

**TOWNSHIP OF EGG HARBOR
SPECIAL PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

July 6, 2015

Planning Board Professional(s):

Solicitor: Christopher Brown, Esq.: (present)

Engineer: James A. Mott, P.E., of Mott Associates: (Robert Watkins, P.E., present)

Planner: Vincent Polistina, P.P., of Polistina and Associates: (present)

A special meeting of the Planning Board of Egg Harbor Township was held on the above date, 5:00 p.m., prevailing time, Egg Harbor Township Hall, Egg Harbor Township, New Jersey. The Chairperson opened the meeting by reading the statement in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Roll Call Taken as Follow(s):

Manuel E. Aponte, V-Chair., present

Charles Eykyn, present

James Garth, Sr., Chairperson, present

Frank Kearns, another engage.

Dennis Kleiner, Alt. #1, present

Robert Levy, present

Mayor James J. McCullough, Jr., * **See below**

Peter Miller, Township Administrator, present

Committeewoman, Laura Pfrommer, present

Daniel Pittaro, Alt. #II, present

Paul Rosenberg, 2nd V-Chairperson, present

***May the record reflect:** Mayor James J. McCullough was unable to attend this evening. He has sent Committeeman Frank Finerty in his place.

PUBLIC HEARING(S):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. <u>SPPF 08-15</u>
<u>SD 02-15</u>
Egg Harbor Senior Urban Renewal, LLC
Zone: M-1/AHO-A, 46.94 acre site, water/sewer,
applicant Road's, proposing a four (4) lot subdivision
Lot 1 will contain 18.6 acres, Lot 1.01 will
contain 10.95 acres, lot 1.02 will contain 7.29 acres, and lot 1.03 will contain 10.08 acres.
Applicant is proposing preliminary and final major site plan approval to construct 60 senior
affordable dwelling units contained within a three (3) story building with a gross floor area
of 64,120 sq. ft. other improvements consist of 72 parking spaces, storm water management
and landscaping. CAFRA</p> | <p>Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan
Minor Subdivision
1029/1
Columbus Ave., Fire and Doughty
and Decadon Drive
Waiver of Time - Not Granted</p> |
|---|--|

Minor Subdivision - Checklist Waiver(s):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Item #2:</p> <p>2. Item #3:</p> <p>3. Item #13:</p> <p>4. Item #14:</p> <p>5. Item #16:</p> <p>6. Item #18:</p> <p>7. Item #20:</p> <p>8. Item #22:</p> | <p>Plan scale 1" = 50' ft.</p> <p>Key map</p> <p>Site triangles</p> <p>Site characteristics map</p> <p>Proposed/existing protective covenants and/or deed restrictions</p> <p>Soil borings (septic systems)</p> <p>Stream corridors/steep slopes</p> <p>Location of existing wells/septic</p> |
|---|---|

Major Site Plan – Checklist Waiver(s):

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>1. Item #2:</p> | <p>Plan scale 1"=50'</p> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

- 2. **Item #3:** **Key map**
- 3. **Item #15:** **Site characteristics map**
- 4. **Item #17:** **Existing and/or proposed protective covenants, deed restrictions**
- 5. **Item #24:** **Profiles of all proposed streets**
- 6. **Item #30:** **Location of existing wells and septic systems**
- 7. **Item #21:** **Fiscal impact**

Design Waiver(s):

- 1. **§94-8(A):** **Buffer**
- 2. **§94-8(H):** **Buffer – parking setback**
- 3. **§94-22(E):** **Landscaping – Stormwater Management Basin**

Variance Relief:

- 1. **Lot Area:** **Senior Lot: 10.95 acres proposed; 12 acres required**
- 2. **225-7:** **Side yard setback: 29.3' ft. proposed; 50' ft. required**
- 3. **225-7:** **Parking setback: 5.2' ft. and 1.4' ft. proposed; 10' ft. required**
- 4. **Parking:** **Parking spaces (off-street): 72 spaces prop.; 110 spaces req.**
- 5. **§225-40(1)H(3):** **Buffer strip of 225' ft. in width shall be required along all property lines and shall be in accordance with §94-8. Applicant is proposing improvements including the off-street parking and stormwater management basins within the required buffer.**

Ben Zeltner, Esq., introduced himself as the attorney representing the applicant, Egg Harbor Senior Urban Renewal, LLC. He advised present this evening is the development team Andrew Schaffer of Schaffer, Nassar, Schiedegg, Nicholas Cangelosi, from the Michael's Organization, and Mary-Jo Johannason, of Kitchen and Associates. Mr. Cangelosi also asked if Sandy Cipollone, Interstate Realty Management could also be sworn. May the record reflect: Board Solicitor Brown had duly sworn all professional's referenced by Attorney Zeltner, as well as, the Planning Board professional's.

Attorney Zeltner stated if the Board will recall in January they were granted combined preliminary and final site plan approval for a 76 unit affordable family development on the parcel that is adjacent to the one presented this evening. Attorney Zeltner explained the Michaels Development Company, which is the umbrella organization of this applicant and the applicant that was before the Board in January, is the largest owner of affordable housing in the United States.

Attorney Zeltner advised the subject application is Phase II of the development and will be strictly for seniors. He advised it is an affordable senior development located within the Township's AHOA Overlay Zone and the Board had recommended to Township Committee to adjust the zoning line to accommodate this development. Attorney Zeltner advised the site will be served by sewer and water. He indicated the balance of the site is within the M-1 Zoning District and it is a CAFRA jurisdiction.

Attorney Zeltner advised the application was vented through the Technical Review Committee to present the best plan possible. He added he has worked with the Board Solicitor in the preparation of a decision and resolution, which like the Family Development is required by New Jersey Housing, Mortgage, and Financing Agency as a requirement to submit an application for financing. He indicated the deadline for this is later this month and if the Board sees fit they ask the Board Approve this resolution tonight.

Attorney Zeltner advised the applicant is present this evening seeking minor subdivision approval in order to create this lot, readjust the lot line that was granted with the final approval and then there will be two (2) remainder lots for development in the M-1 Zone for future commercial development. He advised there will be 60 deed restricted affordable senior units on this site with a community room and other ancillary facilities. Attorney Zeltner advised the two (2) communities will be managed by the same company within the Michael's Organization and this is Interstate Realty Management and the units will hopefully help the Township satisfy its COAH affordable housing obligations.

Andrew Schaeffer advised he prepared the plans presented this evening. The Board accepted Engineer Schaeffer's credentials. Engineer Schaeffer advised this is a 45 acre site bounded by the Expressway, Doughty Road, Fire Road, Columbus Avenue and a small amount of Decadon Drive. He stated the property is located mainly in the M-1 Zone with an AHOA overlay, which is the Affordable Housing portion of the zoning. He advised it does include all the buildings and parking lots but not all the land associated with project.

Engineer Schaeffer stated the applicant is proposing and providing rather large lots. He indicated with the family development the applicant is using only six and a half acres (6 ½) for development the lot is 18 acres and for the senior development the applicant is using two (2) acres and they have ten (10) acres. He advised the purpose of this is because of the CAFRA Jurisdiction the property is in they require a two (2) to one (1) mitigation on clearing and vegetation in this area. He advised this makes the lots oversized to include twice as much area for tree save as we are developing. He indicated this is why the lots are so large.

Engineer Schaeffer indicated as noted previously by Attorney Zeltner they are proposing another lot that will remain with the seller within the M-1 Zone and it should be a little over six (6) acres. Engineer Schaeffer advised there is another lot proposed on Decadon and Columbus and they are all complying with the M-1 zone which is a two (2) acre area requirement and they are viable for future commercial development.

Engineer Schaeffer advised as the Board is aware Phase I is for 76 family units for various levels of affordable living. He advised this Phase was approved with a connection driveway connection to Ravensworth which is a public street and the senior phase will also have driveway access Ravensworth. He indicated other road improvements will include Gravesmith Drive which will connect to Columbus Avenue creating two (2) ways in and out of Fire Road and access to Washington Avenue. He indicated by doing so it allows traffic to disperse over a large area.

Engineer Schaeffer stated the family units and the senior units will be sharing infrastructure in terms of sewer and water extensions, as well as, driveway access. He also explained the applicant has applied for a CAFRA permit and they have just ended comment phase and the applicant received minor comments in regards to storm water management received minor comments which had to do with storm water. Engineer Schaeffer advised the plans were revised to address these comments and they were submitted to the Township for review. He indicated the paving was the biggest issue.

Attorney Zeltner questioned Engineer Schaeffer that the applicant is not here for any changes to the family phase. Engineer Schaeffer stated there are some technical variances by adding a lot line. He indicated they are for parking and the building. Attorney Zeltner asked if the shared infrastructure cuts down on the footprint. Engineer Schaeffer indicated yes. He further noted he has reviewed the comments contained within the reports of the Board Engineer, Board Planner and the Fire Department.

Engineer Schaeffer explained the Fire Department asked for placement of another fire hydrant and a reinforced grassed access way around the back side of the building (senior housing) which the applicant has also agreed to.

Engineer Schaeffer advised there are two (2) sets of checklist waivers being requested, as outlined on the agenda, he stated one set is for the minor subdivision the other is for the site plan and many are the same. Engineer Schaeffer then provided on the record a brief explanation as to why the applicant was requesting minor subdivision checklist waiver(s) #1, 2, 4, and 8. He then explained that checklist waiver(s) #3, 5-7 will be provided on compliance plans.

Engineer Schaeffer explained the applicant is also requesting site plan checklist waiver(s) #3, 15, and 30, as well as what would be #7, Item 21: Fiscal Impact Report, which was not listed on the agenda and the remaining checklist items #1, 17, 24 will be provided on compliance plans. He further noted the applicant is not requesting a waiver for lighting and signage it will be provided.

Attorney Zeltner asked Engineer Schaeffer to describe the site plan for the seniors. Engineer Schaeffer stated parking will be on either side of the building but there is a drop-off in front of the building which is more consistent with a senior development. He added there is actually double the handicap spaces that would normally be proposed for this site.

Attorney Zeltner asked if there were any design waivers. Engineer Schaeffer advised the applicant is seeking a waiver of the 25' ft. buffer in a number of the locations, which includes property lines, especially along the common property line. He advised this will behave as one development but owned by two separate entities under the umbrella of the Michaels Group and is managed by the same company. Engineer Schaeffer added there will be one (1) full time maintenance person, who lives on site, to facilitate both properties.

Engineer Schaeffer advised the buffer and the buffer parking setback are encroachments because the lot line created down the middle of the project. He advised the applicant is seeking the redistribution of materials and different types of material concerning the landscaping. He advised they are not seeking a waiver for the quantity. He advised this is similar to the request they received during the family application for the Expressway and is and will be continued for the seniors.

Engineer Schaeffer stated the applicant is seeking a 15' wide access waiver around the basin, as well as, a stabilized entrance into the basin. He indicated these basins will be privately maintained they will not be Township maintained. Board Engineer Watkins advised he cannot recall that the waiver for the basin access. He indicated around the basin he can understand but the access to get into the basin he cannot. He advised he is not sure this is something we have waived previously. Engineer Schaeffer advised they can provide the correct size access way into the basin(s).

Engineer Schaeffer advised the applicant is seeking a waiver of not providing curb and sidewalk along one side of Ravensworth, both sides of Gravesmith, Fire Road, the Expressway, and Doughty Road. He advised it is a long list. Board Engineer Watkins stated these waivers were granted at the last hearing. Engineer Schaeffer stated this is correct. Board Engineer Watkins stated this relief was all part of Phase I. He advised so it's only a partial waiver is really the other side of Ravensworth from Phase I to Phase II. Attorney Zeltner asked Engineer Schaeffer to explain the variance relief. Engineer Schaeffer after a brief discussion concerning variances listed as #1 and #2 on the agenda the applicant has agreed to comply with the zoning requirements and have withdrawn their request for relief. Engineer Schaeffer advised

because of the redrawing of the subdivision line two (2) variances for parking setback is required one for 5.2' ft. and the other for 1.4' ft. where 10' ft. required. He advised there is also a front yard setback that was approved in January for 26.4' ft. in lieu of 30' ft. for one of the buildings. He indicated we are not changing anything. He advised this is for proposed lot 1. Board Member Miller asked why is it being requested if it was part of lot #1, Phase I. Board Planner Polistina advised because the applicant has modified the lot line.

Engineer Schaeffer stated the next request is for the number of parking spaces associated with the senior development. We are proposing 72 spaces where 110 are required. He advised there are very few ordinance(s) in the nation that consider 62 and above senior living. However, experience shows a one to one ratio which would mean 60 spaces which is more appropriate. Engineer Schaeffer advised Michaels has two currently operating facilities for the last ten (10) years with a one to one ratio and they have not run out of parking.

Mr. Cangelosi advised their site known as Carpenters Square has been constructed for 10 plus years and it has 100 units and 57 spaces. He indicated community managers have seen excess parking and at the other location known as Glasstown they have 74 spaces for 75 units and they have an abundance of parking there. Engineer Schaeffer stated they were able to find two (2) ordinances in California that offer a one to one ratio. Township Committeewoman Pfrommer asked if the senior's adult children can live here. Mr. Cangelosi stated for 62 + developments every single resident within this development must be 62 years of age or older. He indicated you cannot have any combination. Chairman Garth asked if someone wanted to visit their Grandmother for a week and they stayed here would it be allowed. Mr. Cangelosi stated there is visitor's policy and would be part of the lease agreement.

Chairman Garth asked if this is Section 8 Development. Township Committeewoman Pfrommer stated they are not. Mr. Cangelosi stated the resources of this development are provided by way of tax credit. He indicated the development will generate almost 12 million dollars in a tax credit through the New Jersey Housing, Mortgage and Finance Agency provides them the ability to charge rent at the income rates. He indicated there are no rental subsidies. He indicated the residents have minimal income requirements and they pay their rent.

Board Member Rosenberg stated he believes people will be visiting such as nurses. He stated he never sees an abundance of parking and he does not care what California does. Concerning that you are planning for half the parking. Mr. Cangelosi stated typically when you have an affordable housing development with 62 years of age. Board Member Rosenberg asked typical to where. Mr. Cangelosi stated the two (2) developments they have are within South Jersey one is in Gloucester City and the other is in Millville. He advised generally with low income seniors they do not have as many cars as you would see in a market senior development. He indicated they rely heavily on public transportation.

Mr. Cangelosi stated we have services in place through our provider that provides the residents with transportation opportunities. He explained they will link-up with the County and other providers in the area to get them from the development to the place they need to be without a vehicle. Board Member Rosenberg asked what type of public transportation is within the area other than County. Mr. Cangelosi stated part of the financing the State wants to see access to public transportation. He indicated if you are not within a half mile of public transportation the State looks unfavorably. He indicated the family phase scored very well because of its access to public transportation. He indicated the senior development will get the same type of look because of the screening associated with public transportation. Township Administrator Miller stated there is a bus stop on Washington Avenue and

there is also one that goes to the Social Security Administration which are both within a half mile of the facility.

Township Administrator Miller asked how many single people live in these types of facilities. He asked based on the experience associated with their past projects. Ms. Cipollone, senior vice president, with Interstate Realty Management stated she could not provide a percentage but the majority of the people are single and there are very few couples that come to the door. Ms. Cipollone stated with this particular facility there will be about 10% of the residents that will be couples. She indicated of her experience there would be less than 72 residents. Township Administrator Miller asked what the numbers in Millville and Gloucester City. Ms. Cipollone stated she does not know what the numbers are but typically the people living in the senior housing is senior single females and there are few males.

Mr. Cangelosi stated Gloucester City has 100 units and they have only 58 parking spaces. Township Administrator Miller stated the numbers are not helping concerning his variance relief. Board Engineer Watkins asked how many spaces are proposed for the Family development. Engineer Schaeffer stated there are 152 spaces and they used R.S.I.S. standards. May the record reflect after discussion between the Board Engineer and the Applicant's Engineer Schaeffer it was discussed that possibly four (4) handicap spaces could be eliminated if deemed so because a larger amount was proposed than required, as well as an additional 20 spaces could be placed in along the belt way of Ravensworth if deemed necessary should a parking problem occur. Board Engineer Watkins advised this parking could be of porous material.

Board Member Levy asked why are there two (2) bedrooms units proposed if you mostly have single individuals living at the facility. Mr. Cangelosi stated it is inherent to the design. He indicated seniors do like two (2) bedrooms. They use them for storage. Engineer Schaeffer advised he would like to correct something previously discussed. He advised the family units only required 144 spaces and the applicant proposed 151 spaces. So there will be seven (7) extra spaces there and they just happen to be close to the seniors. Board Engineer Watkins stated there will be seven (7) extra spaces, plus an extra four (4) to five (5) handicap spaces and there is possibly another 20 spaces along the roadway to be used if parking becomes an issue.

Board Member Aponte stated this is senior living. He asked how far from the front door to the spaces is it. Engineer Schaeffer stated it is about 150' ft. Township Committeewoman Pfrommer stated this is a long distance for someone who may of 75 years of age with grocery bags. Township Administrator Miller stated the can pull up to the front and unload and then park. He advised he can assure the Board that he has went and seen five (5) or six (6) senior housing projects over the last couple of years and no one has more than one to one parking for them. He indicated they are not wealthy seniors and they do not own two (2) cars even if there is couple. He indicated many do not own a car. Township Administrator Miller advised when he was in Pleasantville they have about .5 parking spaces for every unit because there is a bus on the Black Horse Pike. He indicated this is affordable housing and the people are on a very limited fixed income. He stated a car is a luxury for them.

Township Administrator Miller stated he is comfortable with 72 spaces for both the residents and visitors. He does not want to see the removal of the handicap spaces because there will be people that do have cars and they will be using the handicap spaces. He asked if they could assign parking spaces. Ms. Cipollone stated they do not assign spaces. She indicated this becomes a total war between residents.

Board Member Aponte advised it is his understanding that the deed restrictions can they be upheld. He indicated there was a project in Absecon and it was to be senior living but now it is not. Can this happen. Attorney Zeltner stated not with their financing and COAH. Mr. Cangelosi stated they are applying for tax credit financing under a certain set aside for 62 years and older. He indicated from a financing standpoint the answer is no and from an approval standpoint they would have to come back to the board to amend the site plan approval for family. He indicated the building is also not conducive to family living. The building could not be marketed that way with one to two bedrooms for families.

Township Administrator Miller stated under the COAH rules they are locked in for 30 years. He indicated after 30 years the COAH restriction comes off. He advised whether the applicant's marketing and financing expires at the same time he does not know. Mr. Cangelosi stated it is actually 45 years. He indicated there is a 15 year compliance and 30 year restriction for a total of 45 years. Board Planner Polistina advised this is the senior conversion. He advised there were a lot of age restricted developments that were not being constructed so the Legislature came up to allow developers to convert age restricted develops into family developments. Board Engineer Watkins stated this is not that situation. Board Planner Polistina advised this conversion has expired and you can no longer do this.

Township Committeeman Finerty stated the applicant advised the units would be mostly single females. He asked if two (2) people lived in the unit with incomes would they be disqualified. Ms. Cipollone stated they would have to be within the income limitations for two (2) people. She further noted there are two (2) different scales for married versus single. Ms. Cipollone advised there are different income limits for the number of people in the household. Township Committeewoman Pfrommer stated this is entry only limits. Ms. Cipollone stated yes and as people get through the initial year and eligibility and if they make more money they are not removed they will remain. Township Committeewoman asked how far from the senior is the nearest bus stop. Township Administrator Miller stated they would go down Columbus to Washington. Board Member Aponte stated it seems to be about a half mile.

Mr. Cangelosi asked if the Board would consider that after a year in service a parking study can be done and if necessitated the need for additional spaces we can work with Board professionals to determine where the best or realistic placement. Board Member Eykyn asked for confirmation that there is community center proposed. Mr. Cangelosi advised there is a standalone community center within the family development and within the three (3) story midrise (senior development) there is 2,800 sq. ft. of community space. Board Member Eykyn advised his mother was in a nursing home and at Christmas time visitors were parking on the grassed areas. He indicated it may have only been for an hour but this did occur. He asked if any of their other communities this has occurred.

Mr. Cangelosi stated there is not really anyway to anticipate for this. He indicated if there is a need for parking they will accommodate. He advised there will be visitor's at Christmas time. He also added that many of the events are resident only events and not open to the public. Ms. Cipollone advised you will not typically have functions for the family development and the senior on the same day so each development could handle overflow, should it occur. She added they are different color passes for each development so you can distinguish where the car should be and where it is.

Board Engineer Watkins asked are the colored tags enforced. Ms. Cipollone advised they are not enforced by the police it will be dealt with by the management copy. She advised communication is the best between the senior and family development and possibly bringing police in to advise what are the things they are there for and if there is a parking issue to bring it to management's attention.

Board Member Aponte suggested maybe placing within the resolution that an objective study on peak times and non-peak times. Board Solicitor Brown advised it will be included as well as requiring the study be done one (1) year after full tenancy. He indicated you will not receive a full study if you possibly do it one (1) year after opening because they may not be full. Ms. Cipollone the management team works well with the development team. We have a check and balance. Township Committeewoman Pfrommer asked there is enough of area in front for a bus to come in and drop people off. Engineer Schaeffer stated he made sure the "eyebrow" along the front of the senior development was very large. He indicated there is no vestibule but there is lobby for people.

Engineer Schaeffer advised the buffer of 25' ft. is being encroached by 1.4' ft. for parking. Attorney Zeltner stated it is simply because of drawing the subdivision line. Engineer Schaeffer stated it is self-imposed issue because of the line being drawn between the two (2) developments. Attorney Zeltner asked the purpose of buffers and setbacks controls. Engineer Schaeffer explained to protect adjoining properties. He advised they have not incurred into anyone's space. He indicated mainly because there will be deed restricted woods and a 65' ft. wide Atlantic Electric easement. Attorney Zeltner asked if good civic design be enhanced. Engineer Schaeffer advised he has demonstrated this by the access points and the circulation around site. Engineer Schaeffer advised there is no impacts to the Zoning ordinance.

Attorney Zeltner advised they are in agreement with Board Planner Polistina's report concerning the modified condition that the applicant will resubmit the site plan application on the family phase rather than come back with an amended preliminary and final because the plan was presented tonight. Engineer Schaeffer stated the same thing is applicable with the Board Engineer's report.

Township Committeewoman Pfrommer asked if there is any lighting in the back of the senior development. Engineer Schaeffer stated we will not be placing any pole lighting but there is a patio in the rear that will be lit. Mr. Cangelosi stated there will be wall packs on the rear of the building. Engineer Schaeffer advised he will include the architect's plans for lighting on the building with his plans that show the freestanding lighting. Board Engineer Watkins stated there is a comment within the Planner's report that discusses open space and possible variance relief. Engineer Schaeffer explained they exceed the open space provision and relief is not required. Board Engineer Watkins also advised there is comment within his report concerning density. He advised Board Planner Polistina has reviewed the plans and does not believe this is an issue, therefore, strike comment from his report.

Mary-Jo Johannason, New Jersey Licensed Architect, partner with Kitchen and Associates, she advised they prepared the drawings dated June 5, 2015, including the architectural floor plans referenced as SP 101, 102 and 103 and the architectural building elevations SP 201 and 202. Attorney Zeltner added they prepared the plans reviewed by the Board for the family development. Ms. Johannason stated this is correct.

Architect Johannason referred to Exhibit A3, dated July 6, 2015, advising it shows the conceptual rendering of the building and the main entrance as you would enter building. She indicated the view is from across the parking lot looking into the corner of the "elbow". She advised the building will be three (3) stories and is was designed to complement the three (3) story family buildings on the adjacent parcel. She indicated it will also have similar colors and materials with the cultured stone accents and horizontal siding the shakes, the sloped roofs with architectural shingles and gabled eyebrows across the roof line.

Attorney Zeltner asked what amenities are being provided in the building. Architect Johannason advised the amenities provided for the senior building include a community room that can be used for social and recreational activities. She explained there is a small kitchenette if they have donuts and coffee and there is a dishwasher and microwave in the community room. Architect Johannason indicated there is a patio located off the back of the community room so the resident can have outdoor recreation space. She indicated there is a lobby at the front door that will be used for social gatherings, there is a fitness/exercise room with senior friendly equipment. Architect Johannason stated there is a library/computer room and there is one common laundry room provided on each floor.

Architect Johannason stated there are a total of 60 apartments. She advised 54 are one (1) bedroom and six (6) are two (2) bedroom. She advised the building is fully sprinkler, it has two (2) elevators that are centrally located. She advised the residents will enter the building at a controlled access point. She indicated there is a fire/emergency stair at the end of each wing. She indicated there will be onsite management suite to be used as a leasing office for a manager to occupy.

Architect Johannason stated there are maintenance facilities within the building. She advised storage of different parts to do minor repairs, janitorial housekeeping and an office for onsite maintenance. She further explained there will be energy efficient features to the building which is a requirement of the current energy code but also the funding source that Mr. Cangelosi had mentioned. Architect Johannason stated they have recycled flooring, bio-base flooring, recycled construction debris, low or no VOC paints, sealants, and adhesives, water conserving faucets and fixtures, energy star labeled heating/air conditioning and lighting fixtures, high efficiency water heaters and increased insulation in the exterior walls and roof.

Board Member Levy asked how far is it from the eye brow when you pull up to the entrance. Architect Johannason advised about 50' ft. and is not covered. She advised this is not an assisted living facility or nursing home where most residents would be in wheelchairs. She indicated it is independent living. Board Member Kliener asked if there is any nurse call system in these rooms. He stated there is no 24 hour medical staff. Architect Johannason stated no. Attorney Zeltner stated this is not an assisted living facility.

Board Member Levy stated someone trying to get out in snow and then it is 50' ft. to the door. Ms. Cipollone stated as part of their management they would have the superintendent on site for both sites doing some clearing on own but typically they contract a snow removal company. Township Committeewoman Pfrommer asked if there is a double door for the front entrance. Mr. Cangelosi stated it is a sliding door to get into the vestibule. Township Administrator Miller asked the square footage for the one bedroom unit.

Architect Johannason advised they are 700 sq. ft. and the two (2) bedroom units are 900 sq. ft. She indicated they are full size apartments. She indicated they have full size kitchen with refrigerator, dishwasher, range, counter tops and cabinets. She noted there is a living/dining area that is generously sized single one (1) or two (2) bedrooms and a full bathroom. Architect Johannason advised 5% will be wheelchair accessible the day they open the doors. She indicated all the other units will be adaptable so there is minor modifications that the maintenance staff can do such as adding grab bars, lower counter tops and 2% will be equipped for residents that are visual and/or hearing impaired. Chairman Garth asked if there were any rooms subsurface. Architect Johannason stated the building is slab on grade so there are no steps coming in and there is basement; crawl space or anything below grade.

Township Committeewoman Pfrommer asked where are the staircase's located. Architect Johannason stated there are two (2) stairs required by code at the end of each wing and the elevator is in the center.

Motion Rosenberg/Eykyn to open public portion. Vote 9 Yes.

May the record reflect no one came forward

Motion Levy/Rosenberg to close public portion. Vote 9 Yes.

Motion Eykyn/Rosenberg to grant requested checklist waiver(s) Minor Subdivision (item #2, #3, #14, #22). Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

Motion Eykyn/Rosenberg to grant requested checklist waiver(s) Major Site Plan (item #3, #15, #30, #21). Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

Motion Rosenberg/Eykyn to grant requested design waiver(s). Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

Board Planner Polistina advised the applicant does not need the lot area variance nor the side yard setback because the applicant testified they will comply. He indicated the applicant does need the parking area setback because of the creation of the lot line between lots 1 and 1.01. He indicated they need the parking variance for the 72 spaces provided and they need the buffer strip relief. Township Administrator Miller indicated they need a 4th variance is the lot 1 variance for the family building for the rear yard setback.

Board Solicitor Brown stated he will make as a condition of the parking variance the parking study. He added the applicant will have to bring in a site plan for family because of the new proposed minor subdivision. Board Solicitor Brown advised they are the only two (2) conditions he is aware of. Township Administrator Miller stated family is not a condition of variance.

Township Committeeman Finnerty stated he believes the professionals whom have more experience, as well as the administrator, to believe it is a reasonable number to have 72 spaces. He indicated it is also to the advantage of the management company to have sufficient parking the problem is going to be theirs. Would assume 72 is the correct number but with the additional condition that has been given, which he believes is fair. He indicated if there is a parking situation there is enough flexibility to resolve it.

Motion Miller/Pfrommer to grant requested variance relief. Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

Board Solicitor Brown stated this is where the applicant will have the condition of submitting for the family a site plan due to the new proposed subdivision.

Motion Rosenberg/Pfrommer to grant requested conditional minor subdivision approval. Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

Board Planner Polistina advised the Fire Department report should be include within the motion as a condition of the site plan which is the access way around the building and the addition hydrants that were requested.

Motion Eykyn/Rosenberg to grant conditional preliminary/final major site plan approval (Phase II only). Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

Motion Rosenberg/Eykyn to memorialize resolution granting requested checklist waiver(s), design waiver(s), variance relief, conditional minor subdivision approval and conditional preliminary/final major site plan approval (Phase II only). Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

SUMMARY MATTER(S):

SECTION I:

Discussions of matters pertaining to the Board:

Board Secretary Wilbert stated to those members involved in the Deannexation matter she sent out an email for advisement of the dates provided were acceptable. Board Secretary Wilbert stated she has not heard back from everyone. She was hoping for a motion to schedule these meetings but advised she will wait until the 20th of July for the scheduling.

A: General public discussion: Motion Aponte/Miller to open public portion. Vote 9 Yes

No one came forward

Motion Rosenberg/Pfrommer to close public portion. Vote 9 Yes

Motion Aponte/Rosenberg to adjourn at 6:27 P.M. Vote 9 Yes: Aponte, Eykyn, Garth, Kleiner, Levy, Finnerty, Miller, Pfrommer, Rosenberg

Respectfully submitted by,

Theresa Wilbert, Secretary