## Township of Manalapan

120 Route 522 \& Taylors Mills Road Manalapan, NJ 07726

Planning Board Minutes Reorganization and Public Meeting February 8, 2024

The meeting was called to order with the reading of the Open Public Meetings Act by Chairwoman Kathryn Kwaak at 7:30 p.m., followed by the salute to the flag.

Mr. Brown read the TV Disclosure Statement and took the Roll Call of the Board.
In attendance at the meeting: Barry Fisher, Todd Brown, John Castronovo, Barry Jacobson, Kathryn Kwaak, Jack McNaboe, Richard Hogan, Steve Kastell, Brian Shorr, Nunzio Pollifrone, Pat Givelekian.

Also present: Ronald Cucchiaro, Planning Board Attorney Brian Boccanfuso, Planning Board Engineer Jennifer Beahm, Planning Board Planner Nancy McGrath, Recording Secretary

Deputy Mayor McNaboe administered the Oaths of Office to Nunzio Pollifrone and Pat Givelekian the two alternates to the Planning Board.

Mr. Cucchiaro swore in Brian Boccanfuso, Professional Engineer, and Jennifer Beahm, Professional Planner.

## Minutes:

A Motion was made by Chief Hogan and Seconded by Mr. Shorr to approve the Minutes of January 11, 2024 as written.

| Yes: | Brown, Castronovo, Jacobson, Kwaak, McNaboe, Hogan, Kastell, Shorr |
| :--- | :--- |
| No: | None |
| Absent: | None |
| Abstain: | None |
| Not Eligible: | Fisher, Pollifrone, Givelekian |

## Resolutions

PMS2314 ~ Vincent Tornatore
45 Saupe Drive ~ Block 339 / Lot 12.01
A Motion was made by Chief Hogan and Seconded by Mr. Brown to memorialize the Vincent Tornatore Two-Lot Minor Subdivision

| Yes: | Brown, Castronovo, Jacobson, Kwaak, McNaboe, Hogan, Shorr |
| :--- | :--- |
| No: | None |
| Absent: | None |
| Abstain: | None |
| Not Eligible: | Kastell, Pollifrone, Givelekian |

## Applications

## PFM2308~ Lamb Lane Stables, LLC

Lamb Lane ~ Block 74/Lot 14.02
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan
12 buildings/stables
Mr. Cucchiaro announced the application to be carried to the March 14, 2024 Planning Board meeting with no further noticing to the property owners.

PMS2238 ~ Monmouth Battlefield Flex Co., LLC
Route 33~Block 79.02/Lots 2, 3 \& 5
Preliminary \& Final Major Site Plan - Flex Space
Hearing \#3
Please refer to the transcript below for application PMS2238 Monmouth Battlefield Flex.
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CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: I would like to call this meeting to order for the Manalapan Township Planning Board, February 8th at 7:30.

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, notice of this meeting was sent and advertised in the Asbury Park Press.

A copy of that notice was posted on the bulletin board where public notices are displayed in the municipal building.

In addition, a copy of this notice is and has been available to the public and is on file in the office of the municipal clerk. Accordingly, this meeting is deemed to be in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Can we please stand and salute the flag.
(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Todd, can you please read the $T V$ Disclosure statement?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: The Township of Manalapan Television Network will be videotaping this meeting for re-broadcast on MTTN Channel 77 on Cablevision and Channel 42 on Verizon Fios.

By attending this evening the attendees
acknowledge this recording and agree to allow their image to be broadcast on MTTN Channel 77 and Verizon Fios Channel 42 .

All attendees and participants agree to conduct themselves in a manner appropriate for public gathering. Inappropriate behavior or gatherings creating a disturbance or safety hazard are prohibited inside this meeting.

Individual speakers should be advised that no right of privacy protects a citizen's public comments made in a public forum.

Any statements made by members of the public to promote or alter public opinion about a candidate for political office, a political party or interest group are inappropriate and in violation of MTTN broadcast policies.

Accordingly, all participants bear responsibility for their own statements and commentary.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Thank you. Can you also do roll call, please.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Mr. Fisher?

MEMBER FISHER: Here.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Mr. Brown, here.

Mr. Castronovo?

Mr. CASTRONOVO: Here.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Mr. Jacobson?
COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: Here.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Chairman
Kwaak?

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Yes.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Mr. McNaboe?

COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: Here.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Chief Hogan?

FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Present.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Mr. Kastell?

MEMBER KASTELL: Here.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Mr. Shorr?

MEMBER SHORR: Here.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN:

Mr. Pollifrone?

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Present.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: And

Mr. Givelekian?

MEMBER GIVELEKIAN: Present.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Thank you.
(Whereupon, board members were sworn.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Mr. Cucchiaro, swear in the professionals.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are going to provide this board is the truth the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

PLANNER BEAHM: I do.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Yes, I do.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the board continues with posted agenda.)

-     -         - 

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay, on to PMS2238 Monmouth Battlefield Flex, LLC, Route 33, Block 79.02, Lots 2, 3 and 5. Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan flex space.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Madam Chair?
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Just before we get started, just by way of housekeeping, I notice there's a lot of suits out there walking around.

Mr. Giunco, any other attorney who is here representing someone, could you just enter your appearance.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: No, just my
witnesses.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, enter your appearance, then.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Enter your
appearance, he's saying.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I didn't hear you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I didn't know if you would be aware if anyone who is not part of your team showed up, that's why $I$ was asking. You would know.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I don't, of course.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: John, just enter your appearance, please.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Enter your appearance; say who you are on the record.

AtTORNEY GIUNCO: John Giunco, Giordano Halleran \& Ciesla, appearing on behalf of the applicant.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Thank you.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Sorry.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: All right,
Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay, Mr. Giunco.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: When we were here
last there were some edits requested for the plan and Mr. Halari -- -

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Speak up a little bit.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: When we were last here we entered most of our testimony, but there were some revisions to the plans proposed and Mr. Halari has worked on those and I'm going to offer his testimony now with regard to the revisions to the plans and status. And there were a couple of open questions.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Halari, you were previously sworn?

BHASKAR HALARI: Not on this
application, no.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No?
BHASKAR HALARI: No.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Do you
swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

BHASKAR HALARI: I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and
spell your name for the record.
BHASKAR HALARI: Sure. My name is

## B. Halari, P.E.

Bhaskar Halarai, $H-A-L-A-R-I . ~ P r o f e s s i o n a l ~ e n g i n e e r$, Concept Engineering, Manalapan, New Jersey.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Bhaskar, you're a licensed professional engineer?

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes, sir.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Ms. Chairman, we
offer Mr. Halari as an expert in the field of civil engineering.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: His credentials are sufficient. He has been before this board before.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: You're welcome.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\mathrm{E} & \mathrm{X} & \mathrm{A} & \mathrm{M} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{N} & \mathrm{A} & \mathrm{T} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{O} & \mathrm{N}\end{array}$

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Since the last meeting would you describe to the board any edits or amendments that you made to the plans?

THE WITNESS: Sure. I'm just going to briefly go through the existing site here. I don't know if all the members remember from the last hearing that --

PLANNER BEAHM: Bhaskar, this is the

## B. Halari, P.E.

third hearing, just put the proposed plan up.
THE WITNESS: Okay, great. Makes life easier.

Like I said, here is the proposed plan. So the changes that we have made on this plan, as you can see previously we had one large building. Now we have divided that into four buildings. The square foot is about similar, each building is about 48,140 square feet.

The entrance to the site stays at the same location as previously was proposed.

We have a circular driveway system that goes around all four buildings.

The loading and unloading is located in the center courtyard, which is covered by the four buildings around.

The buildings, the two north buildings are divided into 13 units each, and those buildings will have one loading dock in the back and obviously the office space would be on the front, that is facing the parking lot.

The two buildings located to the south has a 15-unit each. That will have about -- sorry, that has ten units with a loading dock and there is five units facing south which each will have a

## B. Halari, P.E.

drive-in door.
And again, all units will have a small office, a bathroom facility.

The change of this design also required us to change the stormwater management design, so we have, this plan shows ten infiltration basins.

There is -- nine of them are small infiltration and one large infiltration basin.

So as you can see on this plan we have two that is located on the westerly property line, that is two on the southerly side. There's two on the easterly side, and then two that is on the northeasterly corner of the property.

The site is serviced by public water and septic. The plan shows the two septic systems. One septic system for Building 1 and 2, that is located on the northerly portion of the site. And for Building 3 and 4 we have one septic system located on southeasterly corner of the site.

We have one design waiver and one variance.

Sorry, before $I$ go there, we have proposed the sidewalk and the curbing along the Business 33. And we propose a contribution for sidewalk and curbing to the Express 33 on the south.

## B. Halari, P.E.

Again, it's the board's choice but we think sidewalk on the express will not serve any...

PLANNER BEAHM: So before you go any further, I just want to say I reviewed the transcript of the last meeting and there was reference to the fact that you agreed to put sidewalk on both frontages.

I'm not suggesting that that's what they do, but that was what was represented to us in August that you were willing to put sidewalk on Business 33 and Express 33. So it will ultimately be up to you guys as the board as to what you want, but they have expressed the willingness to do both.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Correct.
PLANNER BEAHM: I just want to make that clear, from the transcript.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We do understand that the board had expressed a preference to make a contribution to the Sidewalk Fund instead of putting the sidewalks along the southern frontage of the property along the expressway to Route 33. So either way we would fulfill the obligation.

PLANNER BEAHM: John, you've got to talk into that mic because $I$ can guarantee that people in the back cannot hear a word you're saying.

## B. Halari, P.E.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Either way we would fulfill the obligation, either pay in lieu of or build the sidewalks in that location.

PLANNER BEAHM: And, Bhaskar, I just want to correct you. You said one waiver and one variance, I think there's two waivers; you have the buffer --

THE WITNESS: Okay, yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: -- and the foundation plantings.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
PLANNER BEAHM: And another variance for the signage.

THE WITNESS: Sign, correct.
PLANNER BEAHM: I just want to be clear.

THE WITNESS: No, no. I misspoke, yes. Thank you very much, I appreciate it.

PLANNER BEAHM: No problem.
THE WITNESS: So the waiver we just
talked about a minute ago, one waiver is in reference to providing a landscaping and berming along Local 33.

Previous to the last meeting there was a discussion about another office meeting with a

## B. Halari, P.E.

shade tree from -- sorry, Shari spero from CME to review the existing densely wooded area along that Business 33.

Upon the site visit with John Ploskonka from our office and Shari, they came to a conclusion that it is definitely worth preserving, these trees are 40 to 50 feet in height and they provide a much better screening than removing them and installing a berm and putting landscaping.

There is one existing house which creates a small opening. So in that area we have provided a dense landscaping to fill up that gap.

On to the south site, there is some vegetation that exists along the Express 33 but it's not dense enough to provide the screening. So on the south side we have basically provided compliant berming with the landscaping on the south end.

And the second waiver that we just discussed about, as you can see we have provided a foundation planting all around the building except for where there's a loading dock or a drive-in door or a walk-in, like vehicular -- sorry, pedestrian access into the building, but we have provided, like you can see on this building which is facing to the south, we have a landscape island along the

## B. Halari, P.E.

frontage. Obviously on all four sides we have provided foundation planting. But because it's required all around but we couldn't provide where the drive-in door and the loading dock and the walk-in doors are, it's still technically considered a waiver.

The variance relates to one directory sign. The project proposes two signs. There is a one sign monument sign at the entrance of the driveway on Business 33. As you can see on this blowup it's landscape island area with a sign located in the center. That sign is compliant to the ordinance requirement.

The second sign is proposed at the, basically, end of the main driveway going into our site before the first intersection. And that is a directory sign. It's 32 square feet which would provide basically the names of the companies located in the four buildings so the person knows whether to make a right turn or a left turn, and which way to go.

Our architect has provided -- he did the details and he will go over the sign detail in his testimony.

And this is primarily the changes. I

## B. Halari, P.E.

think the intent here was that we made an application under the previous definition of a flex space, originally that we are one large building, but subsequently the town abandoned the flex space definition and the applicant directed our office to come up with a plan which as compliant as possible with this new definition of the flex space.

So, therefore, this plan shows the total 56 units, so the intent is for a small user, $3,000 / 2,500$ square feet. And we basically met all of the requirements except for the building height where the new definition of a flex space has much restricted building height. But we have reduced the height from what was previously proposed. Previously was 42 feet, we have reduced to 37 . And 37 is because of the loading area in the back; the way the definition characterizes the building height is you take an average of four elevations on the corner and because you have a loading dock on one side you have four feet of extra depth or height. So because of that average it's 37 but the building themselves are 35 feet high.

And the architect can go into much
further detail about the looks and how it is designed to be like an architect really meeting the

## B. Halari, P.E.

flex-space type of design.
I think, John, I don't have...
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: With regard to the waivers, could you advise the board if you've analyzed whether they would be reasonable given the design and the scope of the project?

THE WITNESS: Sure. As we said previously that the existing mature vegetation serves a better screening than removing them, so that just justifies that. And also the board/Shade Tree person also agreed with that based on the site meeting.

And as far as the waiver for the foundation planting, well, obviously, it's impractical to provide a foundation planting where you're walking into the building, where you're driving a vehicle into the building. So just from the physical standpoint that waiver is -- is required, but actually we have tried to comply with the requirements.

And the sign, again, as we $I$ think we had discussed in the previous hearing as well, the directory sign is more for the means, so people are visiting the site, so they don't have to walk or drive around to find the location. The ordinance

## B. Halari, P.E.

doesn't provide any directory sign. Even Jennifer, last meeting, she was in favor of having this sign because, obviously, that would make people visiting the site, easier to find the location.

So I think that is a -- a public benefit and that's why we think the variance for the sign is justified.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: And while you're on signs, Bhaskar, $I$ know there was a request -- $I$ know there was a request for some additional signage for directional throughout the project. Are we able to accommodate that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that we'll
accommodate. But those are within the township ordinance requirements, we will provide that.

PLANNER BEAHM: John, I'm sorry, I cannot hear you myself so $I$ can guarantee you the people in the back cannot hear you and so $I$ don't even know what you just said, like, literally about the signage.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, I asked Bhaskar, there was a request for additional signage was he able to accommodate it.

THE WITNESS: Directional signage is what he was talking about. So we don't have that

## B. Halari, P.E.

signage on the plan but we will talk to your office and see what additional signage you think we need.

PLANNER BEAHM: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Excuse me --
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I have no other
questions.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- would the addition of the signage require any relief?

THE WITNESS: No, no, the sign,
directional signage we'll propose within the township ordinance, whatever is permitted. We're not looking for relief on that.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK, Bhaskar, your
testimony is done?
THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
Professionals, questions? Jen? Ron.
PLANNER BEAHM: So when you're talking about the height of the building being 37 feet does that include the structures that are on top of the roof to screen the HVAC?

THE WITNESS: I think I will let the architect speak to that because he's here and he will explain that, yes.

PLANNER BEAHM: So I just want it to

## B. Halari, P.E.

be clear that $I$ don't want to forget about that because the building itself is $X$, but then the building plus the screening, and $I$ think from the prior testimony those screens are 6 to 8 feet so that would take it to maybe 45 feet or, you know, maybe 43 feet. So $I$ just want to be clear on what we're dealing with with respect to that.

THE WITNESS: Understood.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, Mr. Wagner is our architect, he's here. He'll discuss the screening and that way...

PLANNER BEAHM: And then, I mean $I$ guess it's going to be you, considering $I$ know that at the prior hearing you had Mr. Denholtz here to talk about the use, but then he was, like, excused.

Do you legitimately anticipate having 56 tenants at this space? Or, like, what's the average?

I'm just saying, you know, because that's what you're showing on the plan but, in theory, someone could come and take three spaces. So based upon experience are we legitimately thinking we're going to have 57 users? Or are we going to have something less than that?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, I can address

## B. Halari, P.E.

that. I have a similar project in Marlboro, it's about 100,000 square feet and there is one tenant in the entire site that has more than three spaces. Primarily it's either one 2, 500 unless it's slightly bigger, or two.

And that's -- that's you're asking me in general, that's my experience.

PLANNER BEAHM: Okay.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: So I do anticipate
that we'll have a number of tenants there that will want two spaces, possibly somebody might want a third, but $I$ don't think that's very -- I mean, it will happen -- it can happen, but $I$ don't think it's likely.

PLANNER BEAHM: And then, I notice
John Rea is not here, right, so we're going to
postpone the traffic to another date?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, he was travelling today, there was...

PLANNER BEAHM: Totally fine. I'm just saying --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yeah, we might have to postpone the traffic.

PLANNER BEAHM: -- I have some questions about, like, the parking and things like

## B. Halari, P.E.

that; is that going to be deferred to him or is, Bhaskar, are you handling that?

THE WITNESS: Jennifer, I just talked to John and --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I didn't know.
THE WITNESS: -- John Giunco didn't know about it, but John Rea is on his way and he should be here by 8:30, so just so you know.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We'll save it for Mr. Rea but my understanding also is that the traffic counts that you guys were going to perform, there was something wrong with the strips that were out there, and we don't have that tonight, right?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: That is correct. However, $I$ think -- and $I$ don't know this because $I$ didn't get to speak to him -- but when we became aware of that he expected to have the counts this week but we didn't have the report ready. So I don't know if that got completed because he's been away until today.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I have not seen it.

PLANNER BEAHM: So when we talked the last time when you were envisioning that bigger building being divided up to ten tenant spaces, we

## B. Halari, P.E.

talked about the adequacy of the trash enclosure, the size of it and the number.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: Can you talk -- has
that changed?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: Are you proposing
additional trash enclosures; like how is that going to be handled?

THE WITNESS: Sure, let me -- so this plan proposes eight trash enclosures, so two along the northerly part of the site. And then there is a back-to-back trash enclosure that are in the island area between the two buildings. And then basically mirror image of the north trash enclosure area we have two on the south.

So in total we have eight, each is 24 by 11, so each can accommodate three dumpsters. And I really think this is adequate for the site.

PLANNER BEAHM: Great. Thank you.

I'm assuming the architect is going to talk about the sign details because $I$ have some concern about the --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: -- the ground sign and

## B. Halari, P.E.

the piers and the height of the piers. So I'll defer that to later?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: You should have had -- I thought there was a submission.

PLANNER BEAHM: I have it.
ATtORNEY GIUNCO: Oh, Okay.
PLANNER BEAHM: I have it. So now I have some questions about it.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Of course. But Mr. Wagner is here. In fact, I intended to call him when Mr. Halari has completed his testimony, if the board approves.

PLANNER BEAHM: Okay. I don't have anything else. Brian?

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Thanks.
Bhaskar, did you state that there were eight refuse enclosures proposed?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: And where are --
I only identified four.
THE WITNESS: So there are two right in the center here. These are back-to-back, in this area here.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Oh, okay. Got it.

## B. Halari, P.E.

THE WITNESS: Basically we have one
trash enclosure at each end of the buildings.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Understood.

Okay. I didn't catch those ones in the middle there. Great.

THE WITNESS: It happens. Happens to me too.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Great. As you alluded to there were some adjustments to the stormwater management system as a result of the redesign of the site. We had some comments on those in our technical engineer report.

To the extent that the minor revisions or additional analysis are required to address them, do you have any issues with those comments?

THE WITNESS: As a matter of fact, we agreed to supply and revise the plans, as per your engineering report, dated January 10th, 2024 . And we will take care of all the items you have in that report to your satisfaction.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Great. Just today, this afternoon actually, I received a copy of the report from the Freehold area health department. Did you see that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we did.

## B. Halari, P.E.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: And did you review the comments in there?

They had some concerns about the, first of all, the fact that $I$ guess only two septic systems were proposed, and they weren't certain that sufficient soil logs were done. They also had a question about the 56 separate units and the challenges in predicting the volume of sewage generated from that.

Are those comments that you're going to be able to address with them? And if so, how?

THE WITNESS: Yes we will be able to address them. Obviously, we had done the soil testing for the disposal field located on the northern end of the site. As you can see on this plan we have two soil borings there. But in this revised design we proposed the second in the south end of this area -- southeasterly corner of the site, and we were not able to complete that testing before we made the application.

But while we were on the site we have done at least 30,40 soil logs.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: For stormwater management.

THE WITNESS: For stormwater

## B. Halari, P.E.

management. Another purpose, the site has regular soil or sandy soil. No water table. The site has no perc or anything, it's basically what you call high and dry piece of property. May be the last high and dry piece of property in Manalapan.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: It might be.
THE WITNESS: So we think we wouldn't have any issue performing the logs and making sure it works there.

As far as the sewer capacity concern, this type of use that we envision here, flex space, they tend to have a small office, this is like 10-by-20, and 200 square feet, and they don't have lot of people working there.

So we proposed in each office, and I think Eric will go over that, that we have an office in each of these units. And if he use an EP criteria for amount of square footage we have and according to those calculations, we have over 2000 gallons per day. And so we will comply with the water requirement.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: NOw, I
understand that and $I$ don't take any exception to the representation that small offices are going to generate small estimated flows for sewage. But if
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something were to change, I mean it's flex space, so that's kind of the point.

THE WITNESS: Right.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: What happens if
the end-users of the facility are something that is permitted and also generates a higher estimated sewer flow than an office use; do you have flexibility on the site to expand the footprint on the sewage disposal system, if necessary?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Are there other things you can do to make sure that you have a sufficiently sized system, because, obviously, if there is an approval, you have no choice but to comply with the Health Department requirements. You're going to have to make it work, otherwise you'll be back here with a modified design.

THE WITNESS: I agree. So the design of the field size that we have shown on the plan, each field size is for 2000 gallons. So actually the two fields totally can accommodate 4,000 gallons. But that would require NJPDES permit from the DEP and we can get that, that's not an issue. But as far as the space on the site as
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I said we have oversized beds already shown on the plan, which is worst-case scenario.

PLANNER BEAHM: So my concern is, let's just say, one of those spaces or two of those spaces get occupied by an indoor recreation facility, whether it's sports training, strength and agility. We just saw the one from you in

Englishtown that you put like that training facility in a space just like this, that is a little different scenario than like a small office that may have one or two people, you might have 25 , 30 kids in there at a time and the demand on the septic is going to be very different.
So my question -- and don't
misinterpret that $I^{\prime} m$ negative to that use, I'm just asking what is the trigger that would bring that back to the review of the board of health once this is approved, if it is approved?

THE WITNESS: Every tenant before they can occupy the space they're required to get a zoning approval.

PLANNER BEAHM: Right.
THE WITNESS: And also board of health
approval because whenever you have a septic system they automatically forward the file to the board of
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health to make sure that the new proposed use is going to comply with the soil capacity.

We have in the town right now, I mean on Route 33, the Kaiser buildings, there is two, two buildings right on 33 across from $I$ think there's a -- it's right on Route 33 between from Millhurst and - -

COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: From Pegasus.

THE WITNESS: Hmm?
COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Across from Pegasus.

THE WITNESS: Pegasus, yes, right there.

So those two -- there is existing
buildings and we used to occupy one of the space at one time, so that's why I know, we designed the project.

So every tenant that comes in there they required for zoning and then required to the board of health, and then make sure the soil capacity is there. If not, they don't get a permit. PLANNER BEAHM: Thank you. Sorry, Brian.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Not a problem. The bulk of the other comments in our
report have been addressed.
I think the only -- there were several
relative to traffic, which we'll get to, when Mr. Rea arrives and we hear his testimony.

We had a comment about a meeting that you had with Shari Spero from our office. I know that you did discuss the existing vegetation along Route 33 Business frontage, which you provided testimony on. I think that there was another comment that she had relative to specific information on tree replacement calculations and locations of specimen trees.

Is that something that you looked at, sir, or can you provide that information?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we can continue to provide that, yes.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: You have provided it?

THE WITNESS: No, we have not. VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Okay. THE WITNESS: We can provide it, I said.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Okay. Great. I think that's all $I$ have right now, Madam Chair. CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. Ron,
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anything before $I$ go on no?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No, Madam Chair.
Okay. Chief?
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Nothing at the
moment.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Jack?
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Nothing at the
moment.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Jack?
COUNCILMAN MCNABOE: No, I'll wait for the whole thing to go up.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. I just have a couple of questions for you, Bhaskar.

THE WITNESS: Sure, ma'am.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: In looking at the refuse enclosures, right, when you pull in the site, at the top of the picture there, the first two units on either side, when those people try to back up to the to those units, there're going to be not right now.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: I just have a couple of questions for you, Bhaskar.

THE WITNESS: Sure ma'am.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: In looking at the enclosures when you pull in the site, at the top

## B. Halari, P.E.

those first two units on either side, when those people try to back up to the loading dock they're going to be awful tight to that refuse.

THE WITNESS: You see there's loading docks -- the dock itself is normally eight feet wide.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
THE WITNESS: We provided 12 feet space for the loading dock. So what happens you have three feet on both sides of it.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And the pad itself for the trash enclosure is 11 feet deep, so you don't use the whole 11 feet in the back, so the gate and all that will be recessed in.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: So, in other words, if there's a truck there or something doing that, if the garbage people come to pick up the garbage, there's not going to be a problem?

THE WITNESS: Oh, I understand your question. If the truck is standing there, obviously, they cannot get to that trash enclosure, but we can give time for pick up when there is no truck there. But if there is truck when they come for garbage, people don't pick up, but we can hold
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the garbage, if necessary, but normally these type of tenants don't have high frequency of tractor-trailer coming around.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. You
mentioned about the signage. Now is there going to be signage directly on each signage of the buildings, like Building A, Building B as well?

Do they need relief for that, Jen?

PLANNER BEAHM: That was not shown.
And I think that that would be acceptable, if you had like $1,2,3,4, A, B, C, D . \quad I t ' s$ like if you every single tenant wants -- if you like have 57 tenant signs...

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Well, no. Like on the main sign when you come in Building A to the left it's this, but then to the left it says Building A?

PLANNER BEAHM: Yes, I think that's okay to have like the identification. It's no different than having your address on your house.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: So you want the identification location on the sign to match where they are on the site?

THE WITNESS: That makes sense.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: But I'm asking

## B. Halari, P.E.

also, too, does that trigger another...
PLANNER BEAHM: I think that's not --

I think that's permitted.
THE WITNESS: That's permitted.
PLANNER BEAHM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Will there be any storage trucks, storage of trucks overnight?

THE WITNESS: We haven't proposed no storage trucks. There is no parking provided to park the trucks.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Obviously, if there's some delivery or something that came and they need to complete the delivery before they close, then maybe they can stay there so they can complete the delivery, but there's no parking proposed.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
PLANNER BEAHM: So if one of your tenants is, let's say, a landscaping contractor that has multiple equipment, trucks, whatever, you're telling me they're not going to be stored here?

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Like a plumber, an electrician.

THE WITNESS: No, no.

PLANNER BEAHM: Like CJ Landscaping,
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when you drive into their space where they have one little tenant space, they have like 25 vehicles that stay there overnight while their employees take their cars and go home.

THE WITNESS: I think I misunderstood the comment.

PLANNER BEAHM: That's why I'm

THE WITNESS: What I thought as you were asking about tractor-trailers or trailer parking, that's what $I$ thought.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Both. I'm asking for both, and I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: No, no problem.
I think that, obviously, what Jen is pointing out is correct, if we have that type of tenant where the vehicle that they use for their normal business operation, that will be parked there overnight, yes.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. That's all
I have right now.
Brian?

MEMBER SHORR: I have a question, but
I might need Mr. Rea. I would like to see how the entrance and exit of trucks are coming in and
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leaving your facility, if you can go into a picture on that?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Do you have a circulation plan?

THE WITNESS: I do have a circulation plan that $I$ can show you.

So this plan shows the truck turning into the project. Then basically carrying into the loading dock and leaving the loading dock and going out and turning again on 33 .

So they can make the turns, no problems.

MEMBER SHORR: Okay, that's fine.
That's all $I$ wanted to know.
THE WITNESS: Sure, understand.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Barry?
COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: Getting back to about the trucks, what was -- I know you don't have any tenants yet, but do you envision mostly box trucks or tractor-trailers?

And if there are tractor-trailers, I know you are getting out, you know, because the way 33 is configured over there, there is a -- and going west, there's a slight bend. And so if you had tractor-trailers entering and exiting at the same
time would that cause a problem?
Now I don't know if that's for the
traffic engineer or for Bhaskar.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think that's a
civil question.
THE WITNESS: I think that's what the intent of this plan was. This plan was basically - actually, the comment came from Brian's office where they wanted to see a tractor-trailer turning movement to make sure that the driveway can meet the demand, $I$ mean this kind of vehicles.

So that's why we prepared this plan and this plan does show that if a vehicle is standing or leaving the site, the vehicle coming in can make the turn.

COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: One other question, it might be for the traffic engineer, the EV stations, where are they -- are they going to be because parking will change, where are they going to be configured?

THE WITNESS: No, they are proposed on the plan. Just give me one second.

So as you can see on this plan, you're looking at the northern part of the site, the northern two buildings. And if $I$ zoom in a little
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more, you can see right here is the EV parking station with the chargers.

And they are scattered thought the site. I mean you see four on the northerly part, there are -- same, basically mirror image on the other side of the site as well as -- so the other side also we have, yes.

COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: Thank you.
That's all I had.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Todd?
VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: I recall during
the August 10 th meeting Mr. Denholtz giving great testimony on the definition of the flex space and the typical user, the needs for them, the number of trips to be expected.

Does this new design still fit Mr.
Denholtz's testimony for flex space? I'm not questioning the use, $I^{\prime} m$ just questioning how many tenant spaces are being proposed and if this would be, you know, a fit for this property.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: The application requests no variance, so we can start there. So that kind of indicates that it does fit the town's vision for the site.
Second, in terms of my experience in
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the flex space industry, not as extensive as Steve's, Mr. Denholtz's, but it's 90 percent of this size unit will use box trucks.

They will -- the most use of trailers will be delivery of supplies to those users and that's one of the things that we've discussed in preparing this design to make it as direct and simple and in and out as the trailers, as you saw the display as we put it.

So I'm hopeful that there will be a lot of box trucks on this site. We're hopeful there will be plenty of trailers in and out. And we designed it to be successful.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. As I
recall there were ten trailer parking spaces and I believe it was the southeast corner --

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: -- and those
were needed, according to Mr. Denholtz's testimony. So I'm trying to figure out, okay, those went, $I$ don't see those on the site anymore and, okay, but you're still looking for the same type of tenants when the testimony was given that --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, we're not looking for -- this is not the same type of tenant.

I cut you off, I'm sorry.
VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: Oh, no, no. So that's why I'm kind of -- I'm kind of scratching my head saying, okay, is this a whole other piece we're looking at based on what Mr. Denholtz was kind of painting the picture of, hey, this is what this project is going to be.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yes. He was speaking in general of flex space, but specifically related to those units we had, which were --

The buildings we have.
THE WITNESS: 25,000 square foot
building.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: $--25,000$ square feet each -- or 28,000 , right?

THE WITNESS: I don't know how many. ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Anyway, they were 8 or 10 times larger than these. And consequently, the industry that would be there would have -- has lesser demands.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: So we're not -- I'm sorry, $I$ don't want to cut you off; were you done?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: What's that?
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Were you
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done? Sorry, $I$ didn't want to cut you off.
So last time $I$ think popcorn makers, wood for retail fabricators, printer repairs, suppliers, contractors. Is that still the anticipated --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, I don't think popcorn makers are really...

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I'm looking at my own notes, that's the only reason.

PLANNER BEAHM: He did say it. So I went through the transcript, it definitely -- he definitely said that.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I was not that off. I'm not drawing pictures on my notes here.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I haven't come across a popcorn maker as a tenant for 25,000 square feet or even 1000 square feet.

In addition $I$ have a fair amount of ground space in that area, size range but popcorn is typically what you get at the bank when you're waiting in line.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: But you are looking at, so at the end of the day, you're looking at the same type of tenants.

THE WITNESS: So this is the
previously - -
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think you might consider it as the same type of tenants but perhaps on a smaller scale.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Okay.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: So instead of a 75or 80-man law firm, you have like a ten-man law firm. Instead of five machines to do their work, they might have two, that kind of thing.

Because the size is smaller, the rents are much lower, the cost of the building is much less. This is not the elaborate project that we had originally proposed. This is fitting to the ordinance that we have now in terms of the design.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: For testimony
-- let me ask --
PLANNER BEAHM: Go ahead. I'm sorry.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: For testimony
on the actual trailers and number of trips, that's to wait for Mr. Rea.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think so.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
PLANNER BEAHM: Todd, if I could just add to what you're saying?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Sure.
PLANNER BEAHM: There was definitely
conversation, and $I$ think it was Nunzio who
initially brought up like the last-mile. And there was testimony in the transcript that talks about there could be a fulfillment tenant in a flex building, so $I$ just -- and, like, we put a pin in it until the next hearing, which is now.

So I get you don't have an operation user here but $I$ think the concern --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: No, I mis --excuse me, I thought you dismissed Mr. Denholtz.

PLANNER BEAHM: We did.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: And he came as a courtesy, you know, I didn't have to...

PLANNER BEAHM: We did. And there were definitely things that you committed to bringing back to us whether he's here or not, one of which is the discussion of a fulfillment tenant in a flex space. That's Number one. And there was no clarification as to the hours of operation.

So those are two things that we left open ended at the end of August, which initially was going to be in November and now here we are in February.
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I'm not suggesting that Mr. Denholtz come back. You're absolutely correct, we did open it to the public to him and he was excused, but those are open-ended things that the board -- I'm not asking for this exact second, but the board is going to want to know the answers to those questions, right?

So we talked about, $I$ think it was like

11 to 6; right where there's no activity and then there was concern that there's residents not that far away and is 11 really appropriate? And I get that six is -- you know, and then $I$ think Nunzio also brought up the noise ordinance and how it's 10 to 7 is the noise situation.

So at some point we're going to need clarification to those issues. It doesn't have to be at this minute and $I$ don't necessarily know if it's Bhaskar, but I'm saying they're open-ended issues that you guys are going to have to need to address before the board entertains any kind of action.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: As we said, I'm sure we said last time, $I$ don't know any tenants yet because we're not -- we can't rent space we can't say that we can build, so that's the first thing.
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Second, $I$ think that part of what this achieves over the first plan is limitation on any first/last-mile deliveries, it's just -- these units are too small.

PLANNER BEAHM: So are you accepting as a condition that this would not be any last-mile; you would not accept a last-mile tenant because that would be a fulfillment versus flex?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think if we could define it $I$ think we would certainly agree with that.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I agree with that.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: And -- I'm sorry.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So I think if you provide us with a definition of what you think -what you think flex space is.

I mean to me the prominent characteristic of a fulfilment center is that they have products there and they're bringing them to private homes. And, you know, it's not really storage of product or distribution of a product to wholesalers, they're bringing it to people's homes.

ATtORNEY GIUNCO: Well...
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: It could kind of
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be a slippery slope, though, if you have -- I'm just thinking out loud here because $I$ think the point is clear, we need to define it.

If you have someone who produces custom products like on Etsy, and they produce them in these smaller units and then they deliver them to an end-user, that's -- does that violate the last-mile intent?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: But if we think of a plumber he's going to take the -- they want to put a new bathroom in or a new bathtub, he's going to go to the house with the products.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Of course. So I think the point is --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: So I mean, I
think --
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: $\quad-\quad$ we have to be careful how it's defined.

PLANNER BEAHM: I agree. I think the definition is critically important because what we're trying to avoid is a mini Amazon working out of this site, right, where nothing is being actually created, and the people that are working there are not coming to do the installation, it's taking product and just putting it in vans and delivering
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it, which is going to change a lot of the traffic. And I know Mr. Rea is not here but it's going to change a lot of the trip distribution if it's something of that -- I say his name and he appears -- but $I$ just think that --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Everybody listens to you, Jen.

PLANNER BEAHM: I know, well...
But I just think that that's something that the board is going to need a very clear definition of in order for them to understand what they can anticipate from the site.

What we don't want to have happen is somebody take two or three of these units and become a mini Amazon end-mile, you know, where there's like a million vans in and out all day long. That's a little different than a plumber that has six jobs during the day, loads up his truck and goes from Point $A$ to Point $B$, and it's not back and forth, back and forth, back and forth.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Right. But if the plumber had five crews, that would be 30 trips.

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean, John, you know what I'm saying, right? I don't want to make this adversarial, but $I$ can tell you right now --
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ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Let's work on that, let's work on a definition and we'll do this successful.

PLANNER BEAHM: Right, exactly.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Because I think your ordinance already is restrictive and we intend to comply with it.

PLANNER BEAHM: I understand that, but I think we need it clearly spelled out so it can be clearly defined in a resolution so that somebody that works here in Town Hall that is not a volunteer on the board or a professional working for the board has a very clear understanding of what is expected on the site. So that in the event that there's a problem they have something to go back to and very clearly say this is allowed, this is not allowed.

So that's incumbent upon you to provide us with what you would like to see. I know you don't have any tenants, but you need to provide us with that so that we can provide the board information to say we're comfortable with this.

Because that is concerning in this area, you have residential development not that far away. So that's what we're asking.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, since we have
to wait for the traffic counts, I would like to have an opportunity to consider that carefully so that - because that may hamper it.

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean, I would
recommend --
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: If it's too restrictive, $I$ mean we can't do the job.

PLANNER BEAHM: I understand your reluctance, but then $I$ would recommend to the board if they were looking to act in the affirmative that they condition that these uses not be permitted on the site as part of the flex.

So you can take the opportunity to tell me what you would like. If you are not interested in doing that, that's fine. But then I'll advise them what $I$ think we should prohibit as a condition should the board act in the affirmative.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, we could sit -- well, if you're able to work on it with me we could probably either come to a decision or save a lot of the board's time.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: All right, so we're going to move on.

Who is -- Todd?
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I'm done.

> CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.

John?
MEMBER CASTRONOVO: I don't have any
questions.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Not at this time,
okay.
Barry?
MEMBER FISHER: I just have a couple.
I know we have that fund for curbs and sidewalks.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Correct.
MEMBER FISHER: But if we ride down Woodward Road and Tennant Road, the cars and trucks pulling off to the side looks horrible. There's tracks, there's deep mud. It looks unsightly.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Well, that's...
MEMBER FISHER: Can we ask, I know you said you would either put in the curbs -- I'm not worried about the sidewalks, but the curbs would prevent those cars from tearing --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: This is on the expressway of Route 33?

MEMBER FISHER: Yes.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We already said we
would do that if you want.
MEMBER FISHER: No, no.
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BOARD MEMBER: Business.
THE WITNESS: I think on Business 33
we are installing the curb and the sidewalk.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: They are.
THE WITNESS: We are talking about only -- the choice we're giving to the board is for the curb and a sidewalk on Express 33 --

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: The backside.
THE WITNESS: -- on the backside.
And we think that putting a curbing and
a sidewalk there doesn't serve any residents, so it would be better to contribute.

But the choice is to the board, you decide whatever you like.

MEMBER FISHER: Just on Tennant and Woodward Road, where they're pulling off, I would much rather have the curbs. The sidewalks, whatever, but the curbs to prevent that.

It just looks unsightly for people who live in the area.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think you're
talking about an area where it's a four-lane divided highway with a center, so it's...

THE WITNESS: I think you're talking about --

## B. Halari, P.E.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Show them -THE WITNESS: -- this is --

MEMBER FISHER: I know what I'm
talking about. It's on Tennant Road and Woodward Road.

THE WITNESS: But this is -- no, no -CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: No, no. What
part, Barry, what part are you talking about at this project for curbing?

They're already saying they're going to be doing the curbing.

MEMBER FISHER: Then that's it.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We would, if you want it.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: On the Old 33. On the Highway 33 it's our choice as a board.

MEMBER FISHER: Right. I would like to see the curbs in. Not the sidewalks, at minimum the curbs, and the rest could be a donation to the fund.

THE WITNESS: Just so you know, Highway 33, we have a two-lane highway with a shoulder. So there's 12 feet of shoulder.

So you're talking about the car going off the lane itself, crossing over the shoulder, and
then going over.
So on Express 33 we feel we don't need it because there is so much space beyond the drive lane for you to pull over.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Bhaskar, is that expressway for Route 33 anything like Tennant Road or Woodward Road?

THE WITNESS: No. That's what I'm saying, this is like you would never see a curbing on a national highway. You look, Highway 80 or 287, anywhere you go, you wouldn't see a curbing normally because you have a large shoulder.

But if you have, like Business 33 here, there is an area where you don't have --

MEMBER FISHER: You don't have a lot of frontage on that road anyway.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We do, substantial.
THE WITNESS: No, we have on Express 33 as well.

MEMBER FISHER: I don't want to keep dwelling on it, but that is the only place $I$ would like to have the curbs, where it's Tennant Road or Woodward Road.

The next thing is the zoning officer does not have to go in, am $I$ correct, on every
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person who goes in there and opens up?
THE WITNESS: Every -- before any
tenant can occupy the space they're required to get a CO and they need to apply to zoning office because they have to approve the use, because they need to -- they're the one who will check whether that new tenant is meeting the definition of the use for that building.

MEMBER FISHER: All right. At that point they would have to state who's going in, what the operation is, how many vehicles?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: The actual tenant would make an application for a Certificate of Occupancy for the individual unit. That may be done by either management or it could be done individually.

So if Building A, Unit 6 was a plumber who moved in, he has to come in say $I$ want to have a plumbing department here, he'll explain, he'll tell them what he wants to do and they'll say if it is or isn't part of the use. That's the zoning certificate process. You're familiar with that.

MEMBER FISHER: I understand that.
The other thing was there's not going to be manufacturing per se, I mean that's -- I mean
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light assembly but not manufacturing?
THE WITNESS: Manufacturing is a
permitted use here. You can do manufacturing. We just don't know what kind of manufacturing; it could be small. Obviously small-scale. You're not going to have a large-scale but somebody could be making some kind of custom product, smaller product.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Just for an example, one very likely tenant is a chocolate shop, and they would manufacture their products and package them.

MEMBER FISHER: It's a sweet deal.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: It's a sweet deal.

MEMBER FISHER: Okay, going back to our -- when you came before the Environmental Committee, the environmental meeting, were you going to do solar on the roofs?

THE WITNESS: We have not proposed the solar on the roof right now.

MEMBER FISHER: If a tenant wants to do solar, then they could put solar on there, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, the building will be designed to accommodate the solar panel on the roof, yes.

MEMBER FISHER: Okay. How about the
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No Idling signs --
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MEMBER FISHER: -- I think you agreed to
that, right?
THE WITNESS:
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: -- you spoke about
that a few minutes ago, there were directional
signs, one of which was No Idling that was asked to be put on the site, and we said we'll accommodate it. And I'm expected that Bhaskar and Brian would work out where they want to see them.

MEMBER FISHER: Last but not least, the plantings were great, and they taste better for the deer. We're going to use deer-resistant --

THE WITNESS: Yes, I recall -- Shari always recommends those, some changes to the plans if something is not right.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Steve?
Microphone.
MEMBER KASTELL: Can you go over for me how big are the loading docks, and what is the space between the loading docks?

And what is the space from the building to the end? You said they were 12 feet wide,
correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MEMBER KASTELL: How long are they?
THE WITNESS: Well the space between
these two buildings is 180 feet.
MEMBER KASTELL: Okay.
THE WITNESS: More than 180 feet of the distance between these two buildings. So the concrete that you see is, $I$ think, it's 60 feet of concrete they use, you know.

MEMBER KASTELL: Okay, so it's
180 feet. A tractor-trailer could be 72 feet, which means if you have two facing each other, they're going to be barely 30-odd feet apart.

How are they possibly going to turn within the space you provided?

THE WITNESS: Number one, as we talked about is having the tractor-trailer frequency on this type of tenants is not high.

MEMBER KASTELL: Doesn't mean they're not going to be there.

THE WITNESS: And the second thing is, we will, before the next meeting, we will prepare an exhibit for you with the tractor-trailer on both sides and see if we can turn -- the turning movement
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can --
MEMBER KASTELL: I think you need to make sure you have potential to have about 30 feet. And I don't believe that's enough for them to make it into a 12-foot space, particularly across from each other.

THE WITNESS: So we will make that exhibit.

MEMBER KASTELL: Please.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: That's it?
MEMBER KASTELL: That's it.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Nunzio?
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Yes, I do.
Apologies if you covered this before. Will you permit tenants to add a mezzanine to any of the units or will this simply be a single-floor unit.

THE WITNESS: Single-floor unit. No mezzanine.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay. I noticed since the last submission this new submission has considerably more parking spaces.

Have you had to increase the amount of impervious surface in order to create those parking spaces?

THE WITNESS: Actually, we have, the
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way the design worked out, we actually -- because on the previous plan we had a lot more tractor-trailer parking and whatnot on the original plan, $I$ don't know if you remember, but right now we have 56 percent FAR, which was less than -- previously was 58 or 59 percent. So this plan has less impervious than previous plan.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay. Well, you just answered my next question about the FAR. THE WITNESS: Okay. MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay, so that's all $I$ have.

> Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Pat, anything?
MEMBER GIVELEKIAN: Yes. You had
mentioned a similar project in Marlboro and the conversations centered on traffic flow in and out, the number of box trucks versus tractor-trailers, whether the office use is going to be small or employees that are there for the day, whether we're going to have landscapers leaving large amounts of equipment, which would then take away from parking for visitors in and out, last mile, et cetera.

So since you say you don't know because
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you don't have tenants, based on the Marlboro project could you shed some light on occupancy there, what that looks like as far as the mix?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well that particular center has been at 100 percent occupancy for about 22 years. The fact is that $I$ have never had any traffic issues whatsoever. And it's somewhat more concise or tight than this site.

The businesses are all -- they're all in business and they demonstrate common sense. And, for an example, if two trailers have to back in, they'll only go one at a time so they'll be able to accommodate.

And I don't understand the -- I'm trying to address whatever concerns you have but I really don't think you will have much issue with this site at all.

THE WITNESS: I think also another thing is that our traffic engineer can talk more about it because the ITE standards or parking demand for this type of centers and the Trip Generation and type of vehicle, I think he's much suited to answer your question better.

MEMBER GIVELEKIAN: Getting back to the point that Jennifer had raised, you know, so
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what stipulations would you be willing to make as far as limitations, you know, on some of these issues.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Anyone else?
I just have a question. This new plan, John, that you presented to the board, have the Fire Commissioners looked at it?

THE WITNESS: No, this new plan -- the previous plan was reviewed by them. This plan we don't have any review comments on this particular plan, so we may have to go before the Fire Commissioner to come back.

FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: That's correct on the new one, yes.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Please.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: And also, you
have to go again before the Environmental
Commission, correct?
THE WITNESS: Sure, if the board wants us to go back, we will go back.

COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: They were just notified about the revised plans. They may want to see it again.

THE WITNESS: No problem. We will
come over.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay, we're going to take a ten-minute break. It is 8:34. We'll be back in ten minutes.
(Whereupon, a recess is taken.)

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: I would like to call our meeting back to order at 8:45.

So, Mr. Giunco, we were -- we finished our questions for Bhaskar, do you have your next witness?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I would like to call Eric Wagner.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Sir, come forward and --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Ms. Chair,
Mr. Wagner appeared at the last meeting. He's the project architect; he remains under oath.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: You remain under oath.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: You remain under oath from last time. Your ITE person is next to you.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We have to have somebody run the computer.

BHASKAR HALARI: My second job.

E X A M I N A T I O N

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Eric, with regard to the redesign did you modify the plan proposed for the building?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we did. We changed it from one larger building on the site to four separate buildings, each equal size.

The layout has been testified to by
Bhaskar in terms of the loading bays facing each other on the backside, and then the offices -- the office entries to the outside.

There's also, the two buildings on the south side facing the expressway also have office entry on the end of the building. And those, since there's no -- there's no drop loading zone, if you will, those have THE entry to what would be the office and a roll-up door on the same elevation. So you see that here with $A$ glass door and side light and then a smaller rollup door for each of those five units.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: And that's for how many units, five in each of those buildings?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: So could you also now describe to the board the proposal for the building units design features.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Along the same lines as the original building we have metal panels. We're suggesting on this one a brick veneer base around the bottom of the building. And I apologize, these colors are a little bit off, it's a little bit difficult to register it with the AutoCAD converted to PDF, but the suggestion is a buff-brown brick veneer to the bottom and then metal panels up top. We have a medium gray and a darker gray accent.

What Bhaskar has up here on this elevation would be the elevation, the north elevation of the two buildings closest to Local 33. So we added a little bit of detail.

We added the pediment and some windows. Those windows are only on those elevations. As I said the other end elevations facing the highway have the office entrances and then there's essentially a fairly narrow alley between the -between the two buildings.

So this elevation is rather plain but it's really not visible because of the alley. The buildings face each other, $I$ think it's 20 or 20 feet gap, which is enough to separate the buildings.

One other thing I would like to point out, on all the elevations we are breaking the roofline. We have a parapet moving up and down to help break it down. And then the brick veneer base in the upper panels, that's all an attempt to break down the size and mass of the building.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Eric, could you discuss the rooftop equipment mounting, and is it shielded?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we're suggesting - now this building with the smaller buildings will have significantly smaller rooftop units. For a 3,000 square foot space you might have a 12-ton unit. That might be four feet high, five feet high. So they're significantly smaller than we had originally planned, but we can still-- we thought the area of concern was the units that are up closest to Local 33. The grade goes up to Local 33 from the building, so in a way they're somewhat looking down at the building. So we're suggesting
doing rooftop screening along the units at that end of the building.

And as you see here these are freestanding screened fencing. They also have them that mount directly to the rooftop units themselves. But in any case they can kind of look like this. And then here you see one, that is what it looked like on the top of the building.

These are higher. These are a larger building. What you're seeing here would be significantly higher than we would need for these smaller units.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Could you describe the color scheme.

THE WITNESS: Yes, we have metal panels above the gray base. Medium to -- medium gray and then a somewhat darker gray banding at the top coming down. And then the brick, there was some discussion on the brick -- can you go to the file, there was a brick veneer -- go back to the file.

We had originally been showing it -- we had been showing kind of a red brick and the thinking was that that didn't really fit with this. So we got away from the red brick and we're suggesting something in this family. It has some
browns in it and the lighter -- the lighter units somewhat buff.

And we think that would go with the warm, medium and light warm gray metal panels above. ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Now can you describe the elevations and what would show as adjustments or breaks along the facade.

THE WITNESS: Well we have roof breaks so we're breaking up rather than one long plane at the roof edge we're breaking up and down. Those would be shown as jointing that would come right down to the ground.

The elevation that is up now you see is mostly on the ground. You don't see too much brick. It's mostly the store -- the office entrance. And we have a band, a canopy, continuous canopy that would run across these elevations. And we have tenant signage then that could go on that banding.

> And then we did show we have the pediment, the two elevations facing Local 33 that is the other -- would be a little bit more decorative with windows and pediment, just to provide a little bit more interest and aesthetics.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Is there any other aspects?

THE WITNESS: We should probably talk about the signage?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yes.
THE WITNESS: So we've prepared two exhibits for the signage. The top here, the G4, ground sign or pylon sign is now shown at six-feet high. The area of the sign panel is five by two, so it's 10 square feet. And this would just announce the name of the facility and it would have the street number on it.

It's held up off of the ground four feet just to -- so the plantings and things at the ground wouldn't interfere with it but the size and height and $I$ think height above the ground to the bottom. They're all compliant from what $I$ read for the sign ordinance for this G4.

PLANNER BEAHM: They are, but can we just talk about that for a second?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: So, yes, we allow the sign to be six feet high, which you are. I just don't understand the rationale behind the 4-foot-high piers. So, like, is there some visual pediment that requires it to be six-foot high? Because we would allow two and a half foot
clearance.
So those two, like, it just looks awkward for a, quote/unquote, ground sign. Typically it's a solid base, it has like plantings around the base of it a little bit lower.

But, you know, I'm going to defer to the board as to what they want, but is there some pediment on the road that would require those piers to be four feet instead of two and a half?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't think they're getting the heights there to get over something so it's visible.

PLANNER BEAHM: Right.
THE WITNESS: Certainly four feet off the ground is maybe a little more visible. You might see it a little sooner from the road. But if you prefer that it be shorter --

PLANNER BEAHM: It's up to the board.
THE WITNESS: I understand. If the
board felt that they would prefer the look if we shortened it, brought it back down, we can certainly do that.

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean it's totally up to you. The total height of the sign is compliant. It just looked, when $I$ looked at it, it looks a
little awkward with the piers four feet high.
Maybe it's because I'm seeing it in
kind of isolation and it's not surrounded by the landscaping which would close that gap a little bit, but, you know, it would still be compliant if it was reduced about a foot and a half. So it's up to you guys to decide what you want.

The other sign you need the relief for, the directional sign.

THE WITNESS: For having it at all -PLANNER BEAHM: Correct.

THE WITNESS: -- because it's a second sign. Correct.

So if we're identifying the buildings as Building 1, 2, 3, 4, I guess it also could be A, B, C, D, but that would be across each -- the top of the sign, and then the tenants would be listed below. They're removable, replaceable. It's not a permanent.

And we could do this sign with a ground light or internally illuminated. I don't know if there's a preference?

PLANNER BEAHM: I would just want the board to know that the directory sign came out of conversations with the applicant when it went from
one building to four buildings just to help with like circulation and safety on the site, to make sure if you need to go, once you get into the site to the left into those two buildings versus to the right, and to limit the confusion once you get into the site.

So that was definitely a conversation that we had with the applicant during the multiple TRCs that we had to make the internal circulation on the site safer. So I take no exception to them asking for relief for that second sign because I think the traffic safety is important, especially once you get into the site. So for whatever that's worth.

THE WITNESS: So I think I've covered all the changes in the new design. Certainly can answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
Professionals, any questions?
PLANNER BEAHM: Go ahead, Brian.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: ThankS.
I think $I$ just have one question and I think it's kind of along the same lines of something we discussed a few months ago relative to the screening, which you talked a little bit about.

I think you characterized them as
fencing, something along those lines?
THE WITNESS: Screening?
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: That's right. I guess my question is, is that something that would be offset within the building so that it would not be right up against the vertical edge of the building?

THE WITNESS: Oh, absolutely. We would, regardless of screening or not, we would set, you know, a 15-foot minimum.

If you get too close to the edge of the roof you have to put guardrails up and things around the unit for fall protection. So we would stay 15, 20 feet away from the roof edge minimum.

I would commit to even more but the end units, you know, they're not all that wide anymore so -- but, yes, they would be held in from the edge some.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Now does that
commitment to offset 10 to 15 feet, is that the equipment itself or the screening, the vertical screening that would be provided, or both?

THE WITNESS: Both.
That dimension, if we were concerned
about it being a critical dimension we could say that that's the fencing or the screening. As I said, depending on how big a unit it is, they have them that mount to the curb off the rooftop units. And you could see -- $I$ don't know if you could see or not but a lot of these panels are perforated so they allow air flow and so they could be quite close to the units and not interfere with their operation.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Great. And I
don't know what the number is and 10 to 15 sounds reasonable to me. In general, my concern is as you have these fencing units get closer to the edge of the building they become more prominent and almost blend into the facade itself, which $I$ think is what we're trying to avoid because it would create the appearance of a taller building.

THE WITNESS: 15 feet would be fine with us. That's fine. I think it looks better to be elevated also, so it's good.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Sounds
reasonable to me.

That's all $I$ have, Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Jen?
PLANNER BEAHM: So are we still
talking that these are six to eight feet high? THE WITNESS: The rooftop units? PLANNER BEAHM: The screening? I
think the testimony at the last hearing was that they were 6 to 8 feet high.

THE WITNESS: Right, because those were bigger rooftop units that we were screening that $I$ assumed would be 6 to 8 feet high. The screening doesn't need to be any taller than the unit itself.

So here we're going to have
significantly lower. But if we want to say six-feet high approximately, that would cover virtually any unit that they put up there.

PLANNER BEAHM: The reason I'm asking is because it's affixed to the roof so it becomes part of the overall building height.

So if we're at 37 feet for the majority of the roof and we're adding six feet, then we're talking 43 feet. It's still a compliant height in the zone, $I$ just want everyone to be aware.

And I will say, given the setback that Brian just discussed, even though technically that's how we'll measure it, you probably won't see it.

So the building will appear 37 feet but
for zoning purposes it would go to about 43 feet. THE WITNESS: Almost anywhere on this site when you would look up if we're holding it in, 15 feet, and it's only about 5 or 6 feet high, you won't see it. It will be screened by the parapet of the building itself.

PLANNER BEAHM: That's correct, exactly. So $I$ just want everyone to be aware of what they're asking you to consider, that's all. I have nothing else.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. Ron, anything?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No, Madam Chair. CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. Rick? FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Mr. Wagner, the handout, $A-2$, it was your floor plan of your proposal. It shows the flex space. I don't see any office space.

Is there any mezzanines proposed? And would it prohibit a tenant requesting to put a mezzanine in for a second-floor office?

THE WITNESS: Well, we don't have plans for a mezzanine. Structurally we're not designing for a mezzanine, so it would be kind of a heavy lift to come in and do an occupiable
mezzanine. You would have to put in -- open up the floor, put in new footings, things like that.

So, you know, again that would be all part of a zoning and building application.

FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: But there's nothing prohibiting it?

THE WITNESS: No.
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: So where would one construct their office looking at your floor plan?

THE WITNESS: So the bottom here along -- one side of the building, one long side of the building is the loading side, and then the other long side is the office entrance, and we have glass up front with doors.

So the office would be some dimension. We didn't show them because, again, we didn't know how big. You know, that's going to vary.

And that structure or the demising wall from the front office to the rear warehouse space, if you will, for storage or manufacturing, whatever the use would be, that is built as a steel stud chip-board wall typically. It wouldn't be -- it wouldn't be designed -- have to be designed in the building giving us a little flexibility.

FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: With regard to fire
protection, I did not have the availability -- or I guess you haven't provided information yet to the Fire Prevention Bureau. Can you tell us what the fire protection elements are within the building?

THE WITNESS: The building will be fully sprinklered, so we have a sprinkler and electric room identified.

We haven't gotten to the level of
detail to understand what water is available, whether we'll need a fire pump, but the buildings will be fully sprinklered. There will be non-combustible construction, steel, steel studs, no wood, so.

FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Access to the roof
from the interior; any access?
THE WITNESS: We can provide that in either the electric or the sprinkler closet, yes, with a ladder, yep.

FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: That's all I have right now. Thank you.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Mr. Hogan, do you
want to see interior access to the roof?
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: I believe it may be a requirement.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, we'll meet the
requirement, of course.
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: When the architectural is submitted during review. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. Brian?
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: If I could just touch on one item that was discussed here with the Chief.

As far as the mezzanine, the only thing that $I$ could see that would prevent it is the floor-area ratio, they are about 3.6 or 7 percent under their maximum FAR now, so based upon the area of the site they could put a total of somewhere in the ballpark of 35,000 square feet of additional floor space or parking space or stormwater management basin before they had too much FAR to comply with the zoning regulations.

And again, that's assuming that the DOT doesn't take any right-of-way from them, and those types of things.

So there is a -- an upper limit with the $F A R$, but beyond that $I$ would agree there's nothing to prevent them from doing it.

FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. Jack?

COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Okay, so you're talking about RTU's and $I$ could see you using those when they were that big.

You're saying these units break down you said 3000 , it's somewhere between three and four if they're symmetrical to each other. So, obviously, our concern is the height on this building. So why RTUs?

At 3,000 why wouldn't you use -- you're not providing air conditioning in the entire warehouse area, are you?

THE WITNESS: It depends on the use. It potentially could be. If it's used for manufacturing or, you know, if they're doing any kind of metal work, that kind of think.

COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Right. But you're delivering a building here, you're going to put a building together to market it. Will all these bays be air-conditioned or is that something that's going to be done as they need to be fit up? THE WITNESS: We're talking about providing it complete with HVAC, including air conditioner.

COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: Including air conditioning?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: In the shop
areas?
THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Okay. The
reason $I^{\prime} m$ saying that is, you know, obviously if it was just heat we could do it from the interior. The height of this building is being a concern. So we're already, you know, somebody just did the math for you, you're back at 40 feet when you basically stand walls or fences or whatever you want to call it, even though they're moved in, it's still a total height of the building, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: So we're in an area that we're trying to watch that.

So if anything could be done, you know, today's mini systems have changed between minis -I'm not designing the building for you, but there's all kinds of new HVAC systems and we don't have to go up quite so much. Certainly on the roof, but if it's something that's lower to the roof deck than rise, it sure would be nicer to see a three-foot fence instead of a six foot, for instance, if you can get the fence smaller.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Okay. So
height is a real concern. I don't know where the board is on this but if it's approved, lower is better.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: Okay. That's where $I$ was trying to go with this.

You talk about this with the color scheme that goes all the way around this. When you gave me the 37 feet to the top gray band, that is to the highest point, not the roof deck, right? So, in other words, you have parapet areas that go up and down?

THE WITNESS: Well, yes, we have parapets that go up and down. So we're showing this -- our elevation is showing 35 feet from the walk-in grade.

COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Yes.
THE WITNESS: The 37 feet that Bhaskar
testified to was because of the average.
COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Average with the loading
dock so --
COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: It was a 39 at
the loading dock, 35 at-grade.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: I got that. But
that's to the top of the parapets now. The highest point of the building before we start to talk about an HVAC and fencing?

THE WITNESS: I don't think that's what's shown here but if we were to agree to that and amend this plan so it shows that --

COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: I just think we need a height going into this, we're concerned with height. We're not answering that now, go back and get me a real number that we could live with and you could testify to a number that we're actually going to do.

THE WITNESS: So if we put a flat roof on this building, a flat roof by code still has to have a quarter-inch per foot. And if we put a ridge down the middle of this building it will have an 18-inch height differential from the center ridge, the high ridge in the middle, to the gutter line to the outside.

COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: So, you know, it's kind of a little bit of a moving target. We did locate
on the ends of the buildings we raised that parapet so it would hide the -- it's not much of a slope that you would see, but you would hide it entirely behind the stepped parapet, but we could clarify that and -- and set instead of showing 35 there from the grade to the lower of the two parapets, we could set it to the higher, yes.

COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: Yeah, that's
what I'm just looking for, a real, true number that we could do.

And if you would just look at that HVAC equipment, some of the newer stuff see what we could do about getting it down. If it's going to be six feet, it's going to be six feet. I just want to know what we've got going into here, because why put up a six-foot wall to hide a two-foot high unit. THE WITNESS: Right.

COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: So that's what I'm trying to get.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think that the screen fencing would follow the rooftop equipment. COMMITTEEMAN MCNABOE: Yes. I agree with you 100 percent.

THE WITNESS: Once we knew how high it was and how big it was, then we decide on the type,
whether it's a freestanding fence type or it's a rail mounted right on the RTU. We would decide that and it would be no higher than it needed to be for the equipment.

But, yes, there's a lot of new mechanical equipment out there that -- like split systems and things, and they're kind of suitcase-size condensing units that would sit up on the roof rather than larger, and they don't have the duct work that docks through, it's just -- other than fresh air intake, it's just a condensing line.

You know, again, one of the difficulties from our perspective is that we don't know how the tenant is going to be and what the loads and things are. But let's say, there was a higher air conditioning load and we were concerned about the height, we could put in two or three units rather than one large unit.

So there's some options.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Couldn't you move them further back and it would be even less visible?

THE WITNESS: Well, we could move them back to a certain degree but, then, you know, the end unit -- how wide is the units -- they're not all that -- 25 feet. So I need it over the first unit.

So, anyway, so 15,15 feet would work for that, but I'm just saying, you know -- but I don't think, you know, the screening down on the south end of the buildings that face the highway, that is kind of elevated looking up from the highway. I mean we could do some sight of line --line-of-sight studies, but $I$ think if we're holding them back we might not be able to see those at all.

COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: All right.
This is in front of one of the most beautiful parks in the state so you want to do something, if it should in any way end up in the affirmative, we want something that, you know, is conducive to the area. We don't need a big box out there. So I'm saying try to get it down, try to get it attractive.

You used "suitcase size". I love suitcase size versus being standard RTUs so.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Just when -- I'm sure we're not finishing up tonight, we'll have an idea on that and a height and what this thing looks like when it's done.

You don't have anything showing us but that basically a sketch on a roof where you're planning this fence or wall being okay?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Thanks very
much.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay, my question is back to the sign.

Bhaskar, can you put back up the colored rendering of the site with the new plan on it? Yeah, that one. Zoom in, please, where the sign is on 33, Old 33.

Perfect, thank you. So that tall sign that you showed before, personally $I$ think it should be lower, but $I$ also think it should be on the other side where there's more opening and somebody is not flying past it to turn in and they've passed the sign.

I think it needs to be where Bhaskar's mouse is right now. There it's more open than that. Will that sign be lit?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Mounted on -- if it's shrunk down it's going to be on the ground or internal?

THE WITNESS: If there's a preference it could be either way, ground, lit or internally illuminated if you have a preference.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Professionals, do we prefer internal lighting or ground mount lighting?

PLANNER BEAHM: I would prefer internally illuminated because there's no opportunity for glare.

BHASKAR HALARI: Spillage, yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: Right.
BHASKAR HALARI: Also there is a lot
Of LED lighting where it lights, so it's not going to be like entire sign there.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. Now the other lighting, the other sign that shows the buildings and who's going where, what is the size of that signage going to be for the $A, B, C$ Company; is it going to be where somebody can read it or is it going to be too small.

THE WITNESS: Well the panels are three inches high, so you could have two and a half inch, 2 and 3/4-inch lettering.

PLANNER BEAHM: It says slots three inches high, 24 inches wide.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: So I don't know
what's a good normal trying to read and pulling into
a parking lot, you know, because -- I'm just - - and that's going -- $I$ would like to see that internally lit as well.

PLANNER BEAHM: Yeah, I agree.
BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. That's my
question. Just if you could show us -- this is great, but $I$ would like to see the size of the lettering.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Because I'm sure,
like the rest of my board members, when you're pulling into a place and you have people pulling in behind you, you don't want to, you know, try to read a sign and drive at the same time. That's all I have at this time.

Brian?
MEMBER SHORR: I don't have any
questions.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Barry?
COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: My concerns
were addressed by Jennifer and you.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
Todd?
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: A couple of
echoes. I fully agree in regards to the need for the directory sign just for safety purposes, as Jen said. I agree with the concern that, with the Chairwoman, with regard to what really is the legibility of a 2 , 2 and a half inch size letter, especially when you have over 50 tenants that are on. And it's right at the main entrance. So if someone is going to stop, try to figure out what building the tenant they're going to, as box trucks 1, 2, 3 deliveries a week. How many we'll wait for Mr. Rea.

But I really do question that many tenants, that sign. I don't want it to be bigger but $I$ kind of have to scratch the head saying what's the purpose of that with two-inch letters, 50 tenants?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: It is small.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: And it's too small almost, to the point where now you're sitting there going $I$ know -- okay, forget it.

Today we do have phones. We can do Google searches, there's websites, we can always use that, try and figure out where to park best for a mall or for a parking center. Get it? Got it? Good.

With regards to the ground sign on
Business 33, Jen, the requirement in the ordinance for this required clearance of two and a half feet, is that from the ground to the bottom of the sign it has to be at least two and a half feet?

PLANNER BEAHM: Correct.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: So the
purpose of this sign is for direction of traffic of hey, this is 123 Highway Route 33, Battleview Park, correct?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: It's an
identification.
PLANNER BEAHM: It's a site identification sign.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: So a
four-inch high letter would that be good for that type of road with that speed limit.

I guess where I'm going at is definitely $I$ agree to make it lower, make it look more like a monument-style sign. And $I$ wouldn't be opposed to make it a little bit bigger, the sign area, more than two feet in height so you can get bigger letters so that on that road people are able to use the -- a box truck or a tractor-trailer could actually see this.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well $I$ think that would be much more visible and effective than what the --

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Than what is being proposed now.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: -- what is recommended. Yeah, well, that's meeting ordinance/ we would have to deviate $I$ think from that.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Oh. Would
they have to deviate if they were to make the letters larger.

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes. This is maximum permitted.

PLANNER BEAHM: The sign area is compliant. If they -- and I'm not disagreeing with you. And if the board would like to see it a little bit bigger, it would require relief that you would have to consider, but traffic safety would be kind of like the rationale behind it.

Ten square feet is small.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: But that's
all that is required.
PLANNER BEAHM: That's all that is permitted.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: But that's not the
minimum, that's maximum.
PLANNER BEAHM: Yeah.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Correct, so...

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: And I think everybody on this side --

VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: I am not giving away variances tonight. That's not my thing.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: -- everybody thinks that's too small.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: I'm seeing the concerns of the purpose of this sign and what you're trying to do -- is it meeting the intent of what you want?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Its too small, but it's the ordinance requirement so we...

PLANNER BEAHM: I would also -- so I
know you don't have tenants, but do you anticipate a lot of public coming to this location?

Like typical flex space is usually people that work there, right?

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, typically, but
there are some uses that bring tenants in -- or
bring customers in, but it's part of what flex
means, it's flexible to all different types of businesses.

BHASKAR HALARI: I agree with Jen in the sense compared to retail or some other type of use --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Oh, yeah, it's not retail.

BHASKAR HALARI: -- or an office, let's say that a number of people visit -- a percentage of population that will be visiting first time type of thing would be less. If somebody has come there a couple of times, he knows where he's going.

So I understand what Jen is saying --
PLANNER BEAHM: Right. So, like, for example, if there was say some athletic thing that we just put in the Englishtown Business Park, right, yeah, probably the first time they're going to look for the entrance, but once you take your kid there multiple times you know where you're going so it's not like a retail store where you're going to see a lot of different users coming there.

So I do understand your rationale in terms of we want to make sure that people aren't passing it and then making a U-turn on Business 33
or what have you. I think as Deputy Mayor said earlier, we're probably not going to finish tonight. I would suggest taking a look at that.

You know, John, maybe taking -- John, I'm talking to John Rea -- taking a look at even though the speed limit is $X$, most people travel $X$ plus, myself included.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: So you're concerned about the conspicuity of the sign?

PLANNER BEAHM: Just to see whether or not - -

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Which makes sense.
PLANNER BEAHM: -- you know, and I'm not opposed to it, right, just to make sure -- you want the traffic safety to be taken care of. And if giving them a little extra area would prevent some traffic situation, that's something that perhaps when you guys come back we can discuss.

If you feel like it's adequate then that's fine too, but that's something that you guys should just go back and evaluate with your traffic consultant talking about the average speed on the road regardless of the speed limit.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, we designed that to meet the ordinance.

PLANNER BEAHM: I understand that. BHASKAR HALARI: No, but I think we understand what Jen --

PLANNER BEAHM: You know what I'm saying?

BHASKAR HALARI: -- you're trying to say, so we will come back with what we feel that given the speed limit, what size...

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I got it. I
understand.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Now, Jen, what about the placement?

PLANNER BEAHM: No, I agree with your recommendation to turn it -- move it to the other side of the driveway. That, $I$ think, is a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We will prepare a couple of alternatives.

PLANNER BEAHM: Okay.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: And I echo
that, the new proposed location.
Jen, for my own education, in this zone would a design center for let's say kitchens would that be a permitted use in this zone?

PLANNER BEAHM: It would probably fall under the category of flex for sure.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: That might be but the flip side of an athletic center that takes once to understand where -- to locate where it is, but you always know where to go.

But if you have a design center that may have one or two appointments a day, like we typically have appeared before our board before, that may be where you need the bigger letters and that intent would -- or the sign that is proposed would not be of any use per se, or meet what you're trying to do.

So I think it's, on the flip side, yes, it's an athletic place, you have a six-month time, but if you have customers coming for a design appointment, that probably would be detrimental for the safety of the site trying to read a two-inch letter.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, I would expect there would be design centers in a project like this.

BHASKAR HALARI: But let's just say in general, like if you go to drive-through windows, like which has multiple and really those letter
signs are smaller than the two-inch.
So just so, you know, the distance that you are going to be looking at is about the same because you would be very close to it. But the intent is you just want them to stop and look at it, if somebody wants to look at it.

And another thing is as well is, the number of people who probably have to do that in an entire complex would be much less because, as I said, most of the traffic is there coming regularly.

So we feel that the sign size and the lettering size we propose is adequate for that location.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: And I
understand your logic when it's a drive-through, on the size of that, but your car is actually -- it's designed in a drive-through for the car to stop.

With this, that is the main entrance and exit to the site. And the only entrance and exit to the site. It's probably not the best place you would want someone to stop when you're having box trucks and tractor-trailers going through.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think it should be bigger but...

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: So I'm not
saying bigger, I'm just saying, hey, you know, maybe at a different location for that, it's not at the main entrance. And that's all.

BHASKAR HALARI: I think what we could do is we could design some kind of widening in that area, where the car can pull over if they really need to look at the sign.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Possibly.
BHASKAR HALARI: And then they're
still open, driving...
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: It's an option.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: It is, but, I mean, that certainly isn't very attractive.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I don't want to get too far into the weeds on that one.

On the end units, there's ten end units. And you put -- you showed that there would be a man door and a roll-up door.

What restrictions would there be that, for loading at the end, for safety of someone who, say you have a design center doing -- coming in and out, that they're walking in right next to the actual loading dock or loading area to those tenants?

BHASKAR HALARI: Well, I think, that again, $I$ think $I$ have to go back to the same thing as number of people visiting and traffic. If you have a design center then you don't have that number of deliveries when people are coming there.

So this is basically being designed for a smaller tenant. It's 2,500 square feet. So you're looking at a contractor type of tenants, you know, their design center, or they would want more space, and then you have a different type of unit.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: That's fair. That's all. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Thank you. John?

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Talking about that, the directional signs for the buildings, so if one of the tenants occupies the entire building floor --

BHASKAR HALARI: He cannot. The flex definition requires certain minimum number of tenants in the building, if I'm not mistaken. I think there's two or three or something, I believe.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: I'm not sure. I don't know -- the current -- the current ordinance does, but $I$ think you guys were under a previous
ordinance which --

BHASKAR HALARI: I think the previous
ordinance required minimum -- I think there was
still in the building -- two-minimum tenants required. But, anyway...

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Okay, yeah. But so the building floor needs to have a minimum of two, two tenants?

BHASKAR HALARI: Any building can have minimum two tenants.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Okay. So instead of having ten signs you now need, in effect, two signs?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Are they going to be that much proportional so it would be two signs for the occupants; rather than the two-inch sign it will be a 20-inch sign?

THE WITNESS: It could be, yes. Sure.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: It would certainly be better address some of the directional issues that the board was speaking of.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: I'm sorry?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: It would certainly
address the direction- finding issues that we were
just talking about.
MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Yeah, that would make it easy. But the thing is $I$ was wondering if, since your concerned about the two-inch sign that it makes it difficult to drive up and see, which, honestly, I don't think is the issue. I think we should probably have the building directional signs, which way, would be the most efficient. And then in front of the building would have the tenants to know which door to go enter. Because right now you don't have the door number of that tenant to --

BHASKAR HALARI: No, each unit has a number, and this sign will have a unit number and a name on it.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Oh, so it will
have the room or the suite number or whatever you call it?

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes. Each building, yes. So let's say Building $A$, or Building -whatever it is, will have Building 101, 102, something like that, yes.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: I thought you just were having the name of the applicant.

THE WITNESS: Oh, no, no. I agree, that would be even after seeing this sign they would
be driving around.
Each unit will have a number and each unit will have that number identified on their individual sign on the door, so they know which unit it is as they drive around, yes.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: All right. That clarifies it. Okay, thank you. That's it. CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Barry?

MEMBER FISHER: So driving in, if you have Building $A, B, C$, and $D$ with an arrow, and then they go up to the space it will have, 1, 2, 3, 4. I can't see that being a problem finding that particular location, if it's Building A this way, Building B that way, Building C, Building -- and then they look for the number, but they're guided through the center.

The next thing is, okay, the chocolate factory they're worried about melting, so they're going to put in a generator. Where would those generators be located?

BHASKAR HALARI: It will go in the back of the building where the loading dock area is. MEMBER FISHER: In the back where the loading dock is, is the loading area?

BHASKAR HALARI: Not where the loading
dock is but each unit is 25-feet wide, so there is one door is only 12 feet wide. So you still have another 12 feet left.

PLANNER BEAHM: Barry, are you talking
about in the event the power goes out? Because I think they talked about earlier that the building was going to be air-conditioned.

MEMBER FISHER: Well, the air
conditioning also. But $I$ was just talking about that factory that has all of that chocolate in there and it's going to melt.

PLANNER BEAHM: Like refrigeration?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think Mr. Fisher is concerned about a power outage and filling in --

PLANNER BEAHM: That's what I just asked him.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yeah, I think he's thinking emergency power, and that would be tenant option.

MEMBER FISHER: This is like home, right, my wife has to explain everything I said.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: If you are fogging your windows you know you do not have air conditioning there.

MEMBER FISHER: That makes sense,

Building $A, B, C$, then maybe you look for the numbers, $1,2,3,4 . \quad$ That's it.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Steve?
MEMBER KASTELL: I'm good.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Nunzio?
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Oh, yes, thank you.

This is just a followup, maybe some
housekeeping here. I know earlier when I asked about the possibility of a mezzanine and we brought it up again, $I$ was told no mezzanines are permitted. So can we just make that a condition so this way we don't have to bring it up again and we can close the book on that one?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I don't make
conditions. I think the ordinance has a lot of conditions in it and $I$ would prefer to have no further -- no greater restrictions than the ordinance actually.

PLANNER BEAHM: Right, but I think you committed to no mezzanines at the last meeting. That's in my notes and it was also in the transcript you committed no mezzanines.

So I think the confusion is here we are all these months later and the message is changing,
right?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well that was a -what were they 30,000 square foot units -- that was in a 30,000 square foot unit and a 2,500 square foot unit $I$ could see --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Didn't we just have discussion about this earlier tonight? Brian said you're sort of marginally within the FAR and he wasn't sure whether you could actually have casinos?

PLANNER BEAHM: Mezzanines.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Sorry,
mezzanines.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, we weren't planning mezzanines.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well if you do put in mezzanines and it exceeds the height, that's going to be a zoning board application for a $D(6)$. So we want to make sure for purposes of our hearing you're not planning a $D(6)$.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We're not planning mezzanines.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So why would that be a problem with the condition of the resolution?

You said -- the statement from our professional was if you do do it, there is going to
be an FAR problem.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Most tenants would have storage racks or something, now that isn't a mezzanine but...

PLANNER BEAHM: John --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I'm lost on why we are talking about mezzanines.

PLANNER BEAHM: -- you're all over the place.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Madam Chair?
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Yes.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: If the board
wants it in the resolution, we can put it in as condition.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We don't have to have it, we can say no, we don't need a mezzanine, that we can probably say no mezzanines.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: We can put that in the resolution as a condition.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Why does that effect the ordinance?

PLANNER BEAHM: I think the concern is that you made a statement at the last hearing, we will not have a mezzanine. Then there were questions earlier and now the message has changed.

And $I$ think Nunzio is trying to get is
clarity. And I don't think up to what we may consider as a condition, your explanation hasn't been clarified in any way, you're all over the place.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: No mezzanines.
PLANNER BEAHM: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: And the Chief had asked it too.

PLANNER BEAHM: I know.
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: Again, I mean you brought me up here --

PLANNER BEAHM: Sorry.
FIRE CHIEF HOGAN: -- and I'm okay with
a mezzanine. I have no problem with it because we have seen it. We have seen businesses in town request one, once they're in for a couple of years and they need some more office or storage area.

I think Brian explained it pretty well before.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Sure, I can certainly revisit it.

Aside from the discrepancies in the testimony which we've talked about, the only thing mathematically that would limit it is the FAR, as
far as I could see. And based upon my real quick dirty math here tonight they could provide in the ballpark of 35,000 square feet of mezzanine space in total between the four buildings before they got into trouble with the FAR requirements, and at that point they would need to go to the zoning board.

But up to $32 / 34,000$ square feet of mezzanine space, they would still comply with the FAR requirements, assuming no additional parking areas or stormwater basins, things of that nature.

So there is some wiggle room built into the design, assuming there's no condition that mezzanines are prohibited.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: And just for
clarity there is, $I$ believe, a separate FAR for a building; is that correct?

PLANNER BEAHM: No.
BHASKAR HALARI: That's exactly what
Brian is pointing out, that an FAR calculation if you put the mezzanine, that is at least not floor area, so your FAR goes up.

Currently our plan, the way it's designed we are at, as Brian said, we can handle the 32,000 or 33,000 square feet of space and we would
be still below the required $F A R$ for the zone.
PLANNER BEAHM: Right. But here in Manalapan the definition of $F A R$ is different. It's not just building; it's building, parking areas and stormwater management basins, which is different from other communities, which is why the FAR numbers that we allow are significantly higher than you would see somewhere else.

So we don't have separate FAR building versus other things. It includes the parking lot, the circulation drive, and the bays and any kind of stormwater management.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Understood. Thank you. Thank you for that.

Okay, next question, Todd brought up the roll-up doors. Are you anticipating commercial vehicles entering into the building through those roll-up doors? And is there any anticipation of your tenants leaving commercial vehicles inside the building overnight?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We don't plan to park in the building, but it's likely that most of these tenants will have a forklift at least. They would keep that kind of machinery in the building. That's very typical. I don't see why that would be
an issue.
So the reason --
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Sorry.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: The reason that the roll-up door is on that end was because that's a different approach and it appeals to a ore limited -- a limited market. But $I$ would expect every one of these units would have a forklift for their operation.

THE WITNESS: I think there's some prohibitions against bringing vehicles in because you're going to get into -- there's limits on, for the building use, flammable -- the amounts of flammable liquids. So if you have a full tank of gas in a van, $I$ think you would be violating that.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Yeah, I certainly
agree. I was thinking in terms of someone earlier from the board brought up a landscaper and whether they would be leaving their vehicles in the parking lot. Well, maybe not. Would they leave those vehicles inside the building?

But if you're saying that that's not permitted, then that would answer my question.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, for parking. But if, say they wanted to do a repair or change a
tire, they should be able to pull into the building. BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: It's only ten units
that have the drive-in.
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: More overnight, overnight parking of the vehicle inside the building, commercial vehicles.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think we would have to say that we would be compliant with what the construction codes are. So, you know, it's the type of building, the area of the building, whether it's sprinklered or not. There's all kinds of things that factor into the code analysis for construction code compliance.

We absolutely would comply with
construction code. So if there's a prohibition for our building against that, it wouldn't be -- it wouldn't allowed but --

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: I'm sorry, if you could just speak into the microphone. It's not picking you up.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. We're saying that we would need to be compliant with construction codes relative to that, as well as any other requirements.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Thank you for
that.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Pat?
MEMBER GIVELEKIAN: Nothing at this time.

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.
ATtORNEY CUCCHIARO: Madam Chair?
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Yes.
AtTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I don't know if is for the architect, or maybe Bhaskar, but was there ever any kind of internal analysis that was performed to look at, you know, the size and scope of the building, and to make sure that whatever noise would be needed would be compliant with the local noise ordinance and standards?

BHASKAR HALARI: We haven't done any studies because we don't know the tenants.

But are you talking about rooftop units?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I'm talking about -- at one point it talks about how much noise you can produce, at what levels. And the state has requirements as well.

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes. So we will
J. Rea, P.E.
comply with all those requirements.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Anything else,
Ron?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That's it.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. Mr. Giunco?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I have no other
questions for Mr. Wagner.
I would like to call John Rea. CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Thanks, Eric.
THE WITNESS: Sure.
ATtORNEY CUCChIARO: Mr. Rea, you were previously sworn?

JOHN REA: Yes. Yes, sir.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I'll just remind you that you remain under oath.

E X A M I N A T I O N

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Hi, John.
THE WITNESS: Hello.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Could you pick up the board's questions that have come up so far, and Mr. -- Brian had requested some additional counts. THE WITNESS: I will do my best to
J. Rea, P.E.
provide the board with information this evening. It sounds like we're coming back for another meeting.

It is my intent to provide Brian a written response to all of the comments that are in the latest CME review letter. I will respond point by point to all of the traffic items that are in the CME letter.

As far as the traffic counts are concerned $I$ did have an opportunity to go back and review my file and here is what $I$ did in terms of doing the traffic study. When we were engaged to do the project it was May of 2022 , and that's when we did our traffic counts. So the original traffic counts done by McDonough \& Rea Associates for the report were done in May, 2022 .

We had an opportunity to review the Colliers report that was done for the adjoining flex space building on the adjoining property, $I$ think it's to the west of us if I'm not mistaken.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Correct.
THE WITNESS: And their traffic counts were pre-pandemic counts. They were actually conducted in October of 2019. And I think there was an issue of October counts may be higher because of the orchards in the area and the apple picking and
J. Rea, P.E.
the things of that nature.
So in looking at the colliers counts
from October of 2019 and the McDonough \& Rea counts from May of 2022, the Colliers counts were higher, fairly significantly. And I'll go over some of those numbers and I'm going to provide all of this information to Brian in a written response.

But to give you an example, our May 2022 morning peak hour traffic volumes passing the site frontage were 497 cars. The Colliers counts from October 2019 were 680 . Almost 200 cars higher. So that's what we used for our analysis.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: What do you mean that's what you used; the 400 or the 600?

THE WITNESS: No, we used the higher Colliers counts.

The afternoon peak hour on our May 2022 counts there were 767 cars passing our site frontage. The Colliers counts from October 2019 , were 994. So as I went back and I reviewed how I prepared the Traffic Impact Analysis what I can tell you is that we used the 2019 pre-pandemic higher Colliers counts to establish a base.

I then expanded those traffic counts from 2019 to 2025, after consulting the NJDOT's
J. Rea, P.E.
traffic growth rate data for the area. So I expanded the colliers counts by another significant -- a significant percentage.

I also included the counts from the Colliers report for the adjoining property as far as how much traffic that flex building would generate that's all been included in the analysis.

> And I'm just to give you some
additional numbers. And again, I'm going to provide this to Brian to respond to the latest CME review letter. The no-build traffic volumes that $I$ established for the traffic study upon which we added our traffic to in order to do our analysis, for the morning peak hour the no-build traffic volumes in my report were 807 cars in two directions passing the site frontage. 807 .

And I will remind everybody the counts we did in May of 2022 , which we didn't use, were 497, significantly higher. The afternoon peak hour counts that we prepared in our traffic study which included the Colliers counts, the NJDOT's background traffic growth rate, plus the traffic from the Colliers project, we had 1,164 cars passing the site frontage for the afternoon peak hour and that was the base that we used in order to do our traffic
J. Rea, P.E.
study.
So what I'm essentially saying is that
I went to great lengths to prepare a very conservative, in my opinion, analysis with the highest traffic counts that were recorded in the area, pre-pandemic counts. And we didn't stop there. We included the background traffic growth rate data from the DOT to expand the counts to a 2025 design year, which is another issue I know that's in Brian's report. He wants that expanded by another two years. I can do that when $I$ prepare my response.

So I guess the key thing $I$ just wanted to indicate to the board tonight was $I$ went back, I looked at my file. I think everybody knows me pretty well, I don't try to fool anybody with these traffic counts. We did a very conservative analysis and $I$ can tell you that $I$ am absolutely certain that, if anything, $I$ have overestimated how much traffic will be passing the site frontage during those peak hours for our design year.

Nevertheless, I will use those numbers from the traffic study and $I$ will provide a written detailed response to the CME letter which, hopefully, $I$ can testify to at the next meeting.
J. Rea, P.E.

I think that's probably, with all of the other items that are in the CME review letter that $I$ have to respond to, which $I$ will, $I$ think that was probably the one thing $I$ just wanted to let the board know. I did have an opportunity to go back and look at everything. I did get the traffic study done.

And the only other thing $I$ can tell the board members and $I$ think everybody here probably knows it, we have done-- when I say "we," my firm, we have done significant -- a significant amount of traffic impact studies along the Route 33 corridor in Manalapan and Millstone and Monroe, and I can tell you that since the pandemic the peak hour traffic volumes on Route 33 have increased. Depending upon which intersection you look at, it could be anywhere from 10 to 20 percent. I suspect it's because of a change in commuter patterns with people, you know, working from home a little bit more since the pandemic, but there has been a decrease in the peak hour volumes along the Route 33 corridor.

Again, depending upon which intersection you look at, it could range from 10 to 20 percent. Having said all of that, we used the
J. Rea, P.E.
pre-pandemic counts to do the traffic study.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay. So we're not going to ask questions tonight, people. We're going to let Mr. Rea go home and do his homework.

So, obviously, we're not going to make a decision on this tonight so $I$ would like to carry this application to our next meeting, which is February 22 nd.

Does that work for...
We don't have anything, correct?
SECRETARY McGRATH: We do.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Madam Chairwoman,
are we going to get to speak?
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Not tonight, no, ma'am. When they're finished all their testimony then, yes, you can ask all of these witnesses all your questions.

SECRETARY McGRATH: I do have a subdivision for Wood Avenue that they're --

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: That's okay. I want to get this done, and while it's fresh in everybody's minds.

So February 22 nd; does that work for...
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Sure.
THE WITNESS: Could I ask a question
J. Rea, P.E.
since $I$ have to put this information together for Brian; how many days in advance of the February 22 nd meeting do you need the information, Brian?

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: As many as possible.

THE WITNESS: It's February 8th
already. I guess $I$ know what I'm doing this weekend, Okay.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: I recognize we're up against a short time frame. I can certainly touch base with you between now and then.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: I would just request them as far in advance as possible. I mean it's not as if --

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: He wants them Monday morning at 9:00 a.m.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: -- it's not as if
I'm reviewing this for the first time; there's certain things I'm looking for, there's specific questions in my reports.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: So, I mean, a couple of hours at most, but $I$ mean if you can get
J. Rea, P.E.
it to me a few days in advance, a week in advance. The Friday before, would be great.

THE WITNESS: I can do that.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Sooner would be even better, but as soon as possible.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay,
Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Yes.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: The application of Monmouth Battlefield Flex Company, LLC, will be carried to the board's February $23 r d--\quad$ 'm sorry, February 22nd, 2024, meeting. It's a live meeting here at Town Hall, beginning at 7:30.

Again, that's February 22nd, 2024 .

This is important. We're caring it without the need for -- without the requirement of a new public notice. So if you got a notice in the mail on this application, you're not going to receive another one.

Again, this is the announcement that they will be returning on February 22 nd.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON KWAAK: Okay, thank you.
(Time Noted, $9: 50$ p.m.)
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