

**PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF FANWOOD**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**August 26, 2020**

In accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, et seq., and due to the current State of Emergency and Public Health emergency declared by Governor Phil Murphy, pursuant to Executive Order No 103 and/or the “Operational Guidance – COVID-19: Guidance for Remote Public Meetings in New Jersey” dated March 23, 2020, and “Operational Guidance – COID-19: N.J.S.A 40:55D-1. Recommendation for Land Use Public Meetings in New Jersey” dated April 2, 2020 and in an effort to prevent further spread of COVID-19, the May 20, 2020 Planning Board Meetings will be held virtually via Zoom in lieu of an in-person meeting. This meeting is scheduled to commence at 7:30 PM. Members of the public can register to access this virtual meeting by clicking the link provided. Notice of this virtual teleconference meeting was posted at the Borough Municipal Building, posted on the Borough bulletin board designed for that purpose, mailed to the official newspapers as provided by Borough Ordinance, filed with the Municipal Clerk, and on the Borough Website at least 48 hours prior to this meeting given the time, date, location and log-in/call-in information for this virtual teleconference meeting as well as the Planning Board Secretary’s contact information to assist anyone lacking he resources or ability for technological access to this meeting.

The meeting begins at 7:32 PM

Present: Mayor Mahr, Anthony Carter, Kevin Boris, Matthew Juckes, Michael Lysicatos, Teresa Seefeldt, Dennis Sherry Adam Matty, Amy Hamill, Michele Moore, Jack Molenaar, Diane Dabulas, Ray Sullivan, Antonios Panagopoulos, Janke Patel,

Absent: William Lee, John Steigerwald,

There are no minutes to approve at this time.

**Old Business**

**Block 55, Lot 1, 1 South Avenue, Empire Builders**

This hearing will be carried to the next meeting on 9/23/20 with no further notice.

**New Business**

**Block 65, Lot 2 & 3, 274, 278-282 South, Landmark/The Soho at Fanwood**

Mr. Juckes: If the applicant’s lawyer can unmute and introduce yourselves. Before getting to the applicant I will read the commentary

DPW: Tree grates for shade tree should be maintained by the developer

Construction: At the time of review they had no architectural plans to review. Provide construction style proposed. Need square footage for bldg.

BOH: No objection

Historic Commission: no objections

PD: no objections

Construction #2: The minimum construction site of building is required for the purpose of R2 and S2 over parking garage.

Fire Official: *see below*

***FANWOOD FIRE***

# ***BUREAU FIRE PREVENTION***

75 North Martine Avenue Fanwood NJ 07023  
*Phone -908-322-5326 Email tscalera@fanwoodnj.org*

August 25, 2020

## **OFFICE OF THE FIRE OFFICIAL**

**Thomas Scalera**

### **Address 282 South Avenue**

In accordance with the International Fire Code, New Jersey Edition, the fire apparatus road leading to the proposed properties shall comply with

#### **Section 503 Fire Apparatus Access Roads;**

- **503.2.2 Surface.** Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all-weather driving capabilities.
- **503.2.4 Turning radius.** The required inside turning radius of a fire apparatus access road shall be a minimum of 25 feet and meet the Requirements of the Scotch Plans Ladder truck
- **503.2.2 Authority.** The *fire code official* shall have the authority to require or permit modifications to the required access widths where they are inadequate for fire or rescue operations or where necessary to meet the public safe objectives of the jurisdiction.
- **503.2.5 Dead ends.** Dead-end fire apparatus roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus.
- **503.4 Obstruction of fire apparatus access roads.** Fire apparatus access roads shall not be obstructed in any manner, including the parking of vehicles. The minimum widths and clearances established in Section 503.2.1 shall be maintained at all times.
- **Primary Electrical Wires on South Avenue & First Street have wires Relocated underground to allow for fire ladder truck operations.**

**Thomas Scalera Fire Official**

Rescue Squad: They're requesting final plans which including the dimensions as well as brand and make of elevator and finally to work with the Rescue Squad to make sure there is proper radio coverage in all levels of the building including lower level parking

Environmental: You can read most of this on your own but I will say

1. Soil erosion and sediment control features



**FANWOOD ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION**

75 Martine Avenue North  
Fanwood, New Jersey 07023  
Tel-(908) 322-8236 Fax-(908) 322-7178

August 20, 2020

TO: Chair, Planning Board  
Borough of Fanwood

FROM: **Environmental Commission**

SUBJECT: Block 65, Lots 2 and 3—Preliminary & Final Site Plan  
274 and 278-282 Second Street  
“Mixed Use Project”—Downtown Redevelopment

The Environmental Commission reviewed this project at its last regular meeting.

**COMMENTS**

1. **General Comments**—The proposed mixed-use development is slated for a site that contains existing structures and bituminous parking areas. The plans show a very intense re-development with a building that consumes nearly all of the subject properties. The project would require several variances, which because of the intensity of the development seem to be a self-imposed hardship.

All soil erosion and sediment control features need to be in place before any work—including demolition—begins.

2. **Refuse Area**—The plans show the location of the refuse and recycling area in a corner of the lowest level of the garage. The applicant needs to explain how the residents and

businesses would get their trash and recycling to this location. Also, is the space allotted for trash and recycling large enough for this size building? Presumably maintenance personnel would have to push relatively heavy containers up the parking ramp to some location for eventual pickup—where is the designated temporary storage area while waiting the refuse vehicles to show up? How many times per week would trash need to be picked up? For recyclables, would they be part of the municipal recycling (that is, by the Plainfield Municipal Utilities Authority) or a private hauler?

3. **Landscaping**—The intensity of the proposed development leaves little room for landscaping. There is a small interior courtyard that would have a “half wall” planter and several other planting boxes. Because of the height of the proposed building the amount of sunshine reaching this area would be limited. The applicant needs to provide testimony that the plants selected for this area can thrive with limited light. Details and dimensions of the proposed planters need to be provided.

There needs to be more variety in the proposed plantings. For example, in the concrete planter bed along the southeastern side of the building next to the fire lane only has one type of plant along its entire length—a variegated hosta. There should be a variety of flowering plants, groundcover, etc. Similarly, only one type of shrub—skyrocket juniper—is shown along the southeasterly property line and the adjacent residential dwelling. A specific blight or particular insect could destroy this entire minimalist buffer quickly. There should be several varieties of evergreen plantings in this area.

There is only one type of street tree being proposed—the columnar Sargent cherry. The type of tree and its proposed planting size needs to be reviewed and approved by the Shade Tree Commission.

In the southern corner of the project there appears to be a gazebo as an extra “amenity” for the residents. Are there any plantings proposed for this area? A detail of the proposed “amenity” needs to be provided.

The applicant should investigate if a “green roof” can be incorporated into this project.

All proposed plantings shall be of native, non-invasive type species. The applicant shall also agree to the maintenance and if necessary, the replacement of all landscaping for the life of the project.

4. **Bicycle Parking**—The “Requested Variances” table indicates that “60 spaces” are required for bikes while 34 are provided. While we are in favor of this alternative transportation, it seems to be rather excessive given the size of the project. The plans seem to show eight bicycle racks, which would probably hold 16 bicycles and should be adequate for this project.
5. **Electric Charging Stations**—With the growing increase in electric powered vehicles the applicant should provide at least several electric charging stations in the interior

parking garage. The charging stalls would need to be signed and marked. There is also to be a sign indicating to the user that once the vehicle is charged that it needs to be moved to another, non-charging parking space.

6. **Energy**—Has the applicant investigated the use of solar panels on the roof? If such panels are to be incorporated into the building the architectural plans should reflect this. If solar panels cannot be included into the project the applicant is to provide testimony as to why they cannot.

The applicant should provide testimony as to any other energy saving features such as triple-paned windows, extra insulation in the walls and roof, above and beyond the building code; water saving fixtures, and so forth that could be used here.

Exterior lights should be shielded to prevent light spillover onto adjacent properties, particularly the nearby residential dwellings.

7. **Stormwater Management**—By virtue of using grass pavers for the fire lane, the applicant has technically met the requirement for impervious cover and would slightly reduce the existing runoff volume from this site. However, because some sections of the Borough's stormwater system can be overwhelmed it is recommended that the applicant examine other ways that stormwater runoff could be reduced—increasing landscaping, green roof, underground detention, etc.

Thank you for the opportunity to review these plans. As the plans are revised, we would appreciate the chance to review the same. As always, if there are any questions or comments please contact us.

Sincerely,

*Fanwood Environmental Commission*

Mr. Jukes: Jack do you have a comment

Mr. Molenaar: We will be able to question our own fire official, I have lots of questions

Ms. Dabulas: We'll have to see at the end of the meeting if you still feel it is necessary, let's take one step at a time.

Mr. Jukes: Let's see, we're trying to end as close to 10:30 as possible but will determine that later. Lots of people on the screen, is it Mr. Schkolnick?

Mr. Schkolnick: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I don't see my clients on the call, Weinflash, Leshetz

Ms. Dabulas: Both are on without their video.

Mr. Schkolnick: I'm Richard Schkolnick, the client tonight is Landmark, the same group that developed the recently completed station square project. This is a project that we are confident will work with Fanwood's well documented growing downtown it's located just a block from the train station, I'll make the suggestion that this is a classic smart growth project, taking an older paved over and underutilized site and transforms it to a key contributor to a walkable community. It's a mixed-use project with commercial on the ground floor and residential above, which is substantially consistent with your zoning requirement. For the record I note it is the Commercial Corridor Central zone and also in the South Avenue Affordable Housing Overlay Zone, which requires an affordable housing component which this building meets. Chairman, I know you are aware that we made some very recent revisions, the purpose of those revisions was to address some concerns that were raised by the board's professionals concerning the exact calculation of height. We have confirmed with your professional staff, that the height deviation, which is about 4 feet, is a C variance so these revisions will lead to a drop in the unit count from 62 to 48

Ms. Dabulas: Mr. Schkolnick you mean 58?

Mr. Schkolnick: Yes, I'm sorry, 58 total units, we were able to add 4 parking spaces bringing the total count to 91 spaces. Out of the 58 there will be 49 market and 9 affordable to meet the boroughs affordable housing requirement. We have approximately \_\_\_ feet on the ground floor retail and for the record Mr. Chairman, the properties identified on the tax map Block 65, Lots 2& 3 have a couple of addresses as 274, 278-282 South Avenue. We're seeking site plan approval and lot consolidation. For a project of this scope we believe the variance relief is modest. There's no setback variance, there's no lot coverage, building or impervious coverage variance and no density coverage. We're going to start tonight with our civil engineer, David Sehnal from Dynamic and then our traffic engineer Joe Staigar, also from Dynamic. Chairman we thought at minimum we'd take a break at that point and take an accounting to see where we are, given that we have made some adjustments to the height of the building.

Ms. Dabulas: We lost that last part maybe we can get to testimony.

Mr. Schkolnick: OK we'll do that and I'll try to log on through my cellphone to see if we get a better connection. There are going to be subsequent plans that are submitted with some different elevations.

Mr. Jukes: then at that point we'll determine whether it makes sense to have questions from the board and public.

Mr. Schkolnick: If I can call Mr. Sehnal

Ms. Dabulas administers the oath to Mr. Sehnal, engineer from Dynamic Engineering

Mr. Jukes: Background on your qualification please

Mr. Sehnal: I am a graduate of NJIT where I received a bachelor of science in civil engineering, I have multiple years of experience in the preparation of various commercial, industrial and residential site plans and applications throughout the northeast. I am a licensed professional engineer in the state of NJ as well as several other states and my license remains in good standing. I have not been before this board in the past however I have testified before hundreds of boards before throughout the northeast.

Mr. Jukes: Can I get a motion to approve Mr. Sehnal as a civil engineer:

Mr. Sherry: So moved, seconded by Lysicatos. Unanimous voice vote. Motion approved

Mr. Sehnal: First I want to thank the members of the board for the opportunity of presenting this evening. I'll just go ahead and share my screen, want to make sure you can all see the aerial. It is identified as Sheet 2 of the site plan set dated 4-2-2020.

Mr. Sehnal identifies the location of the site indicating the propinquity of residential, commercial and train station. Access is provided from South Avenue, to First Street. There is no parking on South in front of the building. He describes the ingress and egress from 1st Street to the building parking lot. He describes the current use of the site as having a good deal of paving and being bordered by a retaining wall that needs work. He describes existing non-conformities related to the current site.

Mr. Sehnal presented a colorized version of the 8/14 updated site plan. Sheet 1 of 1. Exhibit A1. The building is in a U-shape with an open lots and amenity space as seen from above. This is a 4.5 story mixed use building. First floor will have 2 retail spaces. 2nd & 3rd floor will be apartment flats and the fourth floor will have duplexes. He describes 90 parking spaces on site. Access is from First Street. With access to apartments on South and through the parking lot. Proposing a 200-foot accessway for emergency access with the building set back 23 feet from the property line.

They will work with adjacent property owners to address the retaining wall issues. They will provide streetscaping.

Both driveways are 20 feet.

Mr. Sehnal switches to the emergency access showing turning radius for the Scotch Plains ladder truck dimensions. This demonstrates adequate space for the vehicle. They have met with Fire Officials' numerous times to address which resulted in the provision of this 20-foot access way. Other variances to be discussed for vehicle & bike parking and loading space deficiency, parking space size and gazebo on the ground floor setbacks.

Borough code requires 3 parking spaces for 1,000 sf retail, requiring 15 spaces for retail and 87 spaces for residential totaling 102 spaces, but they propose 91.

Garage Basement level exhibit A-2 dated 8-20-20 shows parking for residential only, totaling 57 spaces. There will be two-way circulation. And 2 handicapped spaces with access to elevator. Page 2 of the same exhibit shows ground floor parking. 8 additional residential spaces, another reserved for employees of retail and building itself. Each residential unit will have one assigned space. Employees and residents will have a fob to gain access to lower level and the gated residential parking on ground floor.

There are 17 additional parking spaces open to the public for retail use. 15 are required. 6 accessible parking stalls were proposed where 4 are required, so applicant will reconfigure to provide 91 spaces, including 4 handicapped.

60 bike parking spaces are required but 34 proposed. Not currently proposing a dedicated loading area, expecting light use retail like boutique, nothing that should require large tractor trailers. Only small UPS-sized deliveries anticipated to use the street parking between the driveways for this purpose.

Site is not proposing major stormwater changes and site is reducing impervious. But will work with neighboring property owners to enlarge the drainage pipe through a neighboring property. All utilities are available via First Street. Not proposing intense site lighting. Low lighting proposed on property line with dense low residential shrubs along property line. Street trees of South & First and will comport with Environmental Commission request to vary tree type. There will be an internal trash room with management required to wheel out trash bins each week for pickup.

It is determined that the questioning will proceed after the traffic engineer testifies.

Mr. Joseph Staigar from Dynamic engineering is sworn and accepted as an expert in traffic engineering who has testified before this board several times.

Mr. Staigar refers to the Traffic Impact Study provided to the board. Comparing existing vs. proposed conditions and evaluating the site plan to provide safety and efficiency in parking. Traffic counts at 1st & South and existing driveways. They made this study prior to the pandemic on 2/4/20. Hours studied were rush hours in AM and PM. Currently there is good access from 1st to South and a left from South to First. We know that DOT has anticipated growth rate of 1%/annually for traffic growth rate on South Avenue. They applied the known growth in place and anticipated that number. Applicant doubled it and then on top of that added the anticipated growth rate for the 211 units and WAWA that are approved down the road. Because the train station is the main draw for residents for this property, and the proximity of walkable retail it is determined you could survive without a vehicle and reside in this building. NJ Transit has studied the effort of residential near train stations as reducing the need for parking by 30%. Further, 2 adults in such a residence will not necessarily have 2 cars. Census data shows this to be the case in Fanwood.

Institute of Transportation Engineers suggests between 1 and 1.2 spaces is required for this type of project and there would be 19 trips during AM peak and 22 trips during PM peaks. Traffic counts as exists is 11 trips at 1m peak and 19 at PM peak. The difference is 8 additional trips in the AM and 2 in the PM.

The difference will be minimal. Applicant analyzed the intersections; showing had no degradation in levels of service and no significant impact on traffic conditions.

Looking at the parking plan, ground level, you see applicant is closing the South Avenue driveway with the only driveways being on First Street. First parking area you hit will be for retail customers and guests of the building residents. Green area will be used for retail employees and the blue space will be for residents along with the lower level. Again, access to green & blue parking areas will be limited by a key fob.

This leaves 65 spaces for residential, at most 58 will be designated. Applicant finds that some residents will not have cars. They rely on rentals and Ubers or the train. On the other hand, they expect a small handful of folks who have 2 cars, in that case there is a sufficiency to accommodate those people. Based on the ITE and the Census data, certainly 65 spaces for residential should be more than sufficient. However, this is a mixed use. There are 17 pink and 8 green spaces that will primarily used by merchant use but they will be available for residents in the evening as shared parking. They don't anticipate this but have the buffer.

The layout works, parking aisles are more than sufficient. Ingress and egress should face sufficient gaps in traffic to accommodate the level of service anticipated.

Mr. Schkolnick asks Mr. Staigar to comment on RSIS and a couple of relatively minor variances and the fire service questions from the borough.

Does this plan meet the terms of RSIS? Staigar responds that applying RSIS would require 120 spaces, but RSIS was established to address the worst-case scenario. It recognizes that what is good in rural NJ is not the same as what is good in suburban NJ. It has a clause that accepts alternative parking methods if the applicant can demonstrate effectiveness. Factors that affect minimum # is household type. These are small 1- & 2-bedroom apartments and rental units throughout NJ generate less traffic and less parking. Applicant doesn't know why this is, maybe when people own their own homes it's different. Most of the rentals are near mass transit, where you can almost roll out of bed and get on the train.

Urban vs. suburban location, Staigar is not calling this urban but it has some attributes of urban being mixed use and pedestrian connectivity. Available offsite parking, after 3 PM the train station allows for non-commuter parking. The proposed building meets all of these attributes when it comes to considering parking needs.

Mr. Schkolnick asks about 9 x 18 size parking. Mr. Staigar says 9 x 18 is RSIS standard that has been met. 9 x 18 is more than sufficient. Staigar doesn't know of a car except maybe a super extended pickup that may be greater than 18 feet long, but 99.5% of vehicles on the road today

will fit. These are small units, if you were in rural area, we might need pickup trips. Not here. But in any event, applicant meets RSIS standards.

Re the lack of a loading zone, Mr. Staigar says this is very typical, there will be no tractor trailers or box trucks, generally step vans or maybe a UPS truck. Buildings like these don't need a designated loading zone. Deliveries are anticipated to be from the street, just as with the local homes.

To address the bicycle parking, applicant is providing 34 bike spaces. Broken down between retail and residential, you might have some employees or residents with bikes, so they're not anticipating a great need. Applicant think 34 is a reasonable number.

As to fire bureau concerns Staigar is quite surprised that they want to park their truck next to a burning building in the collapse zone. However, there may be a certain instance where they feel it is necessary and we're certainly accommodating that. Mr. Sehnal has demonstrated how the largest equipment can make it onto the site. There is no doubt. The clear area is 20 feet meeting the international fire code requirement for fire access road and there's an additional 3 feet which should easily accommodate. 23 feet of clearance and 20 feet roadway which meets the national standards. Staigar's experience is that a FD does not want to put their truck in that position when the building is on fire. He believes there is ample room.

Mr. Juckes comments that the fire issues will have to be worked out with the fire officials.

Mr. Sullivan asks Mr. Sehnal about the main floor parking allocation plan. The basement plan is 100% for residential parking and at grade the purple area is to accommodate the balance of residential. The green zone for the employees, is that dedicated employee space? Mr. Sehnal says not necessarily but will be determined once they know the tenants.

Mr. Sullivan goes on to indicate the pink zone is for visitors and surplus residents. He wonders if a resident could give a visitor his fob and the car remains in the green zone for a week. What is the management plan to ensure there is parking?

Mr. Schkolnick indicates signage could address this and that the applicant will address this when their opportunity to testify comes.

Mr. Panagopoulos, boro engineer, comments that he has long experience with Mr. Staigar. He sees there are 90 spaces but asks about the 3 unmarked spaces. Mr. Sehnal indicates that they are bumping out a wall and will add 3 spaces.

Mr. Panagopoulos points to the first level and notes 15 retail spaces are required and they are allowing for 24. He questions the thinking here. Mr. Sehnal wanted to make sure retail was accommodated. Balance can be adjusted as needed, but this is the allocation they anticipate. Mr. Staigar points out that guest parking for residents is in the pink too so 10 of those spaces can be residential guest spaces. Mr. Panagopoulos is concerned folks may take advantage of those guest spaces. He wonders how management will handle this believing that if a resident has two cars they would park here for free. Mr. Staigar says the retail folks will be the first to complain if residential is taking these spaces. You won't know until the building is filled where the needs will be. But if there are complaints they will be addressed.

Mr. Panagopoulos addresses turning templates, and says the template tonight seems to show that the truck is passing over the property line. Mr. Sehnal thinks it's just sloppy drawing. But looks like they will need to eliminate parking on first street to allow fire truck to swing around for access. Because of this "maybe" situation we can't allow cars to park there forever cause the fire truck will need unimpeded access to make that turn.

Mr. Panagopoulos opines that the reason FD needs to get to the back of the site is that there are power lines on First and South. The back is the only area it can be done or possibly the nearby parking lots to the west. That will be their main access point to the building during firefighting situations.

Mr. Schkolnick will take a close look at the templates and existing parking. Dan is marking that down and will revisit.

Mr. Panagopoulos believes there are 4-5 spaces in that area and asks for them to be shown on a plan.

Mr. Panagopoulos points out there are approx. 3 feet at the front of the building between the property line and the front of the building, which could be the source of the extra space the FD needs. He admits this must be drilled down on by engineering and architecture. Additionally, re electric wires, the applicant must discuss with PSEG to provide shut offs to the site. He suggests the applicant approach PSEG to see if that could be a reality.

Mr. Panagopoulos. reviews his 7-15-20 letter.

Item 1.4, is the roof drainage going to the same drainage system to the southwest? Mr. Sehnal says most will go the southwest but they will be adding roof leaders to drain direct to the street as well.

Item 1.6: instead of hooking directly into the Martine Avenue main he'd like a manhole. Mr. Sehnal agrees.

Do Pre & post development flows differ in what goes to South Avenue and Martine Avenue now? Mr. Sehnal says all flows converge at South and Martine. Mr. Panagopoulos. is concerned that the water will be rushing faster and cause problems at Martine. He just doesn't want to overtax the system in heavier intense events.

Moving to 2.2, I'm guessing the architect will discuss utility meter and transformer locations. Want to make sure that any onsite transformer be screened and safe.

Re 3.5 on deliveries, moving in was not discussed. Mr. Staigar plans to have a section of 1st Street cordoned off on moving day. Police will be pulled in and it should not take more than 1 or 2 spaces at a time. Mr. Staigar indicates a 10-foot-tall truck can get into the garage. U-Haul trucks are 7.5 to 8 feet.

Mr. Schkolnick is prepared to set in wiring for vehicle charging stations. The parking report took no credits for mass transit. Mr. Staigar says they are very conservative in their analysis of traffic projections, we could have taken a certain percentage off the Staigar analysis but we did not. Mr. Panagopoulos agrees that it is a conservative analysis.

#4, you'll need road opening permits from DOT. They just put handicapped ramps at the corner. Mr. Sehnal will try to maintain the existing ramps and resurvey to consider those ramps.

How is the path in the back constructed to hold the weight of a fire truck? Mr. Sehnal indicates concrete pavers will be the material which will be selected once they know the weight of the truck they have to accommodate. He has seen plastic cones with crushed stone and reinforced concrete and will certainly work out those details once they get FS signoff.

Mr. Panagopoulos points out Martine is a county road and there's a paving moratorium, also on South, so any requirements under the moratorium will need to be followed.

The pipe going through the Hallmark property, has it been discussed with them? Mr. Sehnal indicates the applicant has spoken to them but they understand there is an easement and will work with them. Mr. Panagopoulos believes it will be a deed easement. Mr. Sehnal agrees and says they will have to update that.

Mr. Panagopoulos asks that information and design on the retaining wall be provided to ensure it can handle the building weight. This concludes Mr. Panagopoulos' questions.

Mr. Juckes indicates that we'll now move to questions from PB members. Not commentary. Mr. Juckes asks Sehnal what building the black bottom line goes through? Mr. Sehnal indicates that is the zone line.

Ms. Moore asks what percentage of residents have no cars. Ms. Staigar refers to census data for the boro and of the 307 renter occupied units, 123 have no vehicle available to the homeowner or tenant, about 1/3 of rentals in Fanwood. 75 have 1 vehicle. It's been their experience that developments in and around train stations have fewer cars.

No questions from Ms. Hamill

Mr. Matty asks about 1/3 of residents not having vehicles, he suggests that means more bike parking. Mr. Staigar says they could remove 1 or 2 spots and convert to bike parking but he believes they should wait to see what the real experience will be. Mr. Matty asks about the site plan with garbage being internal room with pickup outside. Can he assume the same for recycling? Mr. Sehnal replies yes.

Mr. Matty asks about the fence line on rear property line, what is the height of the fence, is it existing?

Mr. Sehnal says it's an existing fence they will not remove to respect the neighbor, he believes the height goes from 6 to 3 or 4 feet. Mr. Matty asks where the standpipe is. Mr. Sehnal has no location identified yet but the fire official has suggested South Avenue.

Mr. Matty asks if residential parking will be assigned or first come first served, Mr. Sehnal indicates they will be assigned.

No questions from Ms. Seefeldt,

Mr. Molenaar suggests the planner should report.

Ms. Patel says that the CC requirements indicate the walkway must match and she sees the sidewalk proposed is concrete. Also mentions bike parking. Can they describe other ways to accommodate, either bike racks, bollards or lockers that could be beneficial? And she also comments that the streetscape amenities need to be improved.

Mr. Sehnal replies that as far as the sidewalk on South, they are proposing a 3-foot strip of pavers to match the existing streetscape. They are willing to work with the landscape professional to make the streetscape very appealing. Also, they are providing bike parking within the retail area that would be available for public. There is no bike parking proposed on South.

Mr. Molenaar: he is surprised our fire department is requiring something that hasn't been required on any other new building in town and says it seems like it's creating design problems for us, perhaps the boro would prefer more landscaping and he wonders if the applicant could provide an expert in fire response.

Mr. Staigar says they will follow up with the fire department to determine the reasoning, perhaps there's a way to shut the wires off as needed. He agrees, this is the first time he's seen the FD saying they're going to park next to a burning building. Our further discussions with the FD will bear some of that out.

Mr. Molenaar says he is not really sure where these new requirements are coming from that we have never seen before.

Mr. Sehnal say they would love to reduce that strip and add lots of landscaping.

Mr. Boris has no questions

Mr. Sherry asks Mr. Staigar about the traffic growth and if it looks at developments up and down the corridor. It seems it would grow more than 1% given what we see in development.

Mr. Staigar reviewed the immediate area projects. The DOT growth rates are taken from permanent traffic counters, they update them quite often and the most current increase is 1%. DOT would mandate use of their figure, so they have faith in its accuracy.

Mr. Sherry asks if the loading area was considered. Mr. Staigar says typically there is no special loading area for buildings of this size. Moving in and out is the biggest concern and when that happens managements will alert PD. Often the box truck will be able to get into the parking area.

Lastly, Mr. Sherry asks if the fire lane was dictated by the FD rather than it being on the west. Mr. Sehnal says originally there was no fire access but after meeting with FD they asked for 20-foot access.

Mr. Lysicatos asks if it's possible to open up more space in the basement for bike parking? Mr. Sehnal indicates there are currently having 18 spaces on the ground floor and will work with the architect to identify other areas that may be used. Mr. Lysicatos suggests a one-way pattern in the basement might open more space. Mr. Sehnal indicates they tried that and lost spaces.

He asks if they consider a curb ramp on South. Mr. Panagopoulos indicates it would need DOT approval and it will be tough. Mr. Juckes recalls another conversation further down the block and were denied. Mr. Lysicatos is just asking them to consider and make the request. Mr. Lysicatos asks how large the planting pits are? Mr. Sehnal will work with the landscape architect. Questions about streetlighting indicates what exists will remain. Question to Mr. Staigar about light signals needs a retiming indicates that it will not be required. Mr. Lysicatos also questions if there is enough queuing on First Street as people come out of the garage. Mr. Staigar says that during peak hours there were 71 in the AM and 23 in the PM, indicating the impact will be negligible. Mr. Lysicatos asks if it can be made residential parking only. Mr. Schkolnick indicates that will be an issue for the municipality. Mr. Staigar indicates there is also a 2-hour parking limit on the street and suggests there is more than enough retail parking inside the building. Lysicatos asks if the wires can be put underground. Mr. Sehnal said they made the ask and PSEG refused. Mr. Lysicatos indicates PSEG says lots of different things, he's seen it all the time. So would the developer consider it. Mr. Sehnal will inquire again and press harder. Mr. Lysicatos asks if the footings on the wall and foundation encroach municipal or state right of way? Mr. Sehnal says no. Mr. Lysicatos asks about sidewalks and is assured it is just like Passaic County, a satisfactory answer to Mr. Lysicatos.

Mr. Carter as councilman has a lot of questions come on behalf of residents. He thanks the professionals and compliments them on their preparedness. The product looks good, but in considering parking variances he asks if one of the factors is on existing infrastructure? Mr. Staigar agrees. Mr. Carter questions the garbage issues. Garbage breeds rodents. Is there a consideration to move the pickup to South rather than First? Mr. Sehnal says they'll certainly look into it but believes it needs to be discussed with the architect for a good idea of the program plan. He also assures that the garbage wouldn't be on the street for more than a few hours. Carter appreciates their willingness to review so residents can have their questions answered. Carter questions about First Street residents being impacted by a potential loss of parking spaces. How do you propose addressing that situation where parking spaces may be lost because of fire trucks? Mr. Sehnal points out that there is a driveway across the street from the accessway so this may only result in the loss of one parking spot just south of the driveway. Mr. Schkolnick says they'll take a close look.

Mr. Carter inquires about loading and unloading in front of their residences and asks about loading on South as opposed to First.

Mr. Staigar answers that the loading will not be in front of their buildings but will be next to the subject building and doesn't see how that impacts the other residents. He doesn't see loading/unloading as an option on South as a State Highway. He believes First is safer.

Mr. Schkolnick asks to view the property.

Mr. Lysicatos interjects wondering if it is clear there is no parking on South Avenue? Mr. Panagopoulos says there is no parking between First and Martine because the shoulder is narrow there.

Ms. Dabulas interjects that the applicant can clarify these details and carry the issue to the next meeting.

Mr. Carter gets into flow of traffic and impact on neighbors. Is there any mechanism to enter the building from LaGrande? Make that street a one-way street? Is there a consideration for breaking up that flow? Mr. Staigar, when you take a look at what is coming in and out currently there's no significant difference. Mr. Carter begs to differ, you have all the housing and retail, so can you consider breaking up this flow in your design so all the flow isn't on those First Street residences.

Mr. Jukes asks how many cars/hours would enter onto First from the parking lot. Mr. St. 19 in the morning and 22 in the PM. 1 car every three minutes. Mr. Carter again questions whether there can be a mechanism so that not all of the flow is on those first street residences.

Mr. Schkolnick says they will take a look to see if there are any options. It would not be easy because this is a state highway, but will get back to the board with more in-depth answers. This goes along with other issues re loading, entry height. Etc. Will look at it as a whole package. Mr. Carter appreciates the candor and the respect and honesty the questions are being answered with. He recognizes they want to be good neighbors. Mr. Carter asks about the SE corner where the gazebo sits. Mr. Sehnal identifies it as an amenity space and the architect can describe that in detail. Mr. Carter questions if reducing from 62 to 58 if there was a loss in affordable units, and what the cutoff would be. Mr. Schkolnick says that is a rounding question so he will have to get the answer. He believes the required set aside is 15%. which is 9 units, at 62 units the calculation remains 9 affordable units.

Mayor Mahr asks about the width of the sidewalk on the side of the building and if it is public access. Mr. Sehnal describes It as an accessible 4-foot walkway with access to retail and private access to residential.

She asks the date of the Census data – Mr. Staigar indicates it is from 2017. Mayor asks about fire officials memo Mr. Staigar reiterates his surprise that a fire truck would be parked in a fall zone. Mayor asks about turning off wires and the realistic likelihood. Mr. Panagopoulos indicates that had been suggested by the builder further down South Avenue. Mayor asks Mr.

Sehna understands the concern about south and first access. Mr. Sehna indicates the wires were the concern so they could place the truck so that the aerial ladder can get to the building. Part of the take away is that you will look at possibly moving the building up to give them 25 feet and you can do that with a buffer remaining for the neighbor's yards. Mr. Sehna agrees. Mayor Mahr wants to underscore why the garbage has to be hauled to the street rather than putting a truck inside the building.

Mr. Jukes asks that the meeting be opened to the public and reiterates this is for questions not comments

JJ. Conahan asks when the study was taken, half of the business doesn't exist anymore. All those people parked on First street. He doubts 17 cars and 33 cars at night seems a little off. We have 33 buses that line up on the street to get to the Specialized Hospital in the morning. He's lived here all his life and those numbers seem off. Secondly, it's a beautiful looking building but they mention the water and gas is coming off First Street. Says there is no water pressure as it is?

Ms. Dabulas directs these as questions to Mr. Sehna and Mr. Jukes directs Mr. Staigar to respond. Mr. Staigar answers that these studies were of peak hours

Mr. Conahan says he's not talking about rush hour he's saying all day long and that the numbers are not accurate. He can't park in front of his own home at 40 First St.. Ms. Dabulas swears Mr. Conahan. Mr. Conahan says a lot of folks use the street as a bypass and that parking is jammed by existing building, post office...that PSEG parks trucks for access to Bagel Shop. He has cars overhanging my driveway, it's ridiculous. It seems they won't have enough parking. He has 3 cars and 2 motorcycles. Where are businesses and customers parking? What happened to the parking agreement between the Messercola building and Chelsea? They all park on the street!

Mr. Sehna says there is an "ability to serve" letter from American Water and will be meeting with them soon, and will address the water pressure issues.

Sean Lough, 42 First Street is sworn and wonders how the characterization that residents of First Street are out during the day. Mr. Staigar ways it is typical. Mr. Lough says it is a street that has retirees, and people that work from home and that the data is different. Mr. Staigar suggests that those people are out of the home more often during the day than at night and the potential for shared street parking exists. However, he's just using it as a safety valve and firmly believes there is sufficient site parking and they will not rely on the street.

Mr. Lough asks how the ITE's guidelines on COVID impacting the traffic generation. Mr. Staigar has not seen those guidelines and can't answer the question. He doesn't know what the post pandemic recommendations will be. Mr. Lough says they just released it this morning and Mr. Staigar says he will take a look.

Ms. Dabulas swears the witness Yanick Salazar Tracey at 41 First Street has a question for Mr. Sehna regarding the ground level parking, is there a gate? Mr. Sehna indicates the tenant parking gate is the only gate which will be accessible for residents and merchants by key fob.

Ms. Tracey wonders if there will be regulations on ingress and egress, vis a vis safety. Mr. Sehnal says it will be just like any other parking lot in town that is open to the public. Police would patrol.

Ms. Dabulas swears Warren Mateychak, 49 First Street who asks to see the architectural elevation on the south side of the building, indicating there is a disparity showing the fire lane to be a soccer field. Mr. Sehnal says that as an Emergency Access Lane, it can be used as an open grass space. There could be no permanent features. Mr. Mateychak shares Mr. Conahan's concerns about the reality of the parking, saying there are times you really can't make a left turn onto South avenue. And indicates the building across the street on approximately the same lot size has only 12 units.

Gary Morris, 405 South is sworn by Ms. Dabulas. He questions the reality of the emergency access way is not 23 feet and that the pavers feet are technically 16 feet wide which wouldn't really support a truck on a 20-foot-wide space and he thinks the whole area should be pavers, not just strips. Mr. Sehnal says he mentioned the access aisle is 20 feet wide but the building is 23 feet from the property line. The two- six-foot-wide strips are there for the support points for the wheels and outriggers. But they will work with FD to determine if they want entire walkway in pavers. Mr. Morris suggests they get rid of the gazebo and make the fire lane longer. Mr. Juckes says that is a question for the architect. Mr. Morris also questions the garbage pickup, saying the garbage man brings the garbage out from under Fanwood Crossing III. He thinks that may be a good answer for this building. Mr. Juckes suggests the management discuss this.

Mr. Carter mentions that First St. has a downward grade, making rolling trash bins a problem and Mr. Juckes directs the applicant to consider this for the next time.

Mr. Morris asks about any pumps in place but Mr. Sehnal does not anticipate water flow into the basement and is confident they will be able to address it. Mr. Sehnal will be doing a geotechnical inspection to determine the groundwater level, which he believes is below the ground level of their basement.

Motion and second to close the meeting to the public is approved.

Mr. Juckes points out that at 10:48 Mr. Schkolnick was correct in anticipating we would only hear from the engineers. So, we will carry this hearing without notice September 23. He thanks all for their time.

Mr. Schkolnick thanks the PB and signs off the Landmark team.

### **Resolutions**

#### **Block 38, Lot 14 (bulk), 8 Glenwood, Cepparulo**

Ms. Seefeldt moves, Mayor Mahr seconds,

Ayes: Seefeldt, Mahr, Juckes, Boris, Matty, Lysicatos, Moore

Motion carries

**Block 117, Lot 9 (bulk), 80 Shady Lane, Jackman**

Mahr Moves, Seefeldt seconds

Ayes: Mahr, Seefeldt, Juckes, Boris, Matty, Lysicatos, Moore

Motion carries

**Block 100, Lot 17 (bulk), 130 Helen Street, Trovini**

Mahr Moves, Seefeldt seconds

Ayes: Mahr, Seefeldt, Juckes, Boris, Matty, Lysicatos, Moore

Motion carries

**Block 99, Lot 13 (bulk), 84 Helen Street, Gardella**

Mahr Moves, Seefeldt seconds

Ayes: Mahr, Seefeldt, Juckes, Boris, Matty, Moore, Lysicatos

Motion carries

**Block 53, Lot 24 (bulk), 86 Farley, Dugan**

Mayor Mahr moves, Ms. Seefeldt seconds,

Ayes: Seefeldt, Mahr, Juckes, Boris, Moore, Lysicatos

Motion carries

Mr. Sherry & Mayor Mahr move to open to the public. Juckes asks if there are any questions. There are none.

Sherry & Seefeldt move to close. Motion carries.

Juckes mentioned Special meeting on 9/9/20

Ms. Hoynes points out that we have Empire and Soho on for the 23<sup>rd</sup> and anticipates a problem with that. Ms. Dabulas plans to work with attorney's for Empire Builders.

Mr. Molenaar would like to know the distinction between the conflicting requests of the fire officials.

Ms. Mahr says you would go to the fire official. Mr. Molenaar says what we are requiring is way out of left field. He wants some other state official.

Mr. Molenaar says we're all volunteers, as is the fire official

Ms. Hoynes says our Fire Official not a volunteer and suggests you ask for him to clarify and document his claims.

Mayor Mahr says we rely on our professionals and Ms. Dabulas says we can ask him to document. Mr. Lysicatos says he sees this all the time so it does vary statewide. But it is prudent to sit down with Fire official to see what's going on. Some of this stuff is new. Couldn't a committee have a discussion? Mr. Juckes thinks that is an awesome idea. Ms. Hoynes suggests

the site plan committee of which Mr. Lysicatos is the chair. This is agreed and the meeting will be facilitated.

Mr. Boris moves to adjourn. Mr. Carter seconds and meeting is adjourned at

Adjourned at 10:48.

Respectfully submitted

---

Pat Hoynes, Planning Board Secretary