first and my second report, that tail end, as was discussed, that at the southerly end, which is closest to Route 46, the geo-tech work, no decision I'm sure will be made tonight, I would argue that should be done now rather than wait for site plan, because that's a large, probably the largest contiguous area of open space of the three parcels and right now it's just wooded area and it may even have been a sort of a stump burial ground and some other things out there and over in the past. So, I think we need to get as part of the General Development Plan process under subsection C, which talks about open space, I think we need to get a better understanding of the conditions of that area sooner rather than later so that the Board can make a better judgment in terms of what kind of open space you're going to see out there. Once it gets to the site plan stage, it's in some ways too late.

Mr. Selvaggi: If I may Chuck, I mean, it's the intention to keep it open space, I'm not sure what the geo-tech will do. I mean, you're talking about how it's going to be used as open space. Is that what we're...?

Mr. McGroarty: Yes. I mean, it's open space now because you can't develop it. I mean, that's you folks are pretty clear about that. Otherwise you could develop it. So...you know...if it's going to be by default open space simply because it's unusable land and it's perhaps even unstable, I don't know. Other than just having it remain as a wooded parcel at the end, we would like to see, I think what we'd like to see is what are the possibilities for perhaps regrading it, clearing it, making it more an active, open area. I've been saying this all along, it's not something I'm just saying tonight.

Mr. Nelsen: I would agree.

Mr. Weiss: Ed, you have a question?

Mr. Buzak: I will...I think after the Board is finished. I don't want to interrupt the board's questioning. I just didn't want to be left out at the end.

Mr. Weiss: Try not to leave you out anymore, Ed.

Mr. Buzak: Thanks, you never do.

Mr. Weiss: Catherine?

Ms. Natafalusy: All right. Can you go over the Crossword site and tell me what the acreage is on those recreation areas?

Mr. Grisewood: I'm sorry, say that again, I missed the first word.

Ms. Natafalusy: The Crossroads site. How big are the areas that are recreation areas and open space on that site? Because it looks like they're very small little recreation areas, not even an acre or so.

Mr. Grisewood: Sure. The tract area is 13.6 acres, the overall tract. The open space allocated on that particular property is...just let me get to the...it has a 7.8 acres or 57 percent of the site is open space, and some of those areas are open space, meaning it's not developed as hard surfaces. The interior central green is a 1.4 acre area. Its dimensions are approximately 220 feet in length and 170 feet in width internal to the oval sidewalk that was portrayed on the general development plan. So that's large enough to support both passive and informal active recreation opportunities. That project will also include age targeted play structure for children as well as an interior community lounge and fitness center within one of the buildings and an outdoor resident terrace. The plan also depicted a community garden area as well as a dog run area. So that's the statistics on the open space for the Crossroads.

Ms. Natafalusy: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Ok, did anybody else from the Planning Board have any questions. Ed, I'm going to go to you. I know you had a question, then I will turn to the public.

Mr. McGroarty: I'm sorry, Ed. I'm sorry, Ed.

Mr. Buzak: Go ahead. Go ahead.

Mr. McGroarty: I did have one other thing, because the witness that did mention the environmental impact statement, again, I have comments about it. There were some, in my judgment, inconsistencies between the two reports. One report was done for the Crossroads only and the other one for the other two tracts and I know Mr. Selvaggi addressed some of the comments and some correspondence, but we would expect the reports to be revised and updated as part of this process and not wait for site plan.

Mr. Selvaggi: Well, we can do that.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Mr. Selvaggi. Ed?

Mr. Buzak: Yes, Mr. Grisewood, on a couple of occasions during the course of your testimony, you referred to property and you said, if I heard you correctly, that it was owned by the DEP and I think you may have meant the DOT, so I wanted to get the record straight. Is some of this property owned by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection?

Mr. Grisewood: It did not involve these particular tracts. I was describing a parcel that lies to the east of The Canal tract. The Canal tract abuts a property on its east side that's owned by the NJ DEP. That's what I was referring to.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. So they don't have an easement. They actually own a fee interest in that property?

Mr. Grisewood: As far as I know, that's what it showed on the tax maps. I'm not sure of the ownership...

Mr. McGroarty: Yes, the answer is yes. Yes, the DEP owns it clear and outright. It is part of the state park system just in that area. Yes.

Mr. Buzak: Okay, thank you, Chuck. You also referred to and again, it may have been DEP or DOT. I thought you said DOT in this one, but perhaps, I misunderstood. Those parcels that you said...I think the DOT intends or may dedicate adjacent to a parcel of Netcong...to allow access to the...

Mr. Grisewood: What I was speaking to was there is a sliver of land that's the New Jersey Foreign Trade...hang on one second...let me flip to the proper...New Jersey Foreign Trade Zone that owns a piece of property that's indicated on the tax maps as Block 17, Lot 7 in the Borough of Netcong, immediately across Continental Drive from the southern portion of The Ridge development. That property extends to the east and abuts a parcel that's owned by the Borough of Netcong which further extends to Flanders Road in the Borough of Netcong and then on the east side of Flanders Road, the New Jersey Transit's Netcong station parcel goes from Flanders Road up to the station. So there's an opportunity there with the dedication of Block 17, Lot 7 that's owned by the New Jersey Foreign Trade Zone venture for the public entities or those three public agencies, being either the Township of Mt. Olive, the Borough of Netcong and the New Jersey Transit to work together to coordinate and construct a connecting pathway from basically Continental Drive over to the Netcong rail station.

Mr. Buzak: Are there any plans for that to happen or you simply...here is 3 parcels and if these 3 people get together...?

Mr. Grisewood: No, there is no plan...It is an opportunity. It's an opportunity.

Mr. McGroarty: We had asked for that as part of the Master Plan...in the Master Plan change, which I think was back in 2015, we had called for that to be explored. So whether it works or not, at least the opportunity presented itself for maybe a connection to the train station.

Mr. Buzak: Has there been any exploration by the applicant here to bring those parties together to accomplish that? Michael, you know that?

Mr. Selvaggi: No.

Mr. Buzak: Okay, and what's the distance from your tract to the train station?

Mr. Grisewood: All right, let me try to scale that off of a PDF exhibit that I have. You're going to...

Mr. Schaechter: I have a quick question while you're looking for that. Are there any plans connected to the Mount Olive train station? I mean, looks like you're focusing on Netcong. We do have a train station in the trade zone as well on the other side of the development.

Mr. Grisewood: Let me respond to the Mount Olive question first. No, we do not have any plans. I wasn't aware of any proposals or any plans to connect to the Mount Olive train station, which I know is to the northwest of the property. So let me...if you could bear with me a minute, I have to try and scale this off of a reduction because it can't scale off of the...

Mr. McGroarty: Brian, I guess other than through, you know, out through Continental and then the park, there is a small parking area, as you know.

Mr. Schaechter: Right.

Mr. Buzak: And perhaps while we're waiting, although Mr. Grisewood testified to this, Mr. Selvaggi may know the answer better than Mr. Grisewood that is, is there going to be a single homeowners association that will encompass these three developments?

Mr. Selvaggi: The Crossroads will remain not part of the homeowner's association, because those will be rental units.

Mr. Buzak: But they will have rights to utilize?

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes, there'll be cross easements between the various sections, so that will be an integrated site, which is what the ordinance contemplated.

Mr. Buzak: Okay and therefore, then all of the interior roads and facilities will be owned and operated by the owner of that tract that will be the owner of the rental project that's there. Is that correct?

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes. I mean, there's not, the way that tract is laid out, there's not a lot of interior roads. There will be primarily parking lots and access in and off the main roads.

Mr. Grisewood: I mean, the distance, it's approximately a half mile from Continental Drive to the midpoint of the parking lot of the rail station.

Mr. Weiss: You know, I'm a little confused as this interconnect. I asked earlier if we look at The Crossroads...no...I am not sure I have that right.

Mr. McGroarty: The interconnect, Howie, from Crossroads over to the next tract?

Mr. Weiss: Yes, you pick one from The Crossroads. Number One, I'm not sure what the...inaudible...law would be to get there, but Number Two, it's sort of taking your life in your hand, how are you supposed to get from one to the other? Or is that a part of the plan?

Mr. McGroarty: It is an elevated bridge over the highway from Crossroads to The Canal site. It's there today...yes, it's there today...it would...well, I guess it would have to be evaluated by engineering to see if it is structurally sound still for that. But it's essentially, it's a walkway over this bridge.

Mr. Weiss: What was it there for, do you know?

Mr. McGroarty: Look like a walkway or maybe a rail line. I don't know originally. It's a walkway. I mean, there's no rails, there's no rails on it today, I don't know if anyone does know.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. At least that's the answer. That's going to be the way to cross connect each of the communities.

Mr. Buzak: Yes. Do we know who owns that, Chuck?

Mr. McGroarty: I don't...I don't know if Mike knows that.

Mr. Selvaggi: You know what, it's a good question. I would assume it may be part of the Rockefeller Group. Yes, so it's...Rockefeller owns that.

Mr. Buzak: Is that a fact, Mike?

Mr. Selvaggi: That's a fact, yes.

Mr. Buzak: I am not challenging you as you already made statement...

Mr. Selvaggi: No, no, it's a fact, yeah.

Mr. Buzak: So, is the intention to utilize that, whether it needs to be improved or for engineering structural issues or whatever, but to utilize that to access for the people in the Crossroads, to access the Canal property?

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes, that was...it may not show as well on the plan, I think the chairman brings up a nice observation, but that's the interconnectivity, you know, that walkway across the highway so that all of these sites are integrated as opposed to making a mad dash across the highway.

Mr. Weiss: Well, mad dash is underestimated, understated.

Mr. McGroarty: Well, it could also be...I mean, the Crossroads is at the same elevation as the other tracts, give or take a few feet. So depending on the condition of that rail or that crossing, there still could be improvements or expansion of the sidewalk system so that, you know, one could actually walk along Continental from one to the other. In terms of the elevations they are all of the

same. The highway, of course, is down below. So you wouldn't have to...once you're out there, you could walk through the three tracts along Continental.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. McGroarty: That would probably be the sort of thing at the stage of site plan review, will be nailed down more specifically.

Mr. Weiss: All right, Ed, did you have something?

Mr. Buzak: Yes, I did. Mike, I understand that the Crossroads will not be a part of the homeowners association, but that am I correct, in understanding that there will be a single homeowners association for then the Canal and the Ridge, so there'll be one there?

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes.

Mr. Buzak: Okay.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, any other questions for Ken? Okay, so you...go ahead...Ken, go ahead?

Mr. Forlenza: Yes. For Mr. Grisewood, I noticed on the site plan you had bodies of water, are those one hundred year flood sites and they're dry at most of the time or they actually fill with water?

Mr. Grisewood: Those were indicated as blue to represent as stormwater management basins, whether they're going to be wet ponds or not has not been determined. That's part of the engineering that would come with the site plan application. But they were just represented as blue so that we could distinguish where those stormwater basins would be visually on the exhibits.

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Chairman, I have two other questions, if I might. Mr. Grisewood, as a landscape architect, are there any standards of which you are aware related to the amount of open space per unit or per person that's recommended, that's suggested? Is there some measurement or benchmark that the open space can be measured against other than the percentages and so forth that you've done?

Mr. Grisewood: I am not aware of any specific standard on a small site scale, meaning a project like this, of this nature, individual units. I am aware that there's community resource standards for large...you know...where we are planning to develop recreational opportunities for an entire township or borough, then there's some standards at that level. But I'm not aware of any of that are applied in a smaller scale on this kind of a development. In the years of my practice, I've never done that.

Mr. Buzak: And in laying out something like this, again, as a landscape architect, do you have any opinions on how that should be calculated?

Mr. Grisewood: I'm not sure I totally...I don't I don't think there's a need to calculate a square footage basis relationship between the number of residents or the number of bedrooms or the number of units to open space. I think open space is a function of the overall development, how you're addressing opportunities for the future residents, the techniques and pieces of equipment or what you might provide. I do know that the trend in land development and residential communities is away from things like clubhouses and pools because of the expense of the insurance liabilities and they're just not as used as much. There is a growing trend for walking trails and a lot more activity dealing with the more of a passive type of recreational opportunities. I like the plans having two central open spaces that could be utilized for informal activities. I like the central park that's being proposed on the Ridge parcel as well as the center square. The configuration doesn't matter which configuration to use. I do think that the central open space on both of those parcels works well. I'm comfortable with the Crossroads, I'm sorry, the Canal piece not having a central space like that because it is adjacent to such a large open space to the northeast, that that's a wholly different kind of feeling for that development, that portion of the development.

Mr. Buzak: And you raised that, you made a comment that I want to follow up on as well anyway and that is the clubhouse I thought I saw in the materials that I reviewed that there was, in fact, an intention to include a clubhouse.

Mr. Grisewood: Yes. It's not a clubhouse as a freestanding building. There is a community space being proposed for the Crossroads development that's labeled clubhouse. It's an interior community space. It may contain a fitness center. We were directed to allocate some space on the Crossroads development to serve those residents only as a community gathering space.

Mr. Buzak: And is that an interior space, sir, I assume?

Mr. Grisewood: Yes.

Mr. Buzak: Okay, and you mentioned the pools and are there any such as a pool, recreation facilities planned in the general development plan here for any of these communities?

Mr. Grisewood: No, there is not.

Mr. Buzak: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have nothing further.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so I see nothing else going...

Ms. Natafalusy: Howie?

Mr. Weiss: Yes...Catherine.

Ms. Natafalusy: Can you describe what a low rise affordable unit is? Is that an apartment as well, are they townhouses and will they be for sale units?

Mr. Grisewood: The affordable housing units are described as low rise on the Ridge, bear with me. I think the affordable housing planners should speak to the Affordable Housing Program but my understanding is those low rise are two stories. They're called stack townhouses. So they

are...I think they're called stack townhouses. Hang on just a minute while I try to find the...the piece of architecture that was sent to me. I'm sorry. There's a lower unit and an upper unit within those low rise, but they are two storey's. The units on The Ridge and Canal are for sale units and the affordable housing units on the Crossroads parcel will be rental units. But the low rise, what I was talking about was a two story units.

Ms. Natafalusy: And they are for sale units?

Mr. Grisewood: Those are for sale units.

Ms. Natafalusy: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Any other questions for Ken? All right, so here's what we are going to...I'm going to look to just take a quick 10 minute break before we open it to the public. Before we do so, Dane I'm going to turn to you for a little assistance. I see there's been a little meter on my screen for Q&A just to remind the public. Number one nobody gets to ask a question anonymously. Everything that's asked has to be open in public. So I need us to remove...Dane, is there any way to remove that option, it is a written Q&A.

Mr. Westdyk: I have to look into that. As of right now, this meeting, I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we just ask the attendees to type there questions and we can kind of just scroll through them. And the ones that are pertinent, that can be answered under this forum, we will answer. And ones that need to be posed at a future date, can be told that. That might be a little bit more efficient than trying to get everyone to speak.

Mr. Weiss: Well, you know, and that's very interesting, although quite nontraditional. That might be a very good way. I am going to say, though, I just took a quick peek. There's some that are anonymous. I'm not going to address those. I don't think we can. I don't think it would be fair. So as we take a break, it's 8:43. Let's take a ten minute break. But while we're on break, if anybody has questions, feel free to type them in. I will moderate those and maybe we'll just address them as a full Board for the questions. But keep in mind, if it's anonymous, I'm not going to address them. Is that fair, Mr. Buzak?

Mr. Buzak: Yes. You know, again, we run these meetings and these hearings in the same way we run an in-person meeting where a person gets up, he addresses his name, his address, and then asks his or her question. So I think that will be the same practice here. This should not be any different from that.

Mr. Weiss: Ok, so then we really can't follow Dane's suggestion. I can't just scroll through and read those questions, right?

Mr. Buzak: I think that's correct. And, you know, Dane was just trying to create a more efficient way and I appreciate that.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, but I guess you're right. Everything has to be formal. I will open it to the public when we come back. Dane, you'll be able to help me find those that have their hand raised?

Mr. Westdyk: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, I have 8:44. It's going to be ten minutes. At 8:54, we're going to come back and I'll open it with questions from the public. So let's adjourn for ten minutes and we'll be back in ten minutes, 8:54.

Mr. Weiss: All right I have 8:54, so let's bring the meeting back to order. A procedural question again, Mr. Buzak. Where are you? As soon as Ed comes back.

Mr. Buzak: I'm back.

Mr. Weiss: Ok, so I've noticed that some of the questions people have put in their name and address. Is that acceptable or would you like to hear direct testimony, direct questions from those folks?

Mr. Buzak: No. If they put in a name and address. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't mean to interrupt you.

Mr. Weiss: Yeah, no that's fine. The question I'm asking, if they put in a name and address, can we address that?

Mr. Buzak: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so here's what we're going to do. I'll try to go in order. Everyone can hear me still, right? Well, let me try to minimize this.

Mr. Schaechter: You're good, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: So, let me just try to go from the beginning. We'll look for the first question where I see an address. If I miss anybody, we certainly won't...inaudible...they were at the end. I'm going to start at the beginning. Just bear with me, I'm going through each and every one...much more efficient, right? I see a question here. This is from Shelly Morningstar, 70 Oakwood Village in Flanders. I don't see a question. I'm going to skip that for right now...maybe...you see a question...Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Schaechter: Mr. Chairman, she has several questions. If you look under the name of Lucy Niedermann, that is Shelly Morningstar.

Mr. Weiss: Ok, well, Mr. Schaechter...

Mr. Selvaggi: Mr. Buzak, if I can. I appreciate Mr. Weiss's attempts here, but if these people are available and they're typing the questions. I think it's probably just easier to have them, you know, raise their hands and be recognized and answer them that way.

Mr. Buzak: And Mr. Selvaggi, that's fine, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Weiss: Yes, it's funny you say that Mr. Selvaggi. I finally got the one that looked like would have worked for us, but...because I am at the question that looks like Mr. Gray Tuttle at 66 River Road in Flanders asked. So if we could, Dane, can we can we have Mr. Tuttle ask his question?

Mr. McGroarty: So, is he going to give us his name and address?

Mr. Weiss: I would think based on the advice of council, that's what has to happen and then for the record, he'll ask the question. So we would then turn...Dane, you would turn to Mr. Tuttle and invite him in as a participant, as a panelist? You're muted.

Mr. Westdyk: My...inaudible...stopped working. He will be allowed to speak, I just have to locate him on the list. I don't think he's still...

Mr. Schaechter: He left the meeting...that's why.

Mr. Westdyk: Yes, I believe he left the meeting. But Lucy Niedermann or Ms. Morningstar does have her hand raised, and I can allow her. I know she had a...

Mr. Weiss: Okay, let me set the record straight. This is not social media. We're looking for a name. I don't know why people are using multiple names, but I'm sure there's a good reason for it. When you come and ask a question, we're looking for your name and address. We're creating a record. Not only is this one visual, but it's recorded. So, again, you've noted that Ms. Morningstar has her hand up, so let's invite her in to ask her question. And as you're doing that, I want to remind people from the public the instructions that I gave an hour and a half ago, the question directed at Mr. Grisewood is based on the testimony that he delivered. If the question ends up in a manner that has nothing to do with what he said, I'm going to stop it. So let's open it to Ms. Morningstar.

Ms. Morningstar: Thank you, Howie. Thank you to the Planning Board and thank you, Ken, for your comments and great presentation on the site plans and I apologize that my daughter, a senior, a recent graduate, has hijacked my Zoom but this is Shelly Morningstar in Flanders, 70 Oakwood Village, for the record. I have two questions. There's actually seven in that chat. I wasn't sure how you were going to respond to them, so I'll narrow it to two. The first question is, why does the Crossroads community, one of the three communities being proposed by the developer, owned by the Rockefeller Group and other investors as the Federal Trade Zone Ventures LLC, why do they have the housing unit for low income and affordable housing positioned right next to Interstate 80, where there is noise pollution and pollution and limited open space? And secondly will this be LEED Green building design, master construction and building that meets with smart growth and smart construction development? Thank you.

Mr. Selvaggi: Ken, with respect to the second part of the question, as we said earlier, that's probably a little premature when we come in with the site plans and there's more analysis done as to...you know...building layouts, materials, we'll have a better answer to that question.

Mr. Weiss: That's a fair answer. Ms. Morningstar, is that okay with that? You're okay with that answer?

Ms. Morningstar: I look forward to it. Thank you.

Mr. Selvaggi: Now, Ken, with respect to the selection or the location of the affordable units.

Mr. Grisewood: The entire development is required to produce 20 percent affordable housing. There are a 104 allocated on the Ridge property. So the remaining 34 are allocated to the Crossroads as a separate. Since it's a kind of an isolated... I don't want to say isolated, but it's a different type of unit. It's a three storey condo rental style. It's a rental apartment development. That development is required to produce and it's done by a different developer. It's one overall plan, but done with two different developers, so that developer's obligation is 20 percent affordable housing units. The plan is to pick the three storey rental apartment buildings on the Crossroads as part of the overall development and since there are two different developers, each developer is providing its proportionate share of affordable housing. So the affordable housing units on The Crossroad piece are integrated within and the architecture of the buildings haven't been done and how the unit layout hasn't necessarily been fully designed but the affordable housing units will be integrated within that development. And that's the 20 percent they're required to do for that particular developer, that portion of the development.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Buzak: Can I follow up on that for a second, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Weiss: Sure. Go ahead Mr. Buzak.

Mr. Buzak: So on The Crossroads, because it's a rental project, the 20 percent set aside for affordable units will be integrated within that complex and within the various buildings. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. Grisewood: I don't want to comment exactly on how the distribution of the 20 percent gets allocated within the development, because we don't have those kind of plans yet, but the requirement is being met on that site for that number of units.

Mr. Buzak: Ok, well, I just want to be... these are very important points. I thought you said, and perhaps I misunderstood, that they would be integrated into that development. And to me, integrated means they are interspaced within the buildings within there. If you want to modify your testimony, that's fine, but I think that is what you said. And I was just...

Mr. Grisewood: Well, I understand where you're coming from and I'm trying to explain it in a general term what I meant. I don't have the architectural footprints of each and every building. There's no architecture yet. So I don't know how the unit itself, where each affordable unit will be located. I don't... we don't have that kind of detail. So when I said integrated in the development, it's the development. There's a requirement to do 20 percent set aside, the 34 units on that project. Where they end up physically in the buildings, I don't have the... I can't answer that at this point.

Mr. Buzak: Understood. Is it also true that you cannot advise as to whether that's going to be a separate building that will house those affordable units?

Mr. Grisewood: That's correct. I can't advise that.

Mr. Buzak: And how about with regard to the Ridge and Canal? Is your answer the same regarding the affordable units on those projects?

Mr. Grisewood: The Ridge project and the Canal project has a specific unit style that's separate from all the other variations of units. So those are contained within buildings that will have strictly affordable housing units. It's a two storey structure, so it mimics a townhome in appearance but if they are specific structures that contain the affordable units on that development.

Mr. Buzak: Ok, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Selvaggi: Mr. Buzak, just to follow up, but we are going to be obligated because, you know, you can't... Board Members or public are thinking that we're going to save the affordables for the last building and that's where they're all going to go. We're obligated as this project gets built out, a certain percentage of the 20 percent we're providing will get built along with that. So the agreement we would have with the town will set that out. So I hope no one thinks that the affordables are the afterthought that are going to be the last things to go in, that's... not true.

Ms. Morningstar: Michael, that's why I asked the question, because there are three residential communities within this proposed developer, two developers now involved in this particular site. So I asked the question because the only place that I saw for the low income affordable housing was but up against Interstate 80, great for noise pollution and pollution for those who can't afford housing and to purchase housing in this township, so that is exactly why I asked the question, because according to what Ken proposed, out of the three communities, it is the Crossroads community where the low income and affordable housing has the least amount of open space, the least amount of access to public transportation and sits right along Interstate 80. I don't think I need to tell anyone on the Planning Board what that looks like. Thank you for the opportunity to ask the question.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, let's move on. I think I have... I'm looking, Dane... I'm looking at Mr. Anthony Ricardi has his hand up and Mr. Ricardi, it looks like you're muted.

Mr. Ricardi: Can you hear me now?

Mr. Weiss: Yes, Mr. Ricardi. Would you state your name for the record please and your address.

Mr. Ricardi: Anthony Ricardi. My address is 4 Lawrence Ave in Stanhope. So, I had two quick questions, you may not have answers for at this time. I understand that a site plan may need to happen before all of this. Isn't there to be a traffic impact study specifically for Continental Drive and Love Lane? Those roads are awfully narrow and...

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so wait, hold on. Before you give an opinion, your question is will there be a traffic impact statement?

Mr. Ricardi: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Mr. Selvaggi?

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes, as part of the site plan that will be...you know...amongst the information and evidence that will be submitted.

Mr. Weiss: All right. Thank you. And then you had a second question, Mr. Ricardi?

Mr. Ricardi: Yes. So based off of that, there would be possibly a recommendation to upgrade those roads if needed, since this is going to introduce what over a thousand extra cars once all these are rented out?

Mr. Weiss: Let me interrupt real quick. We don't know the numbers, we haven't seen traffic report. But based on any other application that we've seen, we'll review the traffic analysis. The Planning Board does have our own expert traffic engineer that works on behalf of the township. And I would imagine that we'll turn to our traffic, excuse me, our traffic expert for recommendations on how to handle the data that's presented by the applicant.

Mr. Ricardi: Okay. Sorry.

Mr. Selvaggi: Mr. Ricardi, there was a submission of a report of January 13, 2020, that was given to the Board's professional staff dealing with the traffic and particularly, you know, the Love Lane and again, it was a preliminary study that was requested as part of Mr. McGroarty's January 6th report. Chuck, I believe you got that today?

Mr. McGroarty: Yes, I got it today, and Mr. Lublanecki is on with us today. He's our traffic expert. There was a full, more detailed traffic report for the Canal and then the Ridge tracts but that was before we got all this squared away, that all three tracts are going to be part of this plan. So, and Walt can address that, but the overall traffic analysis that has to be done, we'll have to take into account all three tracts.

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: And that will be done through site plan.

Mr. McGroarty: Yes, the general development plan requirement doesn't go into that level of detail, right.

Mr. Weiss: Okay.

Mr. Ricardi: I have one more question, if I may.

Mr. Weiss: Sure.

Mr. Ricardi: For what butts up against the Stanhope portion, in there is two of Stanhope's wells, so what's being proposed here is actually well within the recharge zone for those wells? I don't

know if that's been addressed in the environmental impact statement yet or that's to come. I am just wondering if that information is available and where I could find that?

Mr. Weiss: I'm going to kind of shut that one down. It wasn't testified to tonight... that would come... as also site plan, probably. Mr. Selvaggi, through an engineer report?

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. So we haven't seen that. It will be addressed and that will certainly be a more appropriate time to discuss the recharge and any question that you might have about the impact on the wells in the Stanhope site.

Mr. McGroarty: But Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ricardi should contact me at the Planning Department. I have some information on that.

Mr. Weiss: Ok, thank you for that, Chuck.

Mr. Ricardi: I'm sorry. Just who was that?

Mr. Weiss: That was Chuck McGroarty. He's the Township Planner. You can certainly... to be... just keep it moving, you could find Chuck's contact information on the township website under planning.

Mr. Ricardi: Thank you very much.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. You're welcome. Let me move on. I see that we have a hand raised from Barbara. Well, it looks like you brought in. There we go... let's do Barbara when Barbara is up? There you go... Barbara, I want you to please if you would state your name and address.

Ms. Melveger: 9 Patrick Court, Flanders, New Jersey. And I have a couple of questions. The first one has to do with the consideration of years ago, the original site development plan for the FTZ discussed the possibility of a transit hub being put in at some point in the future. I'm wondering, given the fact that there would be so many houses and the fact that the Netcong train station will certainly be inadequate, the one at the FTZ is inadequate. Is there any consideration other than the walkway to developing a transit hub that really would be accessible to all the people who live there and the people who work there as well?

Mr. Weiss: I'm not sure if that's a question for Mr. Grisewood. Mr. Selvaggi, do you have a suggestion on how to best answer that question?

Mr. Selvaggi: Not at this moment. You know... it's something that... you know... the developer's representatives are listening and we can certainly look into that as we fill out, you know, flush out the site plans.

Ms. Melveger: I thank you very much, I think that's definitely something the Planning Board should keep in mind when this site plan does come in and when we talk about it. My second

question is just. One, I need my memory refreshed and Mr. McGroarty can do this. In the original plan, what was this site zoned?

Mr. McGroarty: It was zoned and remains zoned, actually, the FTZ-4, so it was going to be as, Barbara, you would remember, this was an office campus essentially.

Barbara: Okay. That's what I thought.

Mr. McGroarty: Yes.

Barbara: It was not housing.

Mr. McGroarty: No, no, no. The housing... it was never housing. That was only introduced, as I said, in the 2015 Master Plan Amendment. It was to address, in part done to address the affordable housing obligation.

Ms. Melveger: Okay, thank you very much. I appreciate it. Thank you all.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, thanks, Barbara. Let's bring up Webbs.

Mr. Weiber: Good evening, everyone. My name is Scott Weiber. I live at 526 Drakestown Road in Flanders and the question I have for Mr. Grisewood is based on the projected number of units for this project, how will this impact the existing school infrastructure?

Mr. Weiss: I'm going to pull that question. We haven't had any kind of testimony from the school, certainly Mr. Grisewood is not the person to speak to. The Board of Education has been brought up on this. We haven't had testimony tonight. There will be testimony as far as the impact on the schools. I don't think now is an appropriate time to bring it up but we will certainly hear from the Board of Ed when the time is right.

Mr. McGroarty: And, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Phillips is the next witness, their planner. He can address at least some of those questions, as he's already done in his community and fiscal impact reports.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. It looks like we have a hand raise from Laura.

Ms. Davis: Hi, good evening. Can you hear me?

Mr. Weiss: I can.

Laura Davis: Thanks so much for taking my questions. So as a community member, my address is 9 Glenside Drive in Budd Lake.

Mr. Buzak: Madam, you need to state your name and address.

Ms. Davis: Laura Davis, 9 Glenside Drive, Budd Lake.

Mr. Buzak: Thank you.

Ms. Davis: So having family members in Stanhope Community and Stanhope Union Cemetery, I'd like to know what are the plans to keep that cemetery apart from this very large new community?

Mr. Weiss: I think let me jump in on that. Like I mentioned earlier, this is not a site plan. This is a General Development Plan. We will see specifics and at that time, if you're not satisfied with some kind of delineation to the cemetery, it'll be a great time for you to bring it as an omission to the Planning Board, but like I said earlier, we're not looking at site plans. We're not looking at a development plan. I'm sorry, we're not looking at a subdivision at this point. I don't know if it's fair to answer that question or to address it at this time.

Ms. Davis: Okay. All right. Those lines just look super close.

Mr. Weiss: We'll make sure that it's addressed and delineated and of course, at that point that it's not it will be a more appropriate time to speak to the engineers who will have designed such.

Ms. Davis: Okay, great. Thanks so much.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. You're welcome. I see, it looks like Shelly Morningstar, you're back. I see your hand raised again.

Mr. McGroarty: Is it Shelly or Lucy?

Ms. Morningstar: It is Shelly. She has hijacked my Zoom, I apologize. Shelly Morningstar, 70, Oakwood, Flanders, New Jersey. Thank you so much for taking my question, my second question. I actually have two questions. The first, Howie, is could you please clarify at the top of the Planning Board Meeting, you said that 1,200 affordable housing units was the commitment from the township that was negotiated because the township has done such a great job of putting forth a plan, a Master Plan to meet, and I was confused and I think others might be as well. Does that mean that 1,200 is the reduction or is 600 housing units the reduction? And the second question is, Mr. Grisewood, thank you for your oversight of this initial site plan. Who is the second developer that you keep referring to under the Rockefeller Group FT Ventures, LLC?

Mr. Selvaggi: Ms. Morningstar, as with respect to the developers, right now those negotiations are confidential. A lot of it will...

Ms. Morningstar: It has been mentioned four times on this hearing that there is a second developer, so...

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes, no and at the appropriate time and depending on...you know...how this process goes, those entities, those other entities, you know...

Ms. Morningstar: And we are not at liberty to know those entities now when it's been referred to four times?

Mr. Selvaggi: Ultimately, it really doesn't matter, I mean, what we're doing here is we're approving the conceptual development for this tract. Who builds it, once the plan is approved...

Ms. Morningstar: It may not matter to you, but it may matter to those of us in the public listening.

Mr. Selvaggi: It does, it really...standpoint...

Mr. Weiss: Michael...Mr. Selvaggi. Let me answer this I said it earlier. Just because we don't like the answer doesn't mean we're going to continue a conversation. Mr. Selvaggi said that at this point, the developers is not part of the general development plan. We have to respect that. I don't have to like the answer. But his answer was he's not, they're not ready to deliver it because of some confidential negotiations and that's the answer.

Ms. Morningstar: All I did was ask the question, Howie, and as a resident and a taxpayer in this township, I have the right to.

Mr. Weiss: Shelly, I understand. You don't have to like it.

Ms. Morningstar: Thank you for answering it, Michael, and the first question. Would you go back to clarify the affordable housing commitment and the reduction? How proud we are in Mount Olive...I'm not sure why we're proud, but how proud we are to reduce our affordable housing commitment?

Mr. Weiss: I am not sure. Chuck, you can, you're probably best suited to answer that, Chuck, but before I turn it over to you, I think when you hear the answer, you'll see why our diligence to address this issue is resulting in a 50 percent decrease. It was not a number that we wanted. It was a number that we were told to do. Chuck, why don't you fill in the details of that?

Mr. McGroarty: Only very briefly, because Mr. Phillips who will follow, will talk about affordable housing in detail and I'll mention that the affordable, the town's housing element and fair share plan is on our website. So if you go to the town's website, so you go to the township and you go to the Planning Department, you'll see the housing element fair share plan there. You'll see the settlement agreement there and all the related documents there. In short, and there is, as the attorney is here Mr. Buzak, Mr. Selvaggi know from all of their work in their career with this, there's no short way to answer this question but the fact is that at a certain point the Council on Affordable Housing, which was a state entity involved in this, was no longer the controlling entity and what happened then was municipalities were being sued and many municipalities, Mount Olive being one, went to settlement agreements to work out a number that they felt they could work with as opposed to facing ongoing litigation. So in the case of Mount Olive, we had a very high number. It was an established process between the municipalities and the organization known as the Share Housing Center that was leading the effort to challenge municipalities. We negotiated a number down to something we thought we could work with. We actually have a third round obligation of 650 units or something of that order. It's in the housing plan. And then we add to that the other obligations that we have, which is our prior round and we have numbers. And I realize a lot of this stuff is, you know, a lot of jargon to folks but suffice it to say, we had a very high number. We took advantage of the opportunity to negotiate with the Fair Share Housing Center, came out with a different number,

a lower number, and then the court, a superior court, approved the settlement and obviously the township of Mount Olive, the governing body approved, then the mayor approved the settlement. And we have a plan now that we can...that Mount Olive can work with to address its affordable housing obligation. So we have the project going down in Flanders, which is known as Regency. We have the one on Route 46, Ryan Homes, which is under construction. And if this goes forward, this will be another one. Woodfield, of course, is already in place. So these are what are known as inclusionary projects...

Ms. Morningstar: Thank you Chuck for the detailed description on the question I had with regard to the commitment currently as mandated by the state and the great work of Andrew and our other administrators to pursue this through the court system. I remember clearly reading about that, but I wanted to make sure there was a clarification about it. Secondly, the affect and the laughing and the phone call, text messaging going on by the Planning Board Members, some of you is a real distraction to those of us who are very concerned about smart growth development for this township and as taxpayers, we have a right to expect and demand your full attention. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Dane, I don't see any other hands raised.

Mr. Westdyk: No, unless you want to scroll through some of the questions that were typed...inaudible...and I think you pretty much got them all.

Mr. Weiss: No, I think I'll take the advice of council. I see no other hands raised. So what we'll do is we'll close it to the public and let's at 9:25, Mike, you want to bring up your planner.

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Let's do that.

Mr. Selvaggi: If we can, Dane, if we can have Paul Phillips brought in as a panelist.

Mr. Westdyk: Okay, Paul you may be dropped and then you'll come back right on...inaudible... probably...inaudible... for you now.

Mr. Phillips: Got it

Mr. Selvaggi: Hi, Paul.

Mr. Phillips: Hi, Michael.

Mr. Selvaggi: I know you're very familiar to this board and this community, but nonetheless, for the record, we can get you... Well, actually, I should first ask Mr. Buzak to put you under oath.

Mr. Buzak: Mr. Phillips please raise your right hand where I can see it. Thank you. You swear that any testimony you will give tonight will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Phillips: I do

Mr. Buzak: Can you please state your name and business address for the record, spelling your last name?

Mr. Phillips: Yes, my name is Paul Phillips, P H I L L I P S. The business is Philipps Price. The address is 33-41 Newark Street, Hoboken, New Jersey.

Mr. Buzak: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Selvaggi: All right and Paul, as I was saying a moment ago, you are familiar to this Board, but nonetheless, your educational background, your experience and your professional licenses.

Mr. Phillips: So I am a principal in the firm of Phillips Price. I've been practicing for over 35 years in New Jersey. I am a licensed professional planner, a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. I do hold a master's degree in urban planning from Hunter College. I've been accepted as an expert before over 250 municipalities in the state, including this Board, on more than one occasion.

Mr. Selvaggi: Mr. Weiss, I would hope the Board would accept Mr. Phillips as an expert in the area of professional planning.

Mr. Weiss: Well, I certainly know of Mr. Phillips, and if Chuck has any questions for Mr. Phillips about his qualifications, and I'm sure that Chuck is shaking his head, no. If anybody from the planning board has any questions, otherwise, we'll certainly accept Paul as our expert planner for this evening's hearing.

Mr. Selvaggi: Thank you. Paul, your focus...well, you submitted two reports, one was a fiscal impact analysis and then the other one was a community facilities analysis, correct?

Mr. Phillips: That's correct.

Mr. Selvaggi: All right. And again, for the Board, the public, these analyses, both analyses were required as part of your ordinance. So, Paul, I'll let you decide which one of those you want to tackle first and then go on to the next

Mr. Phillips: Sure. So I think Ken showed an exhibit which outlines the locations of the existing community facilities. We submitted a community facilities report as part of the GDP submission. Essentially, it was an inventory of all municipal services, which would include police, fire, EMS, the library, recreation, the school districts, everything that would potentially serve the residents of this particular project and in that report, we essentially highlighted the conditions and current capacities of each of these municipal services and/or departments. It's largely informational. I do not intend to go through the particulars unless there are specific questions, I'd be happy to answer them. Other than perhaps schools. I do want to mention I do want to spend a little bit of time discussing the issue of schools, but I plan to do that after I summarize the highlights of the fiscal report, which again was submitted as a separate report as part of the GDP and the requirement

was to basically describe the anticipated demand on municipal services and the school district that would be generated by the planned unit residential development and that would also include a projection of property tax revenues, which would accrue to the municipality and the school district specifically. We also allocated the county portion, but I'm sure the municipality is sort of less interested in that as opposed to the municipality and the school district. And so just to briefly highlight and again, I'd be happy to answer any particular questions on the fiscal in terms of methodologies. We followed standardized methodologies in terms of basically the projections with regard to resident population, school age population. We basically estimated the revenues to be generated based on the anticipated rentals and prices for the project working with our client, the applicant, and basically we reconciled. We looked at existing municipal service costs on a per capita basis, which we use to estimate the service cost to the residents and we also looked at existing average school spending per student and applied that to the projected number of school children to basically get these school costs. In essence, we reconciled estimated revenues and costs to come up with fiscal impact. So just to highlight, we're estimating that at full build out, this will be roughly a 227 million dollar ratable to the township that would increase the total municipal ratable base by more than seven percent. We're projecting the development again at full buildout will generate over 1,800 new residents and over 250 school children, that's public school children, at full build out. We have estimated that the township will receive and this is the municipal portion of the tax rate of about 1.6 million in annual tax revenues. And it will have to extend about 1.1 million annually to support the new residents, as I described, which results in an annual net surplus of roughly close to 550 million dollars. The school district, again based on their share of the current tax rate will receive about 5.5 million dollars annually at build out, and they'll expend about 3.9 million to support the new public school students on an annual basis that produces about 1.6 million dollars annual surplus. The other thing that we did to compare apples to apples based on a suggestion both by Chuck and I think also the tax assessor, we looked at the existing revenues that are generated by the parcels that make up this tract because they do generate tax revenue right now and we backed out those revenues to basically get a net figure. And those figures that I just provided to basically translate into a net fiscal surplus of over 440,000 to the municipality and about 1.2 million to the school district. So that basically summarizes the study. Again, I'd be happy to answer particular questions, but I do want to spend one minute because I think it's important to talk a little bit more about the school impacts, and that this is really informational, but as some of you may recall at the time, this area is being considered for rezoning several years back, we had prepared a comprehensive analysis of probable school impacts at that time, and we found that the development would not adversely impact the school district as there was capacity to accommodate additional enrollment. Now, that study was done probably three or more years ago, but at that time there was generally declining or stable enrollment based upon whether you were dealing with the elementary schools or the high schools. We looked at enrollment trends. We looked at the enrollment projections that the schools were done. We had many conversations with the business administrator of the school district and basically that report was prepared at the time the zoning was under consideration. What I will also say is that the school district has done a number of subsequent studies in the past several years, which pretty much have verified the trends of stable enrollment and available capacity, even taking into account new developments and I just want to point out that in their annual report for the fiscal year ending in 2018, that report had a statement that said there was adequate capacity within the district to meet the general classroom enrollment projections, both now and in the future, with taking into account several new housing developments, including the projected development at ITC East. Now, ITC East is this project. Now in full disclosure what I will say is at the time that report was done, this project was being planned for only 502 units and right now we're at 686 units. So the

multifamily section at Crossroads is completely new. That's 166 six units and there were some additional, the 18 additional units on Canal and Ridge, however, and this is detailed in the fiscal impact analysis. These are largely multifamily rentals which generate less school children than the other prototypes that are part of this development, meeting the single family and the townhouses and if you couple that with the trend of declining birth rates, which is expected to persist into the near future, I think the addition of these rental units is not likely to sort of tip the functional capacity of the school district facilities. And lastly, I would just say that the development, as I stated, is also going to generate new tax revenue to the school district based on the current tax rates that would offset any increase in district expenditures due to the addition of students and net, again net, that surplus was estimated about 1.2 million annually. So I think that gives you a clear picture of the fiscal impact study and gives you some indication of the school's impact as part of the study we did some time ago, as well as the recent studies that were done by the school district. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, well, thank you, Ken. Chuck, did you want to jump in at all with anything?

Mr. McGroarty: The only thing I would say is and by the way, Mr. Paul Phillips had revised both reports through March 2020, which we now have, and I don't have any other questions on those reports. I will say that we've...also the school district in their demographic study released, dated December 2019 said essentially what Paul just said, I think he was referring to perhaps just the end of the year report but in that report, the Board of Ed just wanted or rather the professional preparing that report just advised the Board of Education to monitor this project just to see how it would impact going forward but it was aware of this project. And we've reached out to the Board of Education. And I know Mr. Phillips is part of them as he's already said, we can provide additional information to them. I give the Board of Education a report each year on the development applications and the status which I'm in the process of doing right now. So there is the point being to underscore what Mr. Phillips just said, The Board of Education is being kept apprised as to what's going on with the development in the township and particularly this project.

Mr. Weiss: Does anybody have any questions from the Planning Board for Paul? Mr. Buzak?

Mr. Buzak: Again, Mr. Chairman, I'll defer to any Board Member.

Mr. Weiss: You know, I don't see any from the Planning Board. I know Paul basically reviewed this community facilities analysis report pretty straightforward, I do thank, Paul, also for the information of the school. So Ed go ahead, ask the question.

Mr. Buzak: Thank you, Paul. Just to clarify that your testimony was the school report that you referred to in 2018, you said in full disclosure that was based upon a project. Was it 502? I didn't get the number.

Mr. Phillips: You've got it. 502.

Mr. Buzak: Okay, and the second thing, I did not get a chance to see your more recent report, so I apologize if this has been addressed in there, but I guess that's my question. I had seen a comment in Mr. McGroarty's report regarding the physical analysis that it was either the I think it

was the business administrator who pointed out that the equalization rate is dropping in the municipality and that the percentages would be dropping and he was concerned about the analysis that you did, that you had to take that into account given when this project is ultimately going to come into play. So I didn't know whether you addressed that in or whether these figures deal with that.

Mr. Phillips: Let me address that. So there were a number of issues that were raised both by Chuck and the business administrator, which were...

Mr. McGroarty: Actually, it was that tax assessor in this case.

Mr. Phillips: The tax assessor, I'm sorry. You're correct, Chuck. And in our latest submission, we addressed all of...inaudible...for example, we had to update the tax break down and the equalization ratio as of the time we originally prepared it, we made that change. There was, I think, another change that Chuck had suggested that we make. The one change that we did not make, and I'm going to explain why, was the one you just raised and the reason we didn't do it is because it would go against the accepted methodology in doing fiscal impact statements and it would be sort of comparing apples to oranges. When you do a fiscal impact statement, you do it as a snapshot in time. And when you do that, everything on both the revenue side and the expense side is in present dollars as of the day or timing when you do the report. So we did it correctly based on, again, the accepted methodology because all our revenues were as of today, we're not projecting revenues two years into the future. They may go up, they may go down depending upon whether conditions change. So it would be highly speculative and inappropriate to attempt to use or basically project that change in the equalization ratio two or three years down the line without changing everything else. So the short answer is we didn't do it because it's not accepted fiscal impact methodology. All the other changes suggested both by Chuck and the tax assessor were made.

Mr. Buzak: Thank you, Mr. Phillips. I have nothing further. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, Brian, you have a question?

Mr. Schaechter: Mr. Phillips, just a couple of things. You know, I'm going to debate back and forth because with over 600 units going in, you're only figuring out, only figuring in 250 new students. We had a 55 and older community with a median or lower income housing or affordable housing section to it that has just been completed with three buildings. I think we figured on 50 kids or 60 kids just in that development. Now, our school district can handle from my most recent conversations with the superintendent can handle 500 or 600 kids and blended across all grades. So I do think you're a little light on under 250 new kids, new children in the area. The other thing that the school district runs off of is a two percent budget cap. So when you say that it's going to be a 550,000 dollar budget surplus going to the schools, that's not how our schools operate. Our schools operate not on tax, not on the tax base, but on their own budget. So maybe the town will see a surplus, but certainly the schools will not. And that...you know...I don't see a tax reduction going in because you're adding kids to the district. So just a couple of quick comments on that.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Brian. I know, Joe, you had a question.

Mr. Ouimet: All along Brian's line there, you know, the affordable housing, because our school system is one of the best in Morris County, I'm assuming that the affordable housing will have many families moving here or trying to move here to take advantage of the low cost and if you look at all the numbers here, these are all large homes, are we to assume that 60 percent of these are going to be occupied by husband, wife, two people, no children? That's kind of a... it seems farfetched.

Mr. Phillips: So, let me try and differentiate between the market rate units and the affordable units. So in doing both the resident and the school age populations, we basically looked at the best available standard sources, which is what's known as The PUMASurvey for the census, which basically gives multipliers by product type, right? So we used those for the various product types. Now, while I will acknowledge and you can see that if you sift through the tables, the affordable units generate more schoolchildren on a per unit basis. That's very clear. That's consistent with trends and what we did to basically deal with the affordable units is we used the second source, which was the Rutgers study, I think from 2018, because we did not want to basically underestimate the number of public school age children that would be generated from the affordable units. So you're correct, they will generate more affordables but that rate and that generation should be reflected in the tables relative to the market rate units.

Mr. Weiss: Okay. Joe, does that help with the answer?

Mr. Ouimet: Yes, it does.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, well, I suppose we might want to reconsider Paul, I don't know if you're going to reconsider. To me, I kind of agree with Brian's assessment. It's important that we have those numbers pretty clean and accurate, even based on your number, compared to what Brian just reported, that the superintendent has said that there's room for, what, 500 or so much students, Brian?

Mr. Schaechter: Yes, 500 to 600.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so it'd just be nice if we can clean it up a little bit. Chuck, did you have anything you wanted to add to that?

Mr. McGroarty: No, no, I don't.

Mr. Weiss: All right. Does anybody...and Paul, were you finished with your testimony?

Mr. Phillips: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Weiss: Does anybody else from the Planning Board have any questions for Paul before I turn it over to the audience, to the public? Here's what I'm going to do. I've completely lost track of the 60 some odd questions unanswered. I'm not even going to start to look at them. We're going to go back and see who's got a hand up with or without the fact that you have asked a question in writing, I'm not going to acknowledge those in writing, will give you plenty of time to raise your hand and we'll do it like we did before. So as I look at the list, I do see that Tim Halbur has his hand up and so we'll bring him in. It looks like you're unmuted, ready to go, Mr. Halbur?

Mr. Halbur: Yes. This is Tim Halbur, 34 Saunders Lane. A question for the planner. In looking at the Rutgers study, you used Table I13 to calculate the market rate. I am questioning why you used table I13 instead of table I4, which would have given you more information, I believe, more relative to the calculated value of the homes and as well, I would be interested in on your table 5 of your generated document if you could tell me where you got the PSC numbers for the market rate values. You did not get them from Rutgers, I know that because they're not in the Rutgers study. Therefore, you must have calculated from the PUMA.

Mr. Phillips: That's correct. That, you're correct.

Mr. Halbur: And so you believe the PUMA numbers, for example, the four bedroom single family will generate 0.379 students per four bedroom family, whereas a three bedroom multifamily is a 1.087, which implies to me that based on what we were describing earlier, your multifamily, low income and affordable housing would have higher numbers, but you're calculating a three times value of what the market value would bring?

Mr. Phillips: I just want to make sure that when you say value, are you talking about the value of the unit?

Mr. Halbur: No, the number of students? So basically...

Mr. Phillips: And again, I have to go through...you are rattling off the numbers. I'm trying to follow you on the table but again, all else being equal, it's clear and I think it's clear from the multipliers that the affordables are generating a much greater per schoolchildren multiplier relative to the market rate units and that's why we did not use the PUMA data for the affordable units, because it would have underrepresented.

Mr. Halbur: I guess I'm questioning why you couldn't use the Rutgers numbers for the market rate as well, Table I4?

Mr. Phillips: Because...and we do a lot of these and what we're finding is to get a better sense of sort of the local demographics and local conditions that the PUMA data is better than the generic, either statewide or regional data from Rutgers and you can see in the footnote which counties are included in the PUMS. We just feel based on our experience, that it gives a better flavor for local conditions.

Mr. Halbur: Would it also be true when I say that the number for single family detached four bedroom out of Rutgers is almost three times that of the PUMS' number, that it would be more beneficial?

Mr. Phillips: I don't know that. I can't answer that without you looking at the Rutgers, and I don't have that in front of me.

Mr. Halbur: Okay, well, let me state that the Rutgers' number is 0.848 whereas your PUMS number is 0.379. It seems a rather significant, which maybe would lend itself to Brian's feeling that you may be undercounting.

Mr. Phillips: Well, again, all I can answer is that it's my experience that I would use the local data and conditions over the statewide or regional data that Rutgers produces, and that's why I did what I did there are some cases where the multipliers may be greater relative to Rutgers than maybe other places where they're lesser. And again I did not do that analysis. I don't know if you did it beyond the example that you articulate. But again, I used the data, which I think is the best data out there.

Mr. Halbur: And that's what I was simply looking forward, is to get your feedback as to how you came up with that. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you.

Mr. Phillips: Understood.

Mr. Weiss: All right. So we have a question from John Cavanaugh.

Mr. Cavanaugh: Hi, I'm John Cavanaugh, 15, Kevin Drive. Paul, thanks for that clarification. I'm looking at table 5 as well. And while I appreciate the methodology, have you had a chance to really speak with the Board of Ed? And I think Brian said it correctly, you have and one of our most valued treasurers in town is our education system and walking around my neighborhood, just counting the number of young families moving into my neighborhood, these numbers are not close to what we're really seeing in Mount Olive. So I don't know if it's appropriate, I appreciate the methodology that you used, but much like when we do traffic counts for new developments as well. I'm wondering if there's an alternative way we can refine the number. I just think it's going to be low. To be frank, factually low. Given what we do in our township and the value that our education attracts with incoming residents, but I appreciate if you could clarify any other thoughts around an alternative calculation that would be different...

Mr. Phillips: So, yes, I don't know what the school district has done in terms of trying to come up with a multiplier at all for various housing types. They clearly do enrollment projections, which they have done as I described. We did meet and spend quite a bit of time with the school district back when we did the original report three to four years ago when the zoning was under consideration for this property and we did monitor the reports that had been done in 2018 and 2019 that both Chuck and I cited. But they basically have indicated that there is capacity in the school system and so I don't know what else to say... I don't know what the school district has that would help me in terms of taking another look at the projections, I just don't know what they might have and if you can enlighten me, I'm happy to entertain that.

Mr. Cavanaugh: Well I can't. But I appreciate your directness. And, Mr. Chairman, I would request that the Board consider asking the Board of Ed, in writing, to respond to the analysis that we've been given and if they concur, they concur, but if they don't, perhaps there's some alternatives that the board could try to present... the Board of Ed could present to your Board.

Mr. Weiss: Joe, that's not a bad suggestion. I would turn it over to Mr. Schaechter. Brian, I don't know if anybody on the board office is qualified to come up with this answer, but it certainly wouldn't cost to ask if they are in agreement with Paul's data.

Mr. Schaechter: I'll ask the superintendent tomorrow for conversation, but I mean, no one's debating the capacity of what our district is today. I mean, we do have a capacity of 500 to 600 students blended across all grades. I think the issue is the calculation of the 250 coming off these units. I mean, they could send it out to the person who did their study and get comment but that's up to the Board of Ed to do that.

Mr. Selvaggi: I mean, I appreciate the exercise, but you have more than enough capacity even if we look at the bigger numbers, I don't know what it does.

Mr. Cavanaugh: Well, the other question I have to ask is, what about the cost of bussing? I mean, this is kind of an isolated location. So maybe the Board of Ed could comment on what additional effort it would take the bus children from this location to whatever the appropriate school is, grammar school, middle school or high school.

Mr. Weiss: Interesting point, John, I'm not really sure how involved the Board of Ed is going to get when it comes to their cost. It could be a conversation. I don't think, on any application I've ever sat on the Board of Ed has given us a breakdown of their cost per student to include things like bussing. I understand your concern to do so, but I'm not sure if we've ever addressed that, so.

Mr. Schaechter: I personally don't know that the board will have the answer to that because, you know, they could redistrict, there are a lots of things that can happen in the future with the Board. So, you know, I don't know that they have a cost per student per mile to bus them.

Mr. Weiss: We could look into it for whatever that reason is. All right, John anything else?

Mr. Cavanaugh: Well, I mean, I think you're on the right path, guys. I'm not arguing with you. But if you want to make this, you know, financially accurate, I think these costs do have to be figured out.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, well, duly noted. I think that's the best answer with all due respect.

Mr. Cavanaugh: Thank you

Mr. Weiss: Okay, I see a hand raised from Mary Thielee. Mary, when you're unmuted, if you would state your address for the record.

Ms. Thielee: Mary Thielee, 24 Spring Street, Budd Lake.

Mr. Weiss: Welcome, Mary.

Ms. Thiele: Okay, so I had submitted a bunch of questions on the Q&A because I thought that's how it was going to go, so I assume that that will come back to me at some point, but specific to the issues around the schools, I understand that the analysis was being done on tuition

costs. Is that regular ed tuition costs or special ed tuition costs? Because they're very different things.

Mr. Phillips: So the...on an aggregate basis, we looked at the school spending per student generically in the aggregate and applied that figure to the total school population.

Ms. Thiele: So, yes, so you really are not going to be able to see the cost per student unless you know their needs certainly, and...

Mr. Phillips: Well, for purposes of a fiscal impact as part of a GDP for permitted use, and I say this respectfully, you really don't get into the level of the weeds of trying to...you really just want to get a snapshot of whether or not a project is going to be net fiscal positive or net fiscal negative both to the municipality and the school district and in terms of getting down to the relative spending for special needs students as opposed to the general student population, this is typically not done as part of the fiscal, as part of the GDP submission. I'm not saying it's not a relevant issue, but it's just something that we don't do.

Ms. Thiele: And does the forecast that you're...does it include the development on Route 46 that's still being built? And the students that are going to come out of those new?

Mr. Weiss: It does look like Mr. Schaechter is saying yes to that and...

Mr. Schaechter: I was actually on the Board of Ed through the end of 2019 and, yes, the projections on the study that the Board of Ed did included that development as well.

Ms. Thiele: So with that development, there's still 500 additional students can be added?

Mr. Schaechter: As a part of my conversation with the superintendent today, we can add, we can add with no issue in between 500 and 600 students. The kindergarten enrollment is way down this year from what...I mean, that's...there are things that happen on a much larger scale, so they did take into consideration all of that. So...

Ms. Thiele: So now with my questions that I sent up on the Q&A, will those be answered separately? Because I thought you said that you wanted it done in the beginning.

Mr. Weiss: No, no. Let me answer that question for you, Mary. That answer is pretty simply no. The Planning Board is run a lot different than any other kind of social board. Any question that's asked is going to be as publicly while everyone's here. There's not going to be an opportunity for anyone to answer those questions. So while you have the floor, if you had other questions, certainly feel free to ask them.

Ms. Thiele: So, if the lot is under 24 acres, how do you get 686 units in the as of right development. How many dwelling units are allowed versus what's proposed?

Mr. McGroarty: Well, let me jump in for a second. I mean, their experts can certainly address this, but that's why I said early on there is a difference between when we throw these terms around between the gross and the net density, the overall density for the 124 acres...what is it? The zoning

allows for the three separate tracks or whatever number of tracks. And that's why we had an issue early on to make sure this was going to be essentially one development. It will be developed separately, perhaps, but it will function as one development in terms of access to open space, as you heard from the witnesses earlier. So the density is based on six units based on the total acreage on 124 acres and within that, they abide by that, in fact, they're just slightly under that. When they concentrate the development on, let's say, the Crossroads side or the Canal site, there may be more units on that 13 acres or 20 acres, whatever it may be, that particular site, that particular tract of land would have a higher net density. But overall, it'll still meet the total six units per acre density. So that's how I don't know if that makes any sense, but that's how it works. So when you put all three tracts together at 124 acres, you spread out or you divide it up, you get six units per acre, in this case, slightly less. If you were focusing in on one particular tract of the three, it will be higher.

Ms. Thiele: Okay, so what's the percentage of the open space requirement, was it 50?

Mr. McGroarty: The ordinance requires 40.

Ms. Thiele: So my concern too is the space. If I understand where this is going, it's going to be kind of jetting out to 46 under Route 80 on Love Lane, right? Is that really open space that's going to be usable and safe?

Mr. McGroarty: That's a good question. That's why I asked early on about that southern tail, as I think was referred to what the conditions are there, the rest of it is the pockets of parks in the other places that's what we advocated for and plans were changed to show that. But that southerly portion of The Ridge in the old site is a large component of the open space and that's why we asked earlier, I made the point earlier that we'd like to get that type of geo-tech analysis now rather than wait for site plan approval to see what that land can be used for.

Ms. Thiele: So if it's not usable, does it need to be made up elsewhere?

Mr. Selvaggi: If I may, so this doesn't perpetuate. During the break, I was informed that a geotechnical study has been done which shows that that property, that southern piece, cannot be developed for structures. You can't put a...you know...a house or anything on it. However, it's certainly available for recreation, whether it's a passive form or...you know...put grass fields or something and we can provide the information. But that's the extent of what you could do there...inaudible...our geotechnical study would show.

Mr. McGroarty: Well, Mr. Chairman, then that's what we're asking for. So we should get that study, certainly. So Mike Vreeland and his office can review it. But to the question, is it usable open space? It sounds like it will be.

Ms. Thiele: But is it safe?

Mr. Selvaggi: It will have to be made safe. I don't think it's unsafe to a point where it's dangerous but to any extent that, you know, we may need to, you know, stabilize the soil or something like that, we would do that in order to make sure that it's a safe open space area.

Ms. Thiele: I wasn't thinking soil. I was thinking traffic and cars and, you know, it's under the highway. It's on no Route 46.

Mr. McGroarty: No, no. It's not under the highway. It ends at the highway. When we get to the site plan stage, we'll get into that detail. It's a very valid concern. It actually doesn't go as far out as the highway. So, but we'll...we can deal with that at the time of the site plan reveal.

Mr. Weiss: Ok, thanks Chuck.

Ms. Thiele: Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, I don't see anybody else from the public having any questions for Paul. I know we had...I'm going to close it to the public. We have a couple of reports from Chuck and a report from Mike Vreeland. Is there anything you wanted to stress in your report or reports, Chuck?

Mr. McGroarty: I do, but you know, given it's after 10 o'clock, I'd like to spend not tonight, but I just actually got the reports from, I know Paul's reports were dated March, but we just got them today or yesterday, I don't know. The affordable housing, they provided us a lot more information as we requested. I just haven't had the opportunity since we just got that information to really review it. So I'd like a little more time but they certainly have been responsive in providing us information, just it will take a little more time to review it, at least I will...

Mr. Weiss: Mike, same with you? I've got to imagine you have some things you want to review on your report. We are obviously going to carry...

Mr. Vreeland: I will. There are a couple issues that I think we need some more information on.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so it sounds like it might be a good time to end the meeting. We probably need a little bit more time and another hearing on this, correct, Chuck?

Mr. McGroarty: I would think so, yes.

Mr. Weiss: So let's look to carry this meeting. Mary, look forward at the schedule. I think we're booked through August, maybe first Thursday, the second Thursday in September. How does that look?

Ms. Strain: We have Hunkele on September 10th. We have nothing on September 17th.

Mr. McGroarty: I'm not sure that...I wouldn't place a bet on that being frankly, given the Highlands issue that they face that it is going to...keep it on but I wouldn't dedicate the entire night to it...

Mr. Weiss: Chuck, and you are talking about September 10th, right Chuck?

Mr. McGroarty: Is that it, Mary?

Ms. Strain: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so...

Mr. McGroarty: Yes.

Mr. Weiss: So, Mr. Selvaggi, do you have availability on either of those dates.

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes. The September 10th or the 17th, I mean I think we would prefer the 10th and candidly, you know, it would be our intention to try to get the information to your professionals and hopefully not spend a three hour session and get it done and get this in a position where you guys feel comfortable voting in a lot less time. So I don't know what that other application is, but even if it was on, I don't think we're going to need to take the entirety of the evening.

Mr. McGroarty: But I would ask...you know...if like the comments that I had about the environmental impact statement and I don't know some of the other things, I'm not sure...

Mr. Selvaggi: Yes, we've got to coincide the, you know, environmental studies. So they're consistent.

Mr. McGroarty: You know what, Mr. Selvaggi, before we, and Mr. Chairman, whether we do it tonight or not, you've asked for two waivers and there are...some of the components of the general development plan...

Mr. Selvaggi: You are vacuuming your house over there, Chuck?

Mr. McGroarty: Not since 1983...I'm not vacuuming my house.

Mr. Buzak: You know, Chuck, this is all being recorded. So I just want you to remember that this is on the record.

Mr. McGroarty: Yeah, it was actually 1982. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: So, there's two waivers, Chuck.

Mr. McGroarty: There's two waivers, yeah. We might want to at least bring it to the board's attention tonight. Mr. Selvaggi had asked for a waiver of the timing schedule. Actually I think they finally, not finally, but I think they've since addressed that. The phasing plan has been provided. So, Mike, I don't know...

Mr. Selvaggi: I don't think that waiver is relevant any longer.

Mr. McGroarty: And then the last one was a written agreement between the developer and the township relating to this and you had ask that be waived until the time of approval and I don't know if the board's thought on that, but that to me, frankly, makes a lot of sense. I don't know why you would make that, not even sure why that condition is in there. It's in the Land Use Law and we

incorporated it as well, but I don't know if that's really essential at this time. But, Ed, that may be more something you should comment on.

Mr. Buzak: I think that it makes sense to make that a condition of any approval that the board would give for the reasons that you have given, Chuck, and I think Mr. Selvaggi has also advanced it. You can't do the agreement until you know what the general development plan is and that is the process we are going through now. And ultimately, when we're done, we will be able to make that clear and that will form in large part the basis for the agreement. So I think that that's an appropriate request for waiver and we should handle that as a condition if an approval is granted.

Mr. Weiss: No problem with that Mr. Selvaggi?

Mr. Selvaggi: No, no, I mean, I agree. I think it's... I think the municipal land use law intended it to be a condition of the approval, but it's presented almost as a condition of the, you know, being heard.

Mr. Weiss: Certainly an easy way to handle that. All right, Chuck, any other...there's no other waivers...those were the two. One of them no longer exists.

Mr. Selvaggi: One other thing before we move on. Mr. McGroarty had referenced it in his earlier remarks about Covid or whatever, I mean, to the extent that the Board or a subcommittee...does anybody want to go, I think it was the Crossroads section?

Mr. McGroarty: Yes, I think. Yes, I did mention the Crossroads section, I think it would be good if the Board doesn't do it as a committee or as a whole, which would be a public meeting, I guess, arrangement or whatever it might be, at least try and take a look at it, but I think it would be helpful...inaudible...the Crossroads...

Mr. Weiss: I will make a suggestion. We have a site...we have a Site Review Committee, don't we?

Mr. McGroarty: I don't know if it's still active or not.

Mr. Weiss: You know, I even have... I don't know where it is right this minute, but we'll address that, you know, this would not be out of the ordinary, Mr. Selvaggi. The Planning Board historically on larger tracts has actually gone out and walked it and we have noted it...we've noticed it, I mean, and we've had the public join us when they're interested. If it's something that we decide to do, we'll take care of that and we'll have the Planning Board come up with a date. We'll work with you on that and we will notice it or the other option is to have our committee, our site review committee go out and give us a report. I don't know if one is a good idea over another, but let's save that for a conversation.

Mr. Selvaggi: Okay, we have no objections. I just want to make sure it's done and done well in advance of the September 10th meeting date, so, you know, it doesn't cause another delay.

Mr. Weiss: I respect that, and we'll make sure that if we do, we'll do it well in advance.

Mr. Selvaggi: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Weiss: You're welcome. Okay, so let's then carry this meeting through September 10th, 7:00. No further notice. Ed?

Mr. Buzak: Yes, just to remind, I don't know if we need an extension of time through the end of September, I don't know where that stands, but if we don't have one, we should do that. So we don't have a problem.

Mr. McGroarty: Mary asked for that today, didn't you Mary? I think...

Mr. Weiss: Mary is muted.

Mr. McGroarty: Good point. I think we sent Mr. Selvaggi that request today, and I think his office is following up on that.

Mr. Weiss: Okay, so we'll have an extension through the end of August...through the end of September...September correct, September.

Mr. McGroarty: But do you want to do it on the record? Then, just do it now.

Mr. Selvaggi: We have no objection to an extension through September 30th. That's not a problem.

Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Mr. Selvaggi. Okay, so then for the record, this hearing will be carried and picked up again on September 10th, 7:00 pm. I'll work the agenda with Mary. Michael, We'll give you plenty of notice as to where it'll fit on the agenda. I do hear you, with the public interest, it might be wise to do it first so that we don't keep the public out all evening and we'll have that conversation on board, but for the public, the meeting is carried on through September 10th, 7:00 pm, no further notice will be made.

Mr. Buzak: But, Mr. Chairman, it will likely be a virtual meeting. And all of the information with regard to the manner in which you can access this meeting will be placed on the website at least ten days prior to the meeting, if it's not already there, Chuck or Dane...

Mr. Weiss: It's there.

Mr. McGroarty: It'll be there. It's there now, Dane, right?

Mr. Westdyk: Yeah, it'll be there. It's the same...It's just a recurring meeting. It's the same length. But I do post the current meeting with the latest agenda and any drawings and anything else that Chuck deems appropriate.

Mr. Buzak: Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: All right. Well, thank you, everybody. I know it's a late meeting for members of the public. We do appreciate your patience and input and keep in mind that there will be an

opportunity for comments at the end before we take a vote, we will hear from the public. I do request again that although there's a Q&A section we're not going to go to...we're not going to use it. Don't rely on that for a means to get a question out and if you want to post questions while the hearing is on, I don't know if anybody's going to pay attention to it and they don't say that with any kind of malice. It's just not the way we operate. Everything that we do has to be in public and on the record. So with that being said, we have no further business at hand this evening. If someone would make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Schaechter: I will make that motion, Mr. Weiss.


Mr. Weiss: Thank you, Mr. Schaechter. Who has got the second? Dan Nelsen, thank you very much. All in favor?

All In Favor: Aye.

Mr. Weiss: Any opposed? Being none... Good night, everybody.

Meeting adjourned at 10:16 pm.


Signature


Planning Board Meeting Date Approved.