

**MINUTES
PLANNING BOARD
TOWNSHIP OF CHATHAM
JUNE 17, 2019**

Mr. Don Travisano called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:32 P.M.

Adequate notice of the meetings of the Planning Board of the Township of Chatham was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act as follows: Notice in the form of a Resolution setting forth the schedule of meetings for the year 2019, and January, 2020 was published in the *Chatham Courier* and the *Morris County Daily Record*, a copy filed with the Municipal Clerk and a copy placed on the bulletin board in the main hallway of the Municipal Building.

Answering present to the roll call were Mr. Travisano, Mr. Franko, Mrs. Swartz, Ms. Hagner, Mr. Hoffmann, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Ozdemir, Mr. Sheth and Mr. Coviello.

Also present were Board Engineer John Ruschke, Township Planner Frank Banisch and Board Attorney Steve Warner.

Mr. Tarasca was absent.

Hearings

PB 19-48.16-117.27 (February 22, 2019) SOUTHERN BOULEVARD URBAN RENEWAL, LLC, (Arbor Green at Chatham) 401 Southern Boulevard, BLOCK: 48.16 LOT: 117.27.

Mr. Warner said that there will be additional testimony from previous witnesses based on comments at the last meeting and reports from the Township Planner and Township Engineer. The applicant's attorney, Mr. Robert Kasuba, confirmed that the previous witnesses will give further testimony, and testimony for the Dixiedale application will begin before the planner gives testimony.

Ms. Hagner asked if both the Skate Park redevelopment and the Dixiedale development will be voted on separately or together. Mr. Warner said that the plan is to have the testimony except for the planner be completed on the Skate Park application, then proceed with testimony on the Dixiedale application before having the planner address the Skate Park application followed by public comment. The Board would then have their deliberations and vote on the Skate Park application. The planner would then address the Dixiedale application, followed by public comment. The Board would then have their deliberations and vote on the Dixiedale application.

Mrs. Ruskan was recalled to give further testimony.

Exhibit A-10 was entered into the record. This exhibit is a colored landscaping plan and alternate site plan.

Mrs. Ruskan said that the Planning Board and the Board's professionals provided comments at the last meeting that led to the revised landscaping plan and site plan. She said that Exhibit A-10 offers two different options for the position of the buildings, cited as Option A and Option D. Mrs. Ruskan described how the two options are different from what had previously been proposed.

Mrs. Ruskan also said that two additional parking spots were added, which results in the trash area being located closer to the lot line. She said that a deviation from the redevelopment plan will be needed, as the plan states that the setback needs to be ten feet. Mr. Warner asked if a bulk variance for an accessory structure setback is being requested. Mr. Kasuba said that it would technically be a deviation, but it is for the accessory structure.

Mrs. Ruskan said that the driveway radius was widened to 40 feet so that access would be easier, especially for fire truck access.

Mr. Kelly asked about the tot lot. Mrs. Ruskan said that it is still present, however it is smaller than what was originally proposed.

Mr. Travisano asked about design parameters for the trash enclosure. Mrs. Ruskan said that the redevelopment plan only addresses the setback. The enclosure is proposed to be 8-feet high with a vinyl board-on-board fence. Mr. Travisano asked Mr. Ruschke for his review of the proposed trash enclosure, particularly the structural integrity. Mr. Ruschke said that trash enclosures do tend to get beaten up. Mr. Warner said that the stipulation is for ongoing maintenance of the trash enclosure, which Mr. Kasuba confirmed. Mr. Warner asked if the setback for the trash enclosure is a rear, front or side setback. Mr. Kasuba said that he understands it to be a side yard setback. Mr. Travisano asked if the applicant will work with the Township Engineer regarding the structural integrity of the enclosure. Mr. Banisch advised against a wood and vinyl solution for the trash enclosure.

Mr. Kasuba noted that this is a 100% affordable project. Mr. Warner added that it is a component of an inclusionary project.

Mrs. Ruskan said that there was a resubmittal of the calculations for the capacity of the 4-inch sewer line, and material options were shown. Mrs. Ruskan said that when the projected flow from the proposed buildings is added to the flow from the Police Department, there is still adequate capacity. Mr. Ruschke said that there is a concern over having a connection to a 50 year old lateral. Mr. Hoffmann noted renovations and an expansion of the Police Department that will be necessary in the next few years. Mr. Travisano asked if there has been any study of connecting directly to the sewer main, and if there is any good reason other than cost not to connect to the main. Mrs. Ruskan said that DEP approval would be needed to conduct work in the areas needed to connect to the main. She also said that hooking up to the sewer main was not included in the pending DEP application because it was not contemplated at the time. Mr. Banisch said that because the project is for affordable housing, the courts have cautioned against cost-generating actions that are not essential to the project. He also said that there needs to be consideration of the implication for residents if the sewer line were to fail. Mr. Travisano said that he would like to see a study done of the integrity of the existing sewer line. Mr. Kelly said

that even if the integrity of the line were intact, in the future there could be a complication of who would be responsible for repairs in the event of failure. Mr. Ruschke said that this is an engineering detail not addressed in the redevelopment plan, and the applicant can modify their DEP permit application. Mr. Kasuba said that the applicant is not willing to modify their DEP permit at this time, as the application had been submitted in April. Ms. Hagner asked if the Township can show support for the DEP application so that it is not denied. Mr. Ruschke said that the Township could take responsibility for replacing the sewer line if it breaks in the future, however the Township's endorsement of the DEP application will not sway the approval process. Mr. Sheth asked if another sewer connection is available. Mr. Ruschke said that they can connect directly to the main, and he described its location.

Mr. Travisano asked Mr. Kasuba to reconvene with his client to address the issues raised regarding the sewer lateral and the trash enclosure.

Mr. Travisano opened the floor to the public.

1. Rich Matlaga, 36 Dale Drive, said that the Residential Site Improvement Standards would require 48 parking spots for this development. If there are only 38 spots, Mr. Matlaga asked what the plan is for overflow parking. Mr. Kasuba said that the traffic engineer will address this question. Mr. Matlaga asked if the Police Department is asked to sign off on this application, considering that it will affect their building and parking and that they should address potential security concerns. Mrs. Swartz said that the discussion at the last meeting called for noticeable barriers between the residential area and the Police and DPW areas.
2. Sue Hoag, 76 Canterbury Road, asked how many one-bedroom and two-bedroom units are proposed. Mrs. Ruskan said the plan is for 4 one-bedroom units, 14 two-bedroom units and 6 three-bedroom units. Mrs. Hoag asked if the trash area will have separate dumpsters for garbage and recycling. Mrs. Ruskan said that there will be both.
3. Stacey Ewald, 54 Nicholson Drive, asked if the Police Department and the fire departments will be reviewing the application. Mrs. Swartz said that all three departments have been made aware of the application. Mr. Travisano said that moving forward all applications will be sent for review by the Police Department and fire departments.

Seeing no further questions from the public, Mr. Travisano closed the floor to the public.

Corey Chase, the traffic engineer for the applicant, was recalled to give testimony. Mr. Chase acknowledged that he is still under oath.

Mr. Chase said that the number of parking spots was increased from 36 to 38. He said that this creates a parking ratio of 1.6 parking spaces per unit, which exceeds the 1.5 parking spaces required by the redevelopment plan. Mr. Chase also said that Mr. Ruschke had suggested that the parking at Vernon Grove be reviewed, and that was done. He noted that the parking at Vernon Grove has 1 parking space per unit. Mr. Chase said that at Vernon Grove, there are

numbered spots guaranteeing one per unit. He also said that the other parking in the immediate vicinity is also used for amenities in the development.

Mr. Warner asked about the 1 spot per unit provided for under the ITE standards manual, and if it is expected to cover both residents and guests. Mr. Chase said that it does. Mr. Warner asked if the examples in the ITE manual included any in New Jersey. Mr. Chase said that New Jersey was included, however the manual did not specify where in New Jersey.

Mrs. Swartz asked if handicapped parking is mandated for this development, and where it would be located. Mr. Chase said that the development is still subject to the ADA, and there will be two designated handicapped spots. Mr. Travisano asked what the plan is for overflow parking. Mr. Chase said that they do not anticipate a problem, as the national standard suggests 1 vehicle per unit. He also said that the RSIS anticipates half a space per unit for visitor parking, which leads to a combined need of 1.5 spaces per unit.

Mr. Warner asked about the distance from the buildings to the property line near the Police Department. Mrs. Ruskan said that the dimension in question was from the parking lot rather than one of the buildings. She also said that the distance from the parking lot to the lot line has not changed.

Mr. Travisano asked how parking would be addressed if a third building was added for more affordable housing. Mr. Chase said a third building was not contemplated, however 14 more units could be added without adding more parking.

Mr. Ruschke asked about the research conducted on the Chatham Glen development. Mr. Chase said that plan documentation was reviewed, and a manual count of parking spaces was conducted. The site visit was conducted in the evening, and Mr. Chase said there did not appear to be any substantial overflow. Mr. Warner asked if the site visit was on a weekday or a weekend. Mr. Chase said that it was a weeknight at approximately 6:00 PM.

Mr. Travisano opened the floor for the public to ask questions.

1. Richard Matlaga, 36 Dale Drive, referenced an article in NJ.com stating that a development in Teaneck had 68 units and 138 parking spots. Mr. Matlaga said he is concerned about overflow parking, and noted that it is not near a mass transit center.
2. Sue Hoag, 76 Canterbury Road, asked where the fire departments would be expected to park if they respond to an emergency at the development. Mr. Chase said that the site access was reviewed with the fire departments, and they would be expected to be able to use the parking lots. A fire truck would potentially be able to turn around by the trash area, or could back out of the parking lot.

Seeing no further questions, the floor was closed to the public.

Laurence Appel, the architect for the applicant, was recalled to give additional testimony. Mr. Appel addressed Exhibit A-7, which is a material board. He said that a premium product has

been selected for the vinyl siding, and he said that the exhibit has a sample of the material. Mr. Appel said that minimal painting would be needed, and it is impervious to water. Mr. Appel also commented on the proposed roof shingles.

Mrs. Ozdemir asked if other materials were considered. Mr. Appel said that other materials were considered, and the proposed materials were deemed the best option. Mr. Coviello asked if the material will be AZEK or “AZEK-like.” He noted that substitute materials do not hold up as well over time. Mr. Appel said that AZEK is a trade name, and the material used will be an equal material. Mr. Banisch reiterated that the Board should not unnecessarily add cost to an affordable housing project. Mr. Coviello said he is not looking to add costs to the project, but wants to make sure that the project still looks good in the future. Mr. Travisano asked if the applicant would be willing to specify the material with an “as equal” option. Mr. Kasuba said that the applicant will agree to stipulate the material.

The floor was opened for the public to ask questions.

1. Richard Matlaga, 36 Dale Drive, asked if a basement is proposed for the project. Mr. Appel said that it is a slab on grade. Mr. Matlaga asked if the color for the siding will be the crème color presented. Mr. Appel said that the color will be as presented.
2. Stacey Ewald, 54 Nicholson Drive, asked if there are exhibits showing the interior details of the units. Mr. Appel said that there are detailed floor plans. Mrs. Ewald asked if there will be a presentation of proposed fixtures, cabinets and such. Mr. Warner said that there is not a legal requirement under the MLUL for that sort of information to be presented to the Planning Board, as it does not relate to land use.
3. Jennifer McNally, 19 Ferndale Lane, asked if there is a building project with the proposed APEK siding that people can go see to get a sense of how it wears. Mr. Appel said that examples of APEK are common. He also said that any product will require maintenance, and the competitive composites have similar characteristics.
4. Sue Hoag, 76 Canterbury Road, asked about storage space for the units. Mr. Appel said that storage space will be in the units.
5. Mr. Matlaga also asked about the amount of storage space. Mr. Appel said that it was only for the 1-bedroom units that there is a deviation variance requested for the amount of storage space.
6. Sarah Kelliher, 143 Huron Drive, asked if the proposed units will be managed by the same management company as the Arbor Green complex in Edgewater. Mr. Kasuba said that this project is not related to the condo complex in Edgewater.

Seeing no further questions from the public, the floor was closed.

Mr. Warner said that the Board has an extension through July to act on this application. Mr. Kasuba asked that the next meeting date be announced so that additional notice would not be necessary. The hearing will be continued on July 1st.

The Board took a recess at 8:51 PM.

The meeting was reconvened at 9:00 PM.

PB 19-66-1 (February 7, 2019) STERLING/SUN AT CHATHAM, LLC, (Dixiedale) 351 Hillside Avenue, BLOCK: 66, LOT: 1.

Mr. Robert Kasuba, the attorney for the applicant, said that the application is for preliminary and final site plan approval with some variances for 53 townhouse units at what is known as the Dixiedale property. Notice of the application was provided, and the hearing has been carried to this meeting. Mr. Warner agreed that the hearing was properly noticed and the Board has jurisdiction to hear the application.

Patricia Ruskan, the civil engineer for the applicant, was sworn in to give testimony. The Board professionals were also sworn in. Mrs. Ruskan provided her qualifications and was accepted as an expert witness in the field of civil engineering.

Mrs. Ruskan presented Exhibit A-1, which is an aerial image of the site. Mrs. Ruskan described the property and the immediate vicinity. She said that there is Township-owned open space to the north and west of the property. There is residential development to the south and east, as well as the far north. Mrs. Ruskan said that the site is located in the R-6C zone district. The property is currently developed with a single-family home and other out-buildings. Mrs. Ruskan said that the property is known as the Dixiedale Farm, and functioned as a Christmas tree farm. Access to the property is from Hillside Avenue with some gated access from River Road. The site also has some freshwater wetlands, and there is a letter of interpretation from the NJDEP delineating the wetlands. Mrs. Ruskan also described the wetlands areas. She also addressed the slopes on the property.

Exhibit A-2 was presented, which is a colored landscape plan. Mrs. Ruskan said that the exhibit is a composite of the landscape plans in the site plan. She said that the applicant is proposing 53 units, including 50 townhomes and 3 units on the second floor of the existing mansion. The first floor of the mansion will be the clubhouse facility. All other existing buildings will be demolished. Mrs. Ruskan also said that there will be driveways and garages for the units, and RSIS requires 3.5 spaces per unit. Mrs. Ruskan also addressed the availability of guest parking. She said that RSIS standards require 154 parking spaces, and the application proposes 181 parking spaces in the driveways and garages with 43 guest parking spaces. There is additional parking proposed near the clubhouse, with additional accessory garage for the units above the clubhouse. A variance is requested for the setback of the accessory garage from the roadway proposed for the development. The townhouses will be a combination of 2-unit and 3-unit buildings. There will be privacy screening between units. Access to the development will be from Hillside Avenue, with one access point for everyday use and two additional emergency access points.

Mr. Travisano asked if access for construction vehicles will also be from Hillside Avenue. Mrs. Ruskan said that it might make sense for some construction access from River Road. Mr. Travisano suggested that construction trucks be routed through New Providence to River Road rather than coming through Chatham Borough. He suggested that a construction traffic plan be developed. Mr. Kasuba said that development of such a plan can be discussed.

Mrs. Ruskan described the proposed roadway for the development, which is being referred to as Benjamin Way. She also said that it will be a private road, and will be 24 feet wide and 2100 linear feet long. The road will have cul-de-sacs and both the eastern and western ends.

Mrs. Ruskan said that there is not any proposed impact to the wetlands on the site. She also described the proposed mulch walkway through the open space on the site. The walking trail will also have access from River Road, and it will be open to the public. Mrs. Ruskan also addressed the three proposed infiltration detention basins. A monument sign is also proposed at the entrance to the development. Mrs. Ruskan said that the sign will 12 feet wide and five feet high. The sign will be double sided and will be set back 15 feet from the property line, and will have ground mounted up-lights.

Mrs. Ruskan said that they tried to minimize the street lighting at the site, and she described the fixtures and their proposed locations. The light will be directed downward, and will be controlled by photocells so that they will only be in operation from dusk to dawn. Additional lighting will be provided for parking areas. A design waiver is requested for the reduced lighting levels. Mrs. Ruskan said that there will not be any light trespass from the property.

The proposed landscaping was also addressed, and Mrs. Ruskan said that a variety of species were selected, including deer resistant plants. The plan seeks to preserve the wooded areas. 437 trees are proposed for removal, with 396 replacement trees to be planted. Landscaping will be planted along the tiered retaining walls. Mrs. Swartz asked about preserving the hedgerow along Hillside Avenue, noting that the hedgerow is part of the unique character of the property. Mrs. Ruskan said that the hedgerow has mostly been preserved, but some sections had to be removed for traffic safety.

Exhibit A-3 was presented, which is the overall grading and drainage plan. She said that in order for the steep slopes to accommodate the proposed development, some grading is necessary. The majority of the disturbance is concentrated in the northern and central area of the property. Disturbance of sensitive areas such as the wetlands and the steep slopes has been minimized. Positive drainage has also been included. An import material will be needed in the amount of 43,850 cubic yards of soil. The retaining walls will be 6 feet high and will be tiered, with a 12 foot wide separation. There will be plantings to soften the appearance of the retaining walls, and there will be a four foot high ornamental fence at the top level for fall protection. The walls will be modular block, with the exception of the wall by unit 5 which will be a different material due to its proximity to the wetlands.

A variance is requested for slope disturbance. Mrs. Ruskan said that 3.56 acres in the slope range of 15%-20% will be disturbed, and in the 20%-25% range 1.69 acres will be disturbed. In the >25% slope area, 1.51 acres are proposed to be disturbed. 6.76 acres total in the regulated

area are proposed to be disturbed. Mrs. Ruskan said that the disturbance cannot be avoided for the site to be developed, and the disturbance is needed in order to have an access road, walkout basements and necessary infrastructure.

Three infiltration basins are proposed. The stormwater management system will include a forbay for pretreatment of total suspended solids and first flush contaminants. The infiltration basins will address the water quality and water quantity, as well as stormwater recharge. Runoff will be collected in storm sewers. Mrs. Ruskan said that the infiltration basins will normally be dry, and they are designed to drain within 72 hours. The stormwater management system has been designed to in accordance with DEP Stormwater II regulations, Township ordinances and the RSIS manual. A maintenance manual has also been submitted, and it will be the responsibility of either the applicant or the homeowner's association to maintain the stormwater facilities.

Exhibit A-4 was submitted, which is the overall utility plan. Mrs. Ruskan said that the sanitary sewer system was split in half, and she described how the waste will be collected from the units. Water will be provided by New Jersey American Water, and a main extension will be required. Mr. Travisano asked if there are any concerns about water availability. Mrs. Ruskan said that they have met with NJAW, and the proposed connection location was suggested by them. Mrs. Ozdemir asked the maintenance of the sewer lines. Mrs. Ruskan addressed the manhole access for the sewer lines. Mrs. Ruskan said that gas service will be provided by PSE&G, electric by JCP&L, phones by Verizon and cable by Cablevision. The proposed utilities will be underground.

Mr. Kasuba proposed that the review letter dated June 12th from Mr. Ruschke's office be discussed. Mrs. Ruskan said that an agreement has been made to work out the issues raised in the comments in Mr. Ruschke's letter.

Mr. Kelly asked about a comment in the letter about sedimentation in an off-site pond. Mr. Kasuba said that is something the applicant will be working out with Mr. Ruschke. Mr. Ruschke said that his comment is in reference to soil erosion sediment control standards, and he wants to be sure that the development does not have a negative impact on Chatham Glen. Mr. Kasuba proposed that the engineers sort out this matter offline.

Mr. Ruschke commented on the traffic route for construction traffic, and that it would be a more convenient route from Route 24. Mrs. Swartz said that the rail bridge on River Road may be too low for construction trucks.

Mrs. Ruskan went over the items in the letter from Mr. Ruschke's letter that can be addressed.

Mr. Coviello said that the tree survey was reported to have been conducted in 2015, and the years since have been had wet weather. He asked how the weather since 2015 has affected the size of the trees since the survey was conducted. Mrs. Ruskan said that the survey took a representative area of the site. Mr. Coviello said that there may be more regulated trees now than there were when the survey was conducted. Mr. Ruschke asked about the proposed tree density. Mrs. Ruskan said that the density will be calculated. Mrs. Swartz asked if the tree farm area is included in the survey, noting that some of those trees may have been cut down. Mr.

Ruschke said that the tree protection ordinance does not prevent trees from being taken down, but rather looks at the final density.

Ms. Hagner asked about the fill to be brought into the site. Mrs. Ruskan showed on the plans where the fill will be needed. Mr. Travisano asked if Mrs. Ruskan will be the engineer to certify the source of the fill and that it is clean fill. Mrs. Ruskan said that an environmental engineer will sign off on the fill. Mr. Ruschke said that usually an environmental consultant submits a review of the source of the fill.

Mrs. Ozdemir asked about retaining walls on the western side of the project. Mrs. Ruskan said that retaining walls were not needed there, as the topography is such that they can work with the grade. Mrs. Ruskan said that the units on that side will have walk out basements.

Mr. Sheth asked using pond water for irrigation. Mrs. Ruskan said that it is a small drainage area going to the existing pond, and it was not considered for use in irrigation.

Mr. Travisano asked about the refuse collection plan. Mrs. Ruskan said that the units will store the trash in their garage, and put it out on pickup day. Mr. Travisano asked about a developer's agreement. Mr. Kasuba said that a developer's agreement will be addressed after the project is approved.

Mrs. Swartz asked for clarification about trash pickup, and if the homeowner's association would have a contract. Mrs. Ruskan said that it will be handled like a single-family home. Mrs. Swartz also asked about recycling pickup. Mr. Kasuba said he will find out how recycling will be handled.

Mr. Kelly asked if there is a difference between an infiltration basin and a detention basin. Mrs. Ruskan said that an infiltration basin is a type of detention basin, and that in smaller storms the basins will collect water for recharge into the aquifer. Mr. Kelly asked about a rain garden approach. Mrs. Ruskan said that a standard rain garden would not be applicable to a project of this size. Mr. Kelly asked about the dimensions of the sign at the entrance of the development. Mrs. Ruskan said the proposed sign will be 5 feet high and 12 feet wide. Mr. Kelly said that seems significantly larger than the signs in the Chatham Glen areas. Mrs. Ruskan said that the size conforms to the Township code. Mr. Kelly asked about the material for the sign. Mrs. Ruskan said that it will be a mixture of materials, and referred to the section of the plans that deals with the sign.

Mrs. Ozdemir asked about the construction sequencing. Mrs. Ruskan said that the infiltration basins will be built first, and the order of the units is to be determined later.

Mr. Sheth asked if the sales will take place in a trailer or a model unit. Mrs. Ruskan said that the units closest to the access drive will be built first, with sales to take place there. The site will have a trailer for construction offices.

Mr. Travisano opened the floor for the public to ask questions.

1. Stacey Ewald, 54 Nicholson Drive, asked if Hillside Avenue will be enhanced to improve traffic flow. Mrs. Ruskan said that there is not a plan for work on Hillside Avenue. Mrs. Ewald asked if the walkway trails will be open to the public. Mrs. Ruskan said they will be public trails. Mrs. Ewald said that there is not parking available for the public to access the trails.
2. Richard Matlaga, 36 Dale Drive, asked about the width of the proposed roadway. Mrs. Ruskan said it will be 24 feet wide, which meets the RSIS standards. Mr. Matlaga asked if the homeowner's association will need a maintenance building. Mrs. Ruskan said they will likely have a third party handle plowing and landscaping. Mr. Matlaga asked if the three infiltration basins will be connected. Mrs. Ruskan described how the water from the basins will discharge. Mr. Matlaga also asked about emergency services access to the site. Mrs. Ruskan said that they will have access. Mr. Warner suggested that Knox boxes be installed.
3. Sue Hoag, 76 Canterbury Road, said that there is a hedgerow along River Road, and asked if it will be enhanced and maintained. Mrs. Ruskan showed on the plans which sections of hedgerow will be maintained. Mrs. Hoag asked about the infiltration rates of the basins. Mrs. Ruskan addressed the permeability rates. Mrs. Hoag asked if there is sufficient sewer capacity for this development. Mrs. Ruskan addressed treatment works approval application, and said that the plans have been reviewed by Mr. Ruschke's office. Mrs. Hoag asked where the electric feed will be located. Mrs. Ruskan said that it will most likely be from the northwest corner of the site, but JCP&L may need to make some upgrades. Mrs. Hoag asked what substation will be the source. Mrs. Ruskan was not sure which substation will be used.
4. Christina Mott, 22 Nicholson Drive, asked if organic lawn management is proposed for the development. Mrs. Ruskan said that will be determined by the homeowner's association and the management company.
5. Anna Marie Strand, 79 Watching Ave, noted that the access road is in a different spot than where the existing driveway is located. Mrs. Ruskan described the hedgerow leading from the road to the mansion. Mrs. Strand also asked about the flow of construction traffic, and if an alternate route could be used. Mr. Travisano asked for a traffic plan to be developed for the next meeting. Mrs. Swartz noted that some roads have tonnage limits and railroad overpasses.

Mr. Coviello asked about cleanup of the dump site. Mrs. Ruskan said that it will be cleaned up as part of the project, as it is in the vicinity of some of the proposed buildings. Mr. Warner said that the cleanup will be considered a stipulation. Mr. Coviello asked about safe access to the exterior roads from the property. Mrs. Ruskan said there is not a separate sidewalk. Mr. Coviello asked if thought has been given to sidewalks, as the project will not be age restricted.

6. Mr. Matlaga said that improvements to Hillside Avenue should be considered so that it will be able to safely handle the traffic load. Mr. Travisano said the applicant will

present a traffic engineer, and conclusions should not be reached before all professionals have provided testimony.

The hearing will be carried until July 1st without further notice. The applicant agreed to an extension through the month of July for action to be taken.

Mr. Travisano moved to excuse Mr. Tarasca's absence. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Franko moved to adjourn at 10:58 PM. Ms. Hagner seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Gregory J. LaConte
Planning Board Recording Secretary