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CHAIRMAN ASH: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the February 7, 2022, regular meeting of the Westfield Planning Board. May we have a roll call, please.

MR. SAMMET: Chairman Ash.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Mayor Brindle.

MAYOR BRINDLE: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Ceberio.

MR. CEBERIO: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Councilman Dardia.

MR. DARDIA: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Harrison.

MS. HARRISON: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Goldstein.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Jansveld.

MS. JANSVELD: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: Here.

MR. SAMMET: Chief Tiller is absent.

Ms. Carreras.
MS. CARRERAS: Here.

MR. SAMMET: And Ms. Freedman.

MS. FREEDMAN: Here. Thank you, everyone.

MR. SAMMET: Thank you, everyone.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Notice of this meeting has been provided in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, and publication of the notice of this meeting published in the newspapers of record the Town of Westfield.

Let's see have a flag solute.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRMAN ASH: We have minutes from January 26, 2022. There was a revision made and that was circulated. Can I have a motion to --

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: I just want to clarify. I guess I have to abstain because I voted against -- oh, I'm sorry, the minutes. I was thinking resolutions. I'm sorry. Did I have another question? No, I guess that's it. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I'll entertain a
motion to approve the minutes of January 26, 2022.

MR. CEBERIO: I'll motion.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Second, please.

MR. LAPLACE: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ASH: All those in favor say "aye."

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any opposed. Any abstentions. We have resolution tonight, and that is a resolution to approved PB-21-11, it's the application for 552-556 North Avenue and 560 North Avenue from Vimasap, LLC. Can I have a motion to approve?

MR. CEBERIO: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. And a second.

MS. HARRISON: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Can I have the roll call, please?

MR. SAMMET: Chairman Ash.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Mayor Brindle.

MAYOR BRINDLE: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Ceberio.

MR. CEBERIO: Yes.
MR. SAMMET: Councilman Dardia.

MR. DARDIA: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Harrison.

MS. HARRISON: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Goldstein.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Jansveld.

MS. JANSVELD: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: Abstain.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Carreras.

MS. CARRERAS: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Freedman.

MS. FREEDMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you, everyone.

Before we get to our first application tonight, Don, do we have any announcements?

MR. SAMMET: No announcements. Just members of the Board, you're about to get very, very busy. So be ready. Have your Wheaties. And I'm going to meet the subcommittee next month as well; Site Plan Subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN ASH: All right.

Subcommittee, you're on hold. That will take us to PB21-09, 522 Springfield Avenue, Block 1905,
Lot 13. This was carried from our November -- no, December 6, 2021, meeting. And with that, I think Mr. Flannery is up.

MAYOR BRINDLE: Mr. Chairman, I have to recuse myself from this application. So I'm going to leave and if somebody wants to ping me when you're back on and I'll rejoin.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay. We will do that. Thank you.

(Whereupon, Mayor Brindle leaves the meeting proceedings.)

MR. SAMMET: Good evening, Mr. Flannery. I know you will have a number of witnesses with you this evening, so I just need to know some names that I can add to the panelist group here.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Board. For the record, Peter Flannery from Bisgaier Hoff on behalf of the applicant Westfield Park Partners, LLC. I have, as the Board will recall at the December 6th meeting, we had presented our engineer and were about to present our architect. So I have Mr. Avelino Martinez, our architect, as well as Gary Dean, our traffic engineer that will
be presenting tonight. I also have Mr. Rob Espasa
the engineer in case we need him to testify as
well. But we're going to lead with Mr. Martinez
and then go on to Mr. Dean.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Flannery, if any of
your witnesses need to share their screen to
present exhibits, they should have that ability.
If you have any trouble, just let me know.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you. Just
waiting a few moments here while my team joins.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Just let me when
you're ready to proceed, Mr. Flannery.

MR. FLANNERY: Certainly,
Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: All right. I'm
seeing cameras turn on.

MR. FLANNERY: Avelino, are you on
yet? Here we go.

MR. MARTINEZ: I am.

MR. FLANNERY: I just need to ad
video. Perfect. If I can have Mr. Avelino sworn
in.

AVELINO MARTINEZ, having been duly
sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

BY MR. FLANNERY:
Q. Mr. Martinez, if you could just for
the record just state your name and
qualifications, licensure, and experience as an
architect.

A. Sure. Avelino Martinez,
M-a-r-t-i-n-e-z. I hold a bachelor's degree in
architecture and I'm a licensed architect in the
State of New Jersey as well as a number of other
states. And I have been accepted throughout a
number of boards throughout the state. I have not
been before this Board, however.

Q. Your license is current in the State
of New Jersey; correct?

A. It is, yes.

MR. FLANNERY: May I ask that the
Board recognize Mr. Martinez as an expert in
architecture?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any members of the
Board have questions for Mr. Martinez? I see
none. We accept his qualifications as an expert
in architecture.

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Mr. Martinez, can you just briefly
provide an overview of the proposed architect for
the project including the floor plans and
elevations. I know that those are part of the
original submission set. I think you also have an
exhibit or two to present this evening to the
Board; correct?

A. That is correct. So if I may. I'll
share my screen. I hope everyone can see that.

Q. Yes.

A. This is actually the application
package. This is the set of drawings that were
submitted. A total of 16 sheets, last revised
September 30, 2021.

MR. FLANNERY: I think for a
housekeeping matter because it's a submission set,
we do not need to mark this into evidence. I
think that was what we had done at the last
hearing for this application?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes. That's
acceptable.

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Proceed, Mr. Martinez.

A. In general, the project comprises of
a total of 162 dwelling units of which 32 are
affordable units. And that's broken up into three
different buildings as we saw at the last hearing.
Referring to this is Drawing A2.1, so this would
be Building A, which would be the closest to Springfield Avenue, so furthest west on the site. Orientation is generally north being the top of the page. The typical ground floor of each building, and all of them are pretty similar in nature, would be primarily dedicated to parking. We have an entrance and exit drive aisle, if you will, at the southeast corner of the building. We would have the common entrance, so into a lobby, as sort of in the middle of the U-shape here. This particular building houses 89 total parking spaces, and those are combined into 45 single spaces and 44 tandem spaces. Parking, generally, on the ground floor with the entrance here in the middle. And then separate to that, there is a mail and package room, trash compactor room, elevator, stairs, and utilities.

Going up to the next floor, this would be Drawing A2.2 of the same set, this would be the general arrangement that we find in these buildings. Access to this level would be from the elevator which is generally located in the middle of the building, and then we have two stair towers, one on each end. The dwelling units are then arranged around the common corridor with
dwelling units on both sides. In this particular case, there is 19 dwelling units per floor in a combination of one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units. Again, the trash room would be located adjacent to the elevator room. And the operations of that, in short summary, is that there're two trash shoots that would allow trash to go down to the compactor room and then be compacted and be hauled away by a private hauler.

The upper levels of the buildings are all generally similar. Slightly different configurations of unit types. But in general, very similar throughout all three buildings. Building B, again, almost identical layout. Just a mirrored condition. And then, Building C differs a little bit. Now, this is the one furthest to the east. It differs a little bit in the sense that there's parking on the southern end of the ground floor, and then the northern portion is the clubhouse which contains the amenities for the community as well as the leasing office. In general, the building height is 46-feet-5-inches. And that is measured to the flat portion of the roof. And I'll show you that in a moment. And then, there's a pitched roof around the perimeter
which screens mechanical equipment.

If I may refer to this rendering, I think this may be a little bit clearer.

MR. FLANNERY: Let's mark this as Exhibit A-4. I believe that's our next compatible exhibit number.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibit A-4, EXTERIOR COLOR RENDERING, was marked for identification.)

A. Exhibit A-4, this exterior color render undated of the project. This would be looking at Building A. So from Springfield Avenue looking towards the north. Again, this is the -- I guess we can call it a J-shaped building -- so we have the shorter portion of the building faces Springfield Avenue. And then, the building is comprised of a total of four stories. The lower level is our garage level that we just saw on the plans. And then, the upper three stories are the residential portions of the building. What happens behind the pitched roof that we see around the perimeter is that we have a flat roof which is lower than that. That pitched roof extends roughly 3-feet to about 7-and-a-half-feet depending on the condition. That would screen all
of the mechanical equipment for the dwelling
units. None of that would be visible from public
view.

In terms of the exterior materials,
we tried to break up the facade using a number of
measures and that's really breaking it up with
balconies and different rooflines, variations in
roof height. And then using different colors and
materials to modulate that facade. In general,
the exterior finishes are a prefinished, fiber
cement panel. So that would be what we know as
Hardie Plank, and that would be in two
coordinating gray colors. And then we have
portions which are vertical siding and Board and
Batten siding as well. The windows are
double-hung in a black color, and then the roof
would be a standing seam metal in a very dark gray
and gray roof shingles.

Just referring to the material
board, --

Q. This would be Exhibit A-5.

A. That would be Exhibit A-5.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibit A-5, MATERIALS BOARD, was marked for identification.)

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Flannery, can these
be e-mailed to me so I can place them with the
application file?

MR. FLANNERY: Certainly,

Mr. Sammet. We'll do so.

A. Typical exterior materials. And I
apologize, I photographed the Board as best I
could, so the colors may be a little be off on
this particular image, but I think the rendering
is probably more representative. Again, starting
from the top left, we have a black color
double-hung window as a typical window for the
project with corresponding grills as well. The
siding materials would be three colors. So we're
using a white and two shades of gray. The first
portion here really just depicts the texture of
it. The samples are a smooth finish, but in
general, we have two grays. We have a dimensional
asphalt roof shingle as our traditional roof
shingle on the pitched portions of the building.
And then a darker standing seam gray color. We
also have portions of cast stone, which really
form the base of the building. And that would be
this color here. And then the brick, which is a
molded red brick, which you see here on the bottom
right. Then in addition to that, we have built up
decorative trim around the windows, corners, brackets, and things of that sort.

Again, just going back to the rendering of how those tie into the building, we stuck the darker colors down at the bottom of the building and then lighter as we go up. And then using that combination of colors to sort of break up the overall building mass. So all these finishes would apply to all sides of the building. Even though this rendering only shows one view of it, this would apply throughout. Building B would effectively be identical to this, just mirrored. And then Building C, again, same geometry and forms, just a slightly different configuration.

Q. Thank you. Do we want to show some signage?

A. Yes. So we have an additional exhibit. One of the town planner's comments was in an effort to reduce the size of the sign. I believe that previously shown was roughly 13-feet. So we have a new sign that we are proposing. And this was not submitted. So I guess we'll mark that as an exhibit as well.

Q. This will be Exhibit A-6.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibit A-6,
NEW SIGNAGE DRAWING SK-A1 DATED 12/03/2021, was marked for identification.)

A. Exhibit A-6 is Drawing SK-A1 dated December 3, 2021. As you can see, what we did is reduced the length of that overall sign to just over 10-feet in total length. It's 10-feet-2-inches. The idea is it's still a two-sided sign, and we're using the same materials and colors that are used on the building. So it would be the brick and the same types of materials for the actual signboard. The actual text has not been designed at this point, but that would be located here in the main body of it. So in general, we have a 23-square-foot sign area. And 10-feet-2-inches in length by 5-feet-4-inches in overall height. And that will be illuminated by landscape lights sort of down at grade so they're really not visible and just illuminating the sign's surface. So there's no internally illuminated sign or anything like that.

Q. Thank you. And just to clarify, I know there was testimony about this at the last hearing. There are no proposed variances as far as application; correct? It's as of right and conforms with the RA-5A Multi-family District?
A. That is correct.

Q. Thank you. Unless you have any other comments to add, at this time, Mr. Martinez, I think is all the direct testimony I have of Mr. Martinez at this time. I welcome any questions from the Board members.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you, Mr. Flannery and Mr. Martinez. Any there any members of the Board with questions for Mr. Martinez?

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Martinez, I just want to nail down the sign dimensions. The sign area is 25-square-feet? I'm sorry, my screen is a bit small.

MR. MARTINEZ: It is 23-square-feet.

MR. SAMMET: 23-square-feet.

MR. MARTINEZ: That is the actual board itself. That doesn't include the brick. Unless, if you need that.

MR. SAMMET: No. No. No. I believe the maximum permitted signage area is 16-square-feet. The sign area itself not including the mounting.

MR. FLANNERY: Is that part of the general sign ordinance, Mr. Sammet?
MR. SAMMET: Yes. The citation is 16.04C.

MR. FLANNERY: Let's revisit that, if you don't mind, Mr. Sammet. We're looking it up right now.

MR. SAMMET: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any other members of the Board with questions at this time?

MS. HARRISON: I just have a question. If you could go back to the floor plan which shows the apartments. What is the blank space to the left of C2B?

MR. MARTINEZ: I apologize. So that is storage. We're still trying to figure out the exact programming of that, but a portion of it would be tenant storage and a portion of it would be for building janitor's closet and things of that sort.

MS. HARRISON: Thank you.

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes, go ahead.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you. Is there indoor or sheltered bike parking area?

MR. MARTINEZ: There is. On the ground floor, we've dedicated -- for example on
Building A, and I'm referring to Drawing A2.1 of the previously submitted set -- we have bike storage located in the top right corner of the building, and the same idea holds true for all three buildings.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ASH: Any other Board members?

MS. HARRISON: Do they have electric car charging as well?

MR. MARTINEZ: Yeah. So we will comply with the ordinance requirements for electric vehicle charging. The actual destination of the spaces hasn't been selected at this time, but they would be distributed throughout the site. So we'd have a portion inside and a portion outside as well.

CHAIRMAN ASH: At this time we'll turn it over it to members of the public. If anyone has questions for Mr. Martinez based on his exhibits, based on his testimony, anyone have questions, raise your virtual hand and Don Sammet will call on you.

MR. SAMMET: I see Mr. Daniel Aschenbach. Mr. Aschenbach, if you
unmute your microphone, we should be able to hear you.

MR. ASCHENBACH: Thank you. I live in Cranford and I've been very involved in -- as former mayor and very involved in the mayor's council, Rahway River Watershed. As you know, North Cranford gets substantial flooding impact. Over 400 homes had first floor damages during Irene and a like number during Aida. So I know this is not the engineering component of this, but I wanted to ask the question with regards to whether the buildings were consideration of green roof on these buildings to have the whole project go in excess of reducing the amount of coverage given the type of property this is currently.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. Aschenbach, for the record, could you give us your address in Cranford?

MR. ASCHENBACH: I'm sorry.

116 Cranford Avenue, Cranford.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: We are not proposing a fully green roof for this building. There are some limitations for that in the sense that we do locate all of our mechanical equipment on the
roof. The answer is, no, we're not proposing that.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. Aschenbach, is there a follow-up question?

MR. ASCHENBACH: Only just the why.

Given the nature of this area and the need for as much flood mitigation as possible. Green roofs are a green infrastructure that the state has encouraged. And so I guess I've seen it work in work in different locations, but it certainly won't correct I think what would be too much additional flow into the Nomahegan Brook, but at least it would be something to consider to at least mitigate.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you.

Mr. Flannery, you said your engineer is here tonight?

MR. FLANNERY: Yes. Mr. Chairman, the plan was to conclude with Mr. Martinez and then have Mr. Dean briefly discuss traffic, and then we could bring back Mr. Espasa; if that's acceptable to the Board.

CHAIRMAN ASH: It is. And he would be the most qualified witness to discuss issues --

MR. FLANNERY: Correct.
CHAIRMAN ASH: -- on stormwater, drainage, coverage, and potential flood mitigation.

MR. FLANNERY: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Those are all priority concerns of the Board, and I think of members of the public in attendance. So we would welcome additional testimony or questions from your engineer. But at this time, we have the architect for the applicant who is answering questions. So if anyone from the public has questions for Mr. Martinez, please raise your virtual hand.

MR. SAMMET: One here.

CHAIRMAN ASH: NewYorkpuzzle@aol.

MR. SAMMET: Hold on, they're gone. I don't see a raised hand any longer. Wait.

CHAIRMAN ASH: NewYorkpuzzle is back.

MR. SAMMET: Here we are. NewYorkpuzzle is back. Okay.

MS. O'LEARY: So sorry about that. I was having a little bit of technical difficulties. My name is Lisa O'Leary and I live
in Cranford, New Jersey. I didn't hear Mr. Aschenbach's question, but I heard the tail end of it and I know it was related to storm runoff and things of that nature. I just wanted to echo that as a resident of Cranford, I share those concerns and I look forward to that portion of the meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any other members of the public have questions of Mr. Martinez, the architect at this time? We will have the engineer, he will be back for maybe additional testimony based on the recent submissions in response to Mr. Sammet's memo and questions again from the public. But at this time, questions for Mr. Martinez, the architect.

MR. CEBERIO: Mike, I have one and I don't know if this is for Mr. Martinez or someone else. I know in Don's report, there was a question regarding lighting on the site and the specs for the light fixtures to be included. I don't recall if that was something we discussed at the last meeting or something that the applicant is willing to entertain that suggestion by our planner to have the light fixtures match downtown's light fixture specifications.
MR. FLANNERY: I think Mr. Martinez can address building lighting, but Mr. Espasa had touched on the site lighting and he can certainly address that again when he returns later this evening.

MR. CEBERIO: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: In terms of the building lighting, the only real lighting we're proposing is what we consider accent lighting. So it really doesn't contribute much towards the overall site lighting. It does provide some lighting at emergency exits, and, as I said, just accent lighting. On the material board, we did show an example fixtures of the type of fixture we're proposing, so they're generally wall-mounted lanterns. But again, the majority of the site light would come from the pole-mounted fixtures by the civil engineer.

MR. FLANNERY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I don't see any other virtual hands raised. So at this time, we will close --

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes, Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: I'd like to ask a
question of the architect. Can you talk about the
overall stainable building at note, in terms of
this building being a green building? Is it going
to be a lead certified? Is it a passive house?
How's it going to be heated? That sort of thing.

We heard that there's no thought to put anything
on the green roof or any kind of thing like that,
which is unfortunate. I was wondering if the
building is going to be green in any other way.

MR. MARTINEZ: The building is not
proposed to conform to the industry standards such
as leads or one of those programs, I should say,
industry programs. We are making an effort to
provide an efficient building in the sense that we
always increase our insulation values to exceed
the requirements of the building code. We do have
low-consumption plumbing fixtures. All of the
lighting will be LED lighting. We do provide
lighting control systems. So on motion sensors
and photocells to sort of limit common-area
lighting and things like that so they're not being
used when they're not required to. In terms of
how the building is heated, there are conventional
furnaces, if you will, so very similar to a
single-family home. It's a gas-fired forced-air
system with a condensing unit on the roof.

Heating -- so cooking would be natural gas as well, and the same would hold true for common areas as well.

MR. LAPLACE: So pretty conventional.

MR. MARTINEZ: That's right.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you.

MR. FLANNERY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to add very briefly Mr. Sammet, of course, was correct on the sign ordinance, and the applicant will conform, reduce the sign area to the required 16-square-feet. No variances will be sought for signage. So I just wanted to state that for the record.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay. That understood. Thank you. With no further questions for Mr. Martinez, let's hear from your next witness, please.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My next witness is Mr. Gary Dean of Dolan and Dean our traffic consultants. He's here. I see him. If I can have Mr. Dean sworn in, please.

GARY DEAN, having been duly sworn,
was examined and testified as follows:

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Mr. Dean, if you could just briefly
for the record state your education experience and
qualifications.

A. First, (technical interference) my
address is 181 West High Street in Somerville, New
Jersey. I'm a licensed professional engineer
licensed in New Jersey and have been so since
1987. I'm a graduate of Lehigh University
(technical interference) and have a science degree
in civil engineering, and a former member of the
faculty of both Lehigh University and Lafayette
College (technical interference) having served as
an adjunct professor teaching transportation
engineering. I've qualified as an expert in
traffic engineering before (technical
interference) 450 different planning and zoning
boards including Westfield, although, my last
appearance was some time ago for a medical office
building located just north of the site on
Cardinal Drive. And I am presently working on the
former A&P redevelopment site along South Avenue.
So I suspect I will be before you at some point in
the near future.
I ask that the Board accept Mr. Dean as an expert in traffic engineering.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any questions for Mr. Dean regarding his qualifications? I see none. We'll accept his qualification as an expert in traffic engineering.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you.

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Mr. Dean, you had prepared a traffic impact statement for this application. If you could just briefly provide an overview of that report.

A. Sure. For identification purposes, the report is in the form of a letter (technical interference) addressed to the planning board that I prepared. It's dated July 6, 2021. The report sets (technical interference) froth the standard components of a traffic study and it includes traffic counts that we obtained along Springfield Avenue near the site. (Technical interference.) Given what has occurred in terms of the entire United States, but certainly, changes in how we conduct business, how we go to work and school. Such as this forum, we recognize that the Covid
pandemic has affected traffic conditions. We were
so fortunate to collect our data (technical
interference) in April of 2019. So it's what I
would call "pre-pandemic conditions" certainly
typical (technical interference) that would have
been evidenced along Springfield Avenue at the
time. In addition, we have been working on this
particular application with the applicant for a
number of years during its inception. (Technical
interference.)

MR. FLANNERY: Mr. Dean, I'm sorry.

If I could just interrupt. I think you may have a
bad connection. Maybe you can log back in.

MR. LAPLACE: He can mute himself
and call in on the phone for audio.

MR. FLANNERY: Perhaps that would
work.

MR. DEAN: What's happening? Is the
(technical interference) audio just not working?

MR. FLANNERY: It's sort of like
Max Hedroom effect. I'm dating myself here.

MR. DEAN: Wow. Let me try this if
I could. Is that any better by chance?

MR. FLANNERY: It's a little better.

MR. DEAN: Oh, boy. If you'd like
me to log out. I'm sorry for that.

    MR. LAPLACE: It sounds better, I think.

    MR. FLANNERY: Yeah. It's a little better. Thank you.

    (Technical interference.)

    CHAIRMAN ASH: No. It's not better.

    MR. DEAN: Is that any better?

    MR. FLANNERY: No.

    MR. LAPLACE: If you have to talk so we can tell.

    MS. HARRISON: Do you have more than one audio source going on in the same room?

    MR. DEAN: No, I have just the one. Although, I've turned it way up now if that resolution is any better.

    MR. FLANNERY: That sounds a little better. I'm not hearing the echo.

    MR. DEAN: All right. Maybe I should start over. Our report, it consists of a letter addressed to the planning board dated July 6, 2021, prior to the pandemic, so they are reflective of typical (technical interference) conditions along Springfield Avenue at the time.
call in on your cell phone for audio.


MR. LAPLACE: While he's doing that, he mentioned that he's working on the A&P on South Avenue. I'm not aware of an A&P that's on South Avenue in Westfield. Is that another town?

MR. FLANNERY: It's probably another town, Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: Just curious.

MR. FLANNERY: I think it's nearby, though. In the general area.

MS. FREEDMAN: There's one in Scotch Plains.

MR. FLANNERY: That may be it.

MR. LAPLACE: On South Avenue?

MS. FREEDMAN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. LAPLACE: You mean Fanwood?

MS. FREEDMAN: It's kind of on the Fanwood/Scotch Plains border.

MR. LAPLACE: An A&P. Okay.

MR. SAMMET: It used to be back in the day. Yeah.

MR. LAPLACE: I remember there was
an Acme in Fanwood.

MR. SAMMET: I think it was A&P before that, I think. And then they rebranded.

MR. HILLER: A&P went bankrupt and Acme bought them.

MR. SAMMET: That's right. So I have two call-ins. I'm not sure which one is Mr. Dean. I'm going to try the first one.

There's someone who has called in who's currently muted. We'll get this. Mr. Dean, if the last four digits of your phone number 1733.

MR. DEAN: No. Is that any better, board members?

MR. FLANNERY: That sounds better.

MR. SAMMET: Yeah, it does.

MR. DEAN: Okay. I tried to log out, logged in. Two years of doing this, that's the first time that's happened. So my apologies.

Back to the traffic study. A letter submitted (technical interference) in 2021, it included traffic counts conducted along Springfield Avenue in the site vicinity. In April of 2019, pre-pandemic, so we believe these to be a snapshot (technical interference) and representative of typical conditions at the time --
MR. HILLER: Gary, the audio is no
good.

MR. FLANNERY: The audio is still a
problem. Could you try calling in perhaps or we
could switch to Mr. Espasa.

MR. DEAN: Why don't we do that.

MR. FLANNERY: Let's do that. If
the Board doesn't mind, we'll have Mr. Espasa come
back. He's previously been sworn and qualified
for this Board. He'll just briefly go over some
of the questions that were proposed regarding
stormwater. Mr. Espasa, I see him here on the
screen.

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Mr. Espasa, just for the record your
license is still current; correct?

A. It is, yes.

Q. Thank you. Mr. Espasa, if you could
just briefly address some of the questions
Mr. Aschenbach and others had posed regarding the
stormwater. Thank you?

A. Yes. I testified to this last time.

We're actually reducing the amount of runoff from
peak conditions from existing to proposed. We
have to. We're obligated to do that for the
two-year storm, the 10-year storm, and the
100-year storm. We have two underground retention
basins proposed which will collect runoff from the
site, attenuate it, hold it back, and trickle it
out at a reduced rate. So that's below existing
conditions. And we know there is some flooding in
the area like mentioned, especially downstream of
the site. So we went above and beyond reductions.
And I can read off the numbers that we are
proposing here.

Q. Let's do that.

A. For the two-year storm, we're
required to reduce the peak flow runoff 50% as
compared to existing conditions. In
post-development conditions, we're actually
reducing by 70%. So we beefed that up way beyond
the 50%. For the 10-year storm, we're required to
reduce by 25%, and the proposed conditions, we're
reducing to 59%. So significantly better than the
25%. And for the 100-year storm, we're required
to reduce the peak flows to 20% below existing
conditions, and we are at 36% reduction. So well
beyond what we needed to do. Again, we know the
area is susceptible to flooding downstream, so we
tried to beef up the detention basins, get more
storage volume so that we can reduce the peak flows post-development versus pre-development beyond what's required by regulation.

Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Is our board engineer still on?

MR. SAMMET: He was here earlier, I don't see him now.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yeah. He may have dropped off.

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Mr. Espasa, there was also a question regarding site lighting. I know that you had spoken about this the last time as well, but if you could maybe briefly touch on that.

A. Yeah. Just to remind everybody, the applicant is willing to swap out -- we had decorative lights and we had some cobra heads. We had the decorative lights at the main driveway in the front of the buildings, and the applicant has agreed to swap those out with the standards that used in Downtown Westfield. So we will be complying with that.

MS. HARRISON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the engineer.
CHAIRMAN ASH: Go ahead.

MS. HARRISON: Was there any consideration for any bioswales or natural ways to deal with stormwater as opposed to retention basins under the ground? Question one. And then question two is did you use the 100-year storm of the last storm that hit and really damaged Cranford as your baseline for the 100-year storm or did you use some other historical index?

MR. ESPASA: To your first comment, yes. For water quality control, we have bioretention basins, two of them, and we have pervious pavement. So those are used to clean the water, to treat the water before it leaves the site. In addition to retaining and the underground retention basins, we are providing water quality with bioretention basins and pervious pavement. And these are both techniques adopted and really pushed by the DEP as green infrastructure techniques. Your second question, no. We're relying on the published data, the 100-year storm, which is for this area about 8 1/2-inches in 24-hours. I'm not sure what Aida was but, that's a significant storm event is almost 9-inches in 24 hours and that's the
published date we have to use for the 100-year storm.

MS. HARRISON: Does this building owner have a maintenance plan in place or will they have a maintenance plan in place for the impervious pavement and the retention basins for annual maintenance and cleaning because they can only stay pervious as long as we vacuum it.

MR. ESPASA: It's true. We are preparing a Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Manual that the applicant will have to comply with.

MS. HARRISON: Where are the bioswales on the plans?

MR. ESPASA: There's one adjacent to or parallel to Springfield Avenue. And there's one in front of Buildings A. I can bring up a plan here.

MS. HARRISON: Are those going to be planted with nice plants in them sort of all year, and then when there's a water event for the plants to enjoy all of that.

MR. ESPASA: They're fully planted.

MS. HARRISON: It's not like a ditch of grass?
MR. ESPASA:  No. They're fully
planted with water-tolerant plants. You can see
that on the landscaping plan. I can bring that
up.

MR. FLANNERY:  Yeah. Why don't we
bring that up? And also because that was part of
the resubmission. We did supplement landscaping
based on some comments at the last hearing. The
applicant also met with its neighbor, the pool
club, and discussed these measures. So let's
bring that up, Mr. Espasa.

MS. HARRISON:  Thank you.

MR. ESPASA:  This is a new color
rendering. I showed a version of this on my first
go-around.

MR. FLANNERY:  I think we still see
a folder here, Mr. Espasa, on the shared screen.

MR. ESPASA:  Do you?

MR. FLANNERY:  I do, at least.

CHAIRMAN ASH:  We all do.

MR. FLANNERY:  There we go.

MR. ESPASA:  This is a new version
of the color rendering that I presented last time.

MR. FLANNERY:  I'm going to mark
this, A-7, Exhibit A-7.
(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibit A-7, COLORED RENDERING OF REVISED SITE PLAN, was marked for identification.)

MR. FLANNERY: Please proceed.

MR. SAMMET: What are we calling the Exhibit A-7?

MR. FLANNERY: This is a colored rendering of the revised site plan, I believe.

MR. ESPASA: Colored site plan rendering. Yep. Again, Springfield Avenue is here to the west. This is one bioretention swale. You can see it's fully planted with some grass cover and some shrubs and trees that are water-tolerant. And then, we have another here in this island by Building A. So those are the two that are treating water. And then we have our pervious pavement are in this area here between Buildings B and C. Those three items are handling water quality for the site; water quality treatment.

You may remember at the last hearing, there was a member of the public with the swim club who was concerned about some views from the tennis courts to Building C. Originally, we stopped our trees right at the parking. So now,
we've extended them fully out to the existing vegetation. This green area here is existing vegetation that will remain. So we've extended the row of arborvitaes and then we added a second row to help with the screening, and then we added a few more shade trees in the area and some trees on the east side of the building for additional screening. And what I didn't mention last time, that I should of, this area here, hopefully, you can see it, is existing --

MR. FLANNERY: That's the red line?

MR. ESPASA: Yeah. This is existing vegetation that's on the swim club property. Fully matured trees between the tennis court and the site that will remain. So that's providing natural screening, and we're going to supplement it with the two rows of trees that we're planting and the supplemental shade trees. I believe there will be pretty adequate screening between the two properties.

MR. SAMMET: I have a question actually. Really not as much a question just refresh the Boards' memory and the testimony as to the decorative light fixture. Those are proposed in really what are the more pedestrian areas of
the site; if I recall, Mr. Espasa.

MR. ESPASA: That's correct.

MR. SAMMET: And along the southerly

property line, that is a different fixture type.

I think I see six fixture heads there.

MR. ESPASA: Yeah. These are meant
to be cobra head fixtures. And as you mentioned
in the more visible areas, pedestrian-friendly
areas, these will be the decorative fixtures.

MR. SAMMET: Thank you.

MS. HARRISON: What is the gray

space between the buildings; Buildings A and B?

MR. ESPASA: That was my next --

this here? So this came out of a conversation

that we had with the fire officials of the town.

They wanted better access between Building A & B.

So this is actually a concrete sidewalk that's

capable of supporting a fire truck that can pull

in, fight a fire, and then come back out. And

this was discussed with the fire officials. They

agreed with it. This was submitted as part of the

new set. Again, just this is a kind of decorative

concrete and this is standard concrete, but it

will be heavy-duty so it can support the load of a

fire truck.
MR. CEBERIO: Is that something that in your discussions with the fire department is not necessary for Building C? It doesn't seem like they're the same sort of access for fire vehicles around Building C.

MR. ESPASA: Yeah, it's a good question. So because the depth wasn't as far as Buildings A and B, they were okay with having a truck here and being able to still fight the fire. So they didn't require anything between B and C.

MR. CEBERIO: Or even along that southern or eastern portion of that building?

MR. ESPASA: They didn't request anything further on Building C.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. Dardia.

MR. DARDIA: A question about the pervious pavement or concrete that's being used. I think engineering pointed out one area; is that right.

MR. ESPASA: Yes.

MR. DARDIA: Right there. Would there be any consideration to add more of that pervious concrete material?
MR. ESPASA: Well, we meet the requirements of water quality in storm regulations from the state and from your township ordinance with the pervious pavement that we're proposing here in addition to the two bioretention swales that we proposed. So we're meeting the criteria currently.

MR. DARDIA: I would just ask for some consideration to go a bit above and beyond considering the circumstances that we're all very familiar with in this area when it comes to stormwater.

MR. ESPASA: Understood. I believe the applicant would be willing to do that.

MR. FLANNERY: We'll consider that, certainly.

MR. DARDIA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

A question about these outdoor areas adjacent to Building C. One is shown in a bluish color the other is in gray. They look like outdoor paved areas. Maybe you can elaborate what they are. My concern is they're very close to the property line, very close to the stream park area in the
brook. So I'd like to hear about how they're going to be constructed, what they are, and their impact on the nearby parkway.

MR. ESPASA: Sure. This first one here in the blue is a play area for children. There're two sets of play equipment from 2-to-5, I believe, 5-to-12. They're a rubberized safety surface, enclosed in fencing, again, for children to play. We do have screening proposed. And then, again, the natural vegetation. Hopefully, you can see. This is all existing mature vegetation that's going to remain. So it provides a buffer between the site and the park walkway. This is the park walkway that you see here. So with the natural screening, the proposed screening that we're proposing here, I think it will be well shielded from the park. And this is an outdoor amenities space. There're going to be barbecue grills and seating areas. And this is another little seating area with some trees planted. Just an outdoor space for the tenants to enjoy.

MR. LAPLACE: How will that drain, that paved area?

MR. ESPASA: We'll have little drain areas here to collect any runoff and bring it back
in towards the retention system.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you. I don't
know if there are any more questions. Do we want
to move back to Mr. Dean at this point?

MS. JANSEVELD: I had a question.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes. Go ahead,

Ms. Jansveld.

MS. JANSEVELD: You described that
the pervious pavement and the two detention basins
are to the south and the west of the site. I
think you partially answered this with the last
question. But can you explain, the brook is to
the north of the site, so how you're going to
ensure that the runoff is going towards the south
and the west and not towards the brook so that it
can be detained?

MR. ESPASA: We've graded the site
to low points and all the low points have catch
basins, which will collect the runoff, pipe it in.
So we have one, large, underground detention
system in this area between the -- you can see the
manholes here -- that's between the trees. Then
we have another large one underground in this
area. So all the runoff from the site, all the
runoff that goes into these bioswales gets piped into these underground systems. One here and some of it get piped into here and then it gets detained. And then there's an outlet pipe. You can see a headwall here. So this detains the flow, trickles it out at a reduced rate to meet the stormwater peak reductions out towards the wetlands and the brook. Same thing here, here's another headwall coming from this system. Again, the flow gets attenuated, it gets trickles out at a reduced rate to a headwall and then off the site to the wetlands and eventually into the brook.

MS. JANSVELD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Any other members of the Board with questions for Mr. Espasa?

MS. HARRISON: What are the overall ratios of improved coverage, lot coverage, impermeable coverage?

MR. ESPASA: Let me pull up the cover sheet. The ordinance requires a maximum coverage of impervious surface of 65%. Currently, the site is at 73% when you consider the gravel and the buildings. We're proposing 53%. So again, we're well below the allowable 65% of the
site. So about 3.5-acres of the 6.6-acres will be
either building or pavement or sidewalk and that
includes the impervious pavement.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any questions for our
Board engineer Mr. Battaglia? I see you're back
with us.

MR. BATTAGLIA: I am here, yes.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I see you. There's a
very important issue with stormwater and drainage
and flood mitigation in this area. And I just
wanted to get your input having listened to the
testimony and reviewed the resubmission by the
applicant. Could you comment on compliance with
the town ordinance and with DEP standards for
dealing with stormwater?

MR. BATTAGLIA: They're currently in
compliance with both our ordinance and DEP
ordinance. It sounds like some folks would like
to see them maybe go a little bit more due to the
area, which may be in order. But they are in
compliance with everything.

CHAIRMAN ASH: And in your opinion,
how could the current treatments be enhanced based
on the plans submitted?

MR. BATTAGLIA: Probably on this
site, the best way for them to do it would be to
expand the area of porous pavement. Unless the
architect can figure out a way to do some green
roofs. But I think the easiest thing to do would
be expand the porous pavement area.

CHAIRMAN ASH: And I think we heard
some testimony from Mr. Espasa that that would be
considered by the applicant.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Correct. That's
what I heard.

MR. FLANNERY: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN ASH: And to what degree
could those porous areas be expanded or enhanced?

MR. BATTAGLIA: Theoretically, they
could do everything. Everything that's paved
could be porous. Right now, they're only doing
part of the paved area as porous.

CHAIRMAN ASH: All right. I'm going
to just stick a pin in that idea for a bit while
we see if there're any other Board members with
questions. And if not, we'll open it up to the
public. All right. Turning to the public, I see
one virtual hand raised from Kate Rappa.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Rappa, we should be
able to hear you now.
MS. RAPPA: Can you hear me?

MR. SAMMET: We can, yes. Thank you.

MS. RAPPA: Great. Hi. Thank you.

My name is Kate Rappa, I live in Cranford. My address is 305 Manor Avenue in Cranford. Cranford mayor Kathleen Miller Prunty is unable to join tonight because she is in a township meeting, but she asked me to read a statement on her behalf.

"'Dear Members of the Westfield Planning Board, I appreciate that Westfield, like many communities, is dealing with the issue of satisfying its affordable housing obligation. As you know, Cranford faced the same issue and reached an agreement with Fair Share Housing Council. We will be moving ahead with redevelopment projects that will include affordable residential units. I know that meeting these housing obligations while minimizing impacts to our communities are not easy decisions. Developing the Williams Nursery adjacent to Lenape Park is cause for concern to Cranford residents because of the potential to cause more flooding for homeowners in the northeast area of our town. This evening, I'm asking the
Westfield Planning Board to require the developer to more on stormwater management and flood mitigation than just replicating how the site currently functions. Cranford is requiring a developer to go above and beyond the standards because the project is in an area that experiences flash flooding. We expect the developer to do more. In the spirit of cooperation between our towns, I hope the Planning Board will seriously consider the impact this project could have on Cranford residents and require the developer to meet a higher standard.

In addition, Cranford is willing to have our professionals meet with the Westfield representatives for additional information and insight. Best, Kathleen Miller Prunty, Mayor of Cranford." Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. The next hand I see Valerie Latona.

MS. LATONA: I just wanted to thank Mr. Espasa for accommodating our needs. We met with the developers, the Board at Nomahengan. The tennis club met with the developers and they communicated our needs to Mr. Espasa who then redesigned his plan in terms of privacy. So I
just wanted to thank him for accommodating our needs and that we are going to be working with the developers moving forward and, hopefully, all be good neighbors. I just wanted to put that on record. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. I'm happy to hear that. And I appreciate the applicant reaching out to a neighbor with concerns and working out those issues. I recall at the last meeting there was a comment about having installed new tennis courts and that there was maybe some concern about construction vibration, having an impact there. Was that discussed? Was that part of the conversation?

MS. LATONA: It was discussed and we also reached out to our tennis court developers and had them express that since those pylons were not going to be drilled into the ground, there shouldn't be any concern with effect on the new tennis courts.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Very good. Thank you.

MR. FLANNERY: I think, also, that there were some discussions or a statement from the contractor that the material used for the
tennis courts is a flexible material that will withstand a certain amount of vibration. Not that there will be any coming from the site.

CHAIRMAN ASH: And was it discussed that there would be no need for vibration monitoring during construction?

MR. FLANNERY: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Very good. All right. Mr. Aschenbach.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Aschenbach.

MR. ASCHENBACH: Hi, Dan Aschenbach, 116 Cranford Avenue. I just had a question for the engineer. Did they know that Irene was more than 11-inches, not 8-inches that he cited as the basis for the evaluation?

MR. FLANNERY: Is there a question here?

MR. ASCHENBACH: Well, did you know that? You based a lot of your conclusions on an 8-inch storm, not 11-inch.

MR. ESPASA: I based my conclusions on the written regulations of the state. I did know that the --

(Crosstalk.)

MR. ASCHENBACH: Always the state.
MR. FLANNERY: Well, that's what we're supposed to follow.

MR. ASCHENBACH: The other question I had is in engineering reports, the summary to it stated that you were -- the exiting -- the new system, the new stormwater management system mimics the existing flow as much as possible. So I wonder what "as much as possible" means. Are you uncertain that there is a potential that more flow will get into Nomahegan Brook and into Lenape Park and then into the north part of Cranford, which is, again, 400 homes -- not basements -- first floors of homes were inundated.

MR. ESPASA: No. The statement in the report says "drainage areas are mimicked as much as possible" meaning how the site drains today, the grading was done so it mimics existing conditions. I explained the reductions that we're doing to the peak flows for the 100-year storm, that's the reductions that will benefit the downstream neighbors.

MR. FLANNERY: The direction of flow is the same, but the flow will actually be reduced, the amount of flow; correct?

MR. ESPASA: Correct.
MR. ASCHENBACH: Thank you.

MR. SAMMET: Anyone else with questions of Mr. Espasa, please virtually raise your hand. We got NewYorkPuzzle.

MS. O'LEARY: Hi. This is Lisa O'Leary in Cranford again. If I understood correctly, these storm drainage measures are being conducted to adhere to the 100-year flood standard, but it's a 500-year flood that steam to be coming more frequent. The notion of a 100 versus a 500-year flood it just becomes terminology. The reality is the inundation is becoming greater. And to Dan Aschenbach's point, Irene, for example, was an 11-inch storm. And so why aren't we adhering to that greater measure, the measure of the 500-year storm which is becoming all too common?

MR. ESPASA: I can just say that we're designing it to the ordinance and the state regulations. The detention basins will help with all storms. I didn't run the numbers on the 500-year storm, but, obviously, it will provide a reduction from existing to proposed for the 500-year storm.

MS. O'LEARY: I understand that
there might be measures and regulations in place, but they may not reflect the reality that township residents are facing. So I just want to put that out there for our good neighbors in Westfield. And I appreciate again, as the mayor of Cranford said in her statement, I appreciate the challenge of trying to meet these housing standards while also taking all of these other things into account. I just ask that the reality of the storm levels that we faced may be different than what the state minimums are requiring. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Aschenbach is back. Mr. Aschenbach, we should be able to hear you now.

MR. ASCHENBACH: Not to belabor things, I just want to ask one more question. Are you aware that the U.S. Army Corp of engineers restarted its to evaluate Lenape Basin? And one aspect of that is the project alternative was considered previously, but there was issues with the embankments dams along Kenilworth Boulevard, the Kenilworth side of Lenape Park. And one of the problems was the ability to get additional capacity in Lenape Park to prevent upstream backwater of any improvements to those
embankments. And one project considered was to expand Lenape Park the area we're talking about. Six acres is a lot of detention that could help to provide the necessary project for mitigating flooding in Cranford. It's one of the biggest projects, actually. I'm just wondering if you were aware of that study that is coming back? They just approved a million-five match by the state allocation and they're going to get started any day now with their evaluation.

MR. ESPASA: Is the question to me?

Was I was not aware of that study, no.

MR. ASCHENBACH: Yes. I'm just wondering if you were aware of it. That's all.

MR. ESPASA: No, I am not. No.

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Just to recap. Mr. Espasa, we meet the state and local regulations on stormwater; correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And as a developer, especially an inclusionary developer, we're entitled to rely on those standards; is correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. And we're actually reducing the
runoff for this proposed project versus the
existing conditions; correct?

A. Yes. Beyond what we're obligated to
do, yes.

Q. Yes. Thank you.

MR. SAMMET: Anyone else from the
audience with questions for Mr. Espasa? I see no
others, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MASCERA: Mr. Chairman, if I
could just interject. And I apologize, I'm not
familiar with the Board's protocol, nor was I at
the prior meeting. Mr. Battaglia's memorandum
lists quite a number of conditions, if you will,
and also some requests for modifications. Has
Mr. Espasa complied with those requests and has he
tested with regard to the balance of
Mr. Battaglia's memo?

MR. FLANNERY: I believe we have,
Mr. Mascera. Either we've agreed to comply to his
condition of approval or we've addressed those
issues in testimony either at the last hearing or
this hearing this evening. I certainly welcome
the Board engineer to chime in as well. It's a
good point.

MR. MASCERA: Mr. Flannery, if the
Board were to grant approval, if any conditions were not discussed on record, is it the applicant's position tonight that all of these conditions will be met whether they have been specifically addressed in front of the Board or not?

MR. FLANNERY: Yes, that's our understanding. Thank you.

MR. MASCERA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. Battaglia, I see you're ready to chime in.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Yeah. I just wanted to jump in and say that at the last meeting they did state they would comply with all of the conditions of my former memo. They have submitted a new set of plans that needs to be reviewed that I believe is going to address most of these issues. But if there are any further, then I'm certain that they would have to comply with those.

MR. MASCERA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you.

MS. HARRISON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes, go ahead.

MS. HARRISON: This development is
something of a necessary evil. We're sort of tied
with our hands. We need to do development because
our population keeps growing. But there are
environmental concerns that we see happening over
and over again everywhere. We see it all over our
town. We see it all over our subsequent
neighboring towns. I'm sorry I was not at the
last board meeting so I did not hear all of the
original testimony. But I just find that
designing to the letter of the law is kind of the
limit as acceptable at these junctures and in
these very environmentally fragile areas. I just
don't understand why we're not looking at this
project as a flagship to environmental stewardship
and setting an example of what an environmental
project can look like with regards to water
runoff, with regards to blue roofs -- not only
green roofs -- with regards to paving, bioswales,
filling the land in a way that really supports
much greener movements. I've been part of the
U.S. Green Building Council for many years in my
career, and I find that this is a very
well-engineered project that sort of just skirts
the line of what's allowable. And I just don't
know why we're not looking at projects in these
areas with a much higher level of design. I know we're meeting the level that we've been given by the law, but we also are watching our neighbors just drown. And at some point, we have to step above the level and provide the development that will really be something that we can look at and say this is fantastic. This is wonderful. Yes, it's 165 units, but look at everything else.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I think that's a great point. I think in terms of our local ordinance, in terms of state regulations, you know, lawmaking, rulemaking tends to be reactionary. And I think the sad state of affairs is our current condition, 500-year storms occurring way more frequently than the regulations anticipate, and these conditions being exacerbated. The reality is much further along than our regulations would create limits for. And I think, you know, this board having to enforce the letter of the law, you know, we have standards in place that we need to impose, and this applicant has come forward with a plan that complies with those regulations. I am encouraged by this applicant's level of cooperation and collaboration with the neighbors. Specifically,
the swim club where issues were raised by the swim
club and the applicant graciously through
collaboration addressed those concerns. And I
think an applicant who steps forward and is
willing to work with the community above and
beyond what's required is admirable. I think
tonight we're hearing from other neighbors. Our
neighbors in Cranford. And we share those
carens with stormwater issues, with flooding,
especially in such an environmentally sensitive
area. We've so far discussed perhaps enhancing
and increasing, going above and beyond what's
required in the regulations to mitigate flooding
to deal with stormwater. And I think we should
explore that topic further with the applicant	onight. There's been some discussion about
perhaps increasing pervious paved surfaces. And
I'd like to hear more about what could be done to
enhance that so that we are doing our best to
reduce any impacts. Even if it's within the
limits of our ordinance and state regulations.
But considering that this is an extremely
sensitive area and that there are concerns of
other neighbors that should be addressed.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you. Those
points are well taken, but I just want to state
for the record that the applicant is not only
meeting these standards, the state and local
standards, but is also exceeding them. I just
want to make that clear that we're not doing the
bare minimum, we are exceeding. And we are
willing to consider additional measures further
exceeding standards. But let's remember too, this
is an inclusionary development and we have to
balance these environmental measures and the fact
that we're providing affordable housing here.
It's part of the constitutionally-mandated
Affordable Housing Plan as well.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Nope, and that's
understood. And the Board recognize the objective
of this project. The Board is also aware that the
zoning has been in place for over 30 years or so,
and that the proposal for a multifamily
residential on this site does not come as a
surprise and was considered for a long time. But
we would like to hear more about what could be
done to go above and beyond protecting this
critical environmentally sensitive area. And
would it be possible, would the applicant make a
commitment to increase the pervious paved
surfaces, specifically, looking at this rendering for the walkways and maybe the patio areas that are amenities to the buildings?

MR. FLANNERY: The applicant will certainly consider. But this is something that I think really requires some careful study. And maybe the approach here is to as a condition of any approval, the applicant will work with the board's professionals in crafting additional measures that would be acceptable for the development.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. LaPlace?

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you, Chair. I was just thinking as you were going over this, you know, everyone's concern with how sensitive environmentally this location is. And I keep coming back to how it's adjacent to our homestead design county park system, this greenway here by Nomahegan Creek. I was wondering if the applicant would consider doing less formal landscaping along the northerly and easterly edge of the property, along the parkland border there. And maybe do something that has more trees that will fill in more and blend in with what's on the other side of the property line where the park is just to
capture some water and create more air. I mean I
don't think we need grass, you know, something
that has to be formally managed. It would almost
be better if we just had more things growing there
and less formal. Any thought about that?

MR. FLANNERY: Again, that is
something we can consider.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any other members of
the Board? Any other members of the public? I
guess we'll move forward with Mr. Dean.

MR. FLANNERY: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Mr. Dean, I believe you're back
with us?

MR. DEAN: I'm back with you. If
the sound hasn't improved, I'm actually on the
phone right now. So could you let me know if this
is better?

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. It sounds pretty good so far,
actually. Why don't we start over, Mr. Dean?
Just briefly describe your education experience
and licensure for the Board to make sure that the
record captures everything.

A. A graduate of Lehigh University with
a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering.
A former member of the faculty of Lehigh University and Lafayette College having served as an adjunct professor teaching transportation engineering. I've been licensed as a professional engineer in New Jersey since 1987 and my license remains in good standing. I've been qualified both in superior court as well as before close to if not more than 400 different planning and zoning boards throughout the state. As an expert in traffic engineering, I'm a principal in Dolan and Dean Consulting Engineers in Somerville. And aside from representing a wide variety of private applicants/clients, we also represent a number of municipalities serving as a traffic consultant either to the board as a reviewing engineer or in the actual design and implementation of various traffic-related measures such as traffic common. I've been involved with this project for a number of years during the project inception and advised the applicant on a fair number of issues that specifically relate to the best location, for example, where to put the access. But I'd get into that in further detail as we progress.

MR. FLANNERY: I ask that the Board accept Mr. Dean as an expert in traffic
CHAIRMAN ASH: You may proceed.

BY MR. FLANNERY:

Q. Thank you.

A. Thank you. And my apologies again for the technical issues.

We had submitted a traffic study in the form of a letter to the Board dated July 6, 2021. And that report sets forth the traditional components of a traffic study that includes traffic volumes under what we call "existing conditions" and includes a projection of traffic associated with the subject development. And then finally, includes an evaluation of what those traffic impacts could be when we start to look at superimposing the site traffic on the ambient traffic conditions. The past two years have been very challenging for traffics engineers in terms of collecting traffic data given the societal changes that have affected schools attendance and going to work and work from home and e-commerce. And we were so fortunate to obtain data that was collected in April of 2019 that certainly normal reflects the normal or typical conditions at that time. And that was
used as the basis for our traffic study.

    I think even as we've been more
recently collecting traffic data we are seeing
differences in pattern and volumes. That may
continue to be the new normal; if we want to use
that term. But I think for a very conservative
traffic analysis we roll the clock back a few
years and look at those conditions along
Springfield Avenue that were present at the time.

Our traffic study does include that volume
information. And appended to our report is a
series of traffic volume figures, little stick
figures. And what those charts depict are the
actual traffic volumes that we identify during the
peak hour. And the peak hour is a typical
measurement for traffic engineers in that that is
the 60 minutes that occurs generally during
morning rush hours somewhere between 7-and-9. And
during evening rush hours somewhere between
4-and-6:30. And base on the data that we had
along Springfield Avenue, we had identified that
morning peak hour to occur from 7:00 a.m. to
8:00 a.m. During that time, there were roughly
2,000 maybe 2,100 vehicles traveling along
Springfield Avenue with a pronounced northbound
orientation as would be expected towards Route 22 and the highway system.

As we get into the evening peak hour, those flows reverse where we have a little greater travel flow toward the center of town away from the highway and a lesser amount traveling in the counter direction; if you will. We also had the benefit through our own work to collect traffic counts coming in and out of Echo Lake Country Club. And that data was compiled in July of 2019, so I think that's certainly peak golf season, as it were. Not a lot of traffic entering and exiting, but we felt it would be prudent to capture whatever that activity is given the relationship of that driveway relative to the site driveway.

The next step in the traffic study is to estimate how much traffic would be generated by 162 new multi-family apartments. And it's not as simple as saying, well, there's 162, and two cars per people, that's 320, and they all leave at once. That's not how it works. There are some people who work from home, there are some people who may be semi-retired who don't work, there may be people that travel for business, there may be
people that leave at 6:00 in the morning to catch a ferry or a train or some other form of transportation. So we've never have had a circumstance where everyone leaves at once and everyone comes home at the same time. We tend to see traffic for residential communities spread out over a number of hours beginning roughly around 6:00 in the morning and continuing to 9:00 or 9:30. What we do is we isolate the peak hour traffic during that 60 minutes that we would assume to be coincident with the street itself.

And traffic engineers rely on data that's been compiled at other sites. Consultants like myself will put down machines or we will have our staff collect traffic data either for research or just to evaluate before and after, for say, a given expansion. And then that data gets compiled and submitted to the Institute of Transportation Engineers. And every six or seven years, ITE, as it's known, updates their data for multi-family communities. And also appended to our report are the ITE data, summaries, and equations that show us on a statistical basis for a given number of units how much traffic could be expected. And I'm just looking at the ITE data, and there are
between 42 and 50 studies of existing residential apartment communities that have been evaluated as part of ITE. And the data shows a fairly consistent statistical accuracy that depending on the number of units, one can reasonably project the amount of traffic for a given size proposal. And in this particular instance during the morning peak hour for 162 units, we would expect to see 75 trips. That's a technical term for a "traffic movement." And some of those trips, even though it's the morning peak hour is actually inbound traffic. And that may be individuals who work a different shift and are coming home, that may be individuals who have dropped a spouse off at mass transit, that may be individuals who have dropped children off at school. So that's a small component, but principally as one would expect during the morning, most of that traffic would be outbound.

In the evening peak hour, as we have shopping and social events and after-work activities; going to the gym, what have you, the overall traffic is a bit higher with a total of 91 trips that are projected for this community. And that would consist of 57 returning vehicles and 35
exiting vehicles. We weren't able to count Williams Nursery given our time of engagement and the fact that in anticipation of this project, clearly, they had been winding down activities to a certain extent and certainly not typical of their more robust economic operations. Nevertheless, just for a rough comparison, we did also look at ITE data for a commercial retail nursery. In the morning, that type of operation would be pretty light. It would be employees arriving in the morning and perhaps landscapers and tradespeople coming in and picking materials. In the evening, it would be a little bit higher. And that's important because not all of the traffic that I referred to originally are 75, and our 90 trips are new to the corridor.

Again, a typical retail nursery might generate about 20 trips in the morning and about 60 at night. So the delta, in other words, that net difference of traffic associated with this redevelopment is not as high. It still would be on the order of 55 or maybe 60 new vehicles in the morning or about a car a minute. In the evening, it might be a little lower on the order of 30 new trips or vehicles. But we didn't
consider that in our study.

And the next part is then to evaluate how that traffic enters and exits the site. We know that Springfield Avenue is busy, there's no question. We know that there are traffic signals nearby and that's of benefit to neighboring driveways. And that those signals provide metering, if you will, or some gaps. They break traffic up and create opportunities for abutting driveways or residential streets that don't have the benefit of a signal to enter the Springfield Avenues traffic flow. We actually measure that at the site doing what we call a "gap analysis." We do that by, we flew a drone right over the site and we measured the breaks in traffic as they are created in the traffic flow. And we look for those breaks that are, approximately, 7-seconds. That's how long it takes for an individual to look both directions, to ascertain that there is a break of sufficient distance for them to safely proceed and then for that vehicle the turn left. Right turns, by contrast, going towards Route 22, are a whole lot easier to make. It doesn't require a break or a gap in both directions of traffic, only a single
northbound lane.

Our study focused on the left turns because, obviously, it's the left turns that are the most challenging to make. And our gap analysis that we did by measuring those breaks in traffic using the drone overhead photography showed that we would have a range -- and again, it depends on the peak hour -- of anywhere from 58 to 176 gaps in traffic that would accommodate those left turns.

And during the single hour where we had the highest volume of left-turning movements for our site, and those are depicted on Figure 3. You'll note during the morning, there would be 23 left-turn movements. During that time, we would have -- and again, the findings of our gap study are appended to our report -- during that morning peak hour, we would have in a half-an-hour, we measured 88 gaps. If we extrapolate that to two hours, it could be up to 176. But what it demonstrates is that with only needing to accommodate 23 vehicles, they may wait a while, there's no disguising that, but they'll wait safely within the site driveway, that there are sufficient and abundant opportunities for that
traffic to safely turn onto Springfield Avenue.

The last part of our study focused on where the driveway is located. Along Springfield Avenue, just as we get to Mill Lane and up to the Echo Lake Country Club, the northbound lanes actually widen. It goes from a single lane to two lanes as we get along the site frontage. Because of the added challenges for drives to then look across two lanes for ingress and egress. And given the proximity as we get further to the north of the site we get closer and closer to the traffic signal at Mill Lane, we felt that having the driveway at the southerly end of the site would be the best location for visibility and it would provide the best means of separation between not only the country club driveway but any cueing or stacking along Mill Lane. And it would only be along a single-lane section of Springfield Avenue where site traffic would have to discern the presence of a gap in one lane, and it's just for visibility. You can imagine with two lanes of traffic, sometimes one vehicle occludes a driver's visibility of the second vehicle, and it just offers a little additional challenge.

So reviewing all of the design
options and that location of the access did lead
to really a majority of the overall site layout,
we felt that it was in the best location to afford
the highest degree of safety. Our study did also
review the sufficiency of the parking, the manner
of ingress and egress. Much of that is governed
by the Residential Site Improvement Standards, and
the site does comply with the dimensions of aisle
widths, parking stall sizes, and the quantity of
parking that is proposed for the site. We
recognize that, as always, you know, spend a
career understanding and recognizing that traffic
and added traffic is always a sensitive topic.
But in light of the inclusionary nature of the
proposal and in trying to evaluate and provide the
highest degree of safety for access -- that
involves property under the control of the
applicant, of course -- that we felt that the
driveway was in the best location.

One thing did I did neglect to
mention is that Williams Nursery actually had
three driveways, one of which was just a wide-open
curb opening led to a gravel parking lot. It
really lacked the traditional design elements of a
driveway like curbing and signs, and I'd say an
element of control that lessens the potential for any kind of mishap. So what we've designed is I'd say a "conventional-type driveway" with a single ingress lane and then separate left and right-turn lanes to leave the site. They are divided by a median which is required under RSI just given the number of homes that are proposed in the community to provide an additional means of emergency access. I would note that I don't know if it's possible, but there is a stabilized path just to the north of the site on the park property that does provide an additional means of access to the backside of those buildings if it ever became necessary. But the applicant and Mr. Espasa have been responsive to the fire marshall's concern for an additional means of access between the buildings on the site, and I think that also improves safety.

Mr. Flannery, that's all I have on the way of direct. Hopefully, I haven't missed anything, but that's the essence of the traffic study.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you, Mr. Dean. I think you summed it up very well. And that's all the direct testimony I have of Mr. Dean at
this time and I welcome the Board and it's professionals to ask any questions of Mr. Dean.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Mr. Dean, looking at the egress lanes, you've got the right-turn lane and the left-turn lane. How many cars can cue in the left-turn lane before the right-turn lane is actually blocked?

MR. DEAN: If we use a parking stall -- for those of you that have the site plan open, I'm just looking at the one in front of me -- assuming one car fits, obviously, in a parking stall, I'd say we have two vehicles in that left-turn lane before that right-turn lane is no longer accessible.

CHAIRMAN ASH: So that's one car waiting to turn left, another car behind it.

MR. DEAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ASH: And that blocks the right-turn lane from anyone going able to use it.

MR. DEAN: Not anyone. Directly in front of Building A, there's a small parking field and, obviously, any vehicles leaving that parking would be able to access it. I think that's an astute observation, and I would defer -- Peter, maybe someone on our team can call up a site plan.
It's a little easier sometimes --

MR. FLANNERY: Mr. Espasa, do you mind sharing your screen, the site plan? I think it's A-7, the colored site plan rendering would probably be sufficient. There we go.

MR. DEAN: Perfect. Thank you. And if we can zoom in on that driveway, that would be helpful. Thank you. Again, referring, to say, the angled parking space in Building A, the first in essence closest to the right-turn lane, using that as a general measure, there would be two vehicles in the left-turn lane and other than the eight or so parking spaces within that small circular field, yes, everyone else leaving the community would be behind that left-turn cue.

There are a couple of options to improve that. And you'll see a large landscaped island in front of the western edge of Building A, that could be tapered better or even that entire curb line pulled back further into the site interior to improve that. The only thing -- and I know there's been a lot of discussions about impervious and there is that tradeoff -- but that would certainly provide that additional cueing under that scenario. Bear in mind, there are projected
to be 23 left turns leaving in the morning. And
it's roughly 48 or so turning right going up
towards Route 22 -- 35. So it's one car every two
to three minutes trying to turn left, and with 88
-- call it 176 gaps -- turning left out of the
site, my expectation is that the cueing won't be
four and five and six cars turning left, that it
will be a majority will be continuing right north
on Springfield Avenue. But if it's the Board's
pleasure, that certainly can be reworked to
improve that stacking; if that's your pleasure.
CHAIRMAN ASH: I accept your expert
testimony and analysis and I'm somewhat familiar
with traffic engineering and how trips are counted
and evaluated against ITE. However, anecdotally,
I've sat in what I would describe as
"bumper-to-bumper traffic" on Springfield Avenue,
not moving, stuck at the light. People get stuck
in the intersection at the light during rush hour
and I think that there is a major traffic concern
here. I think making a left-hand turn out of this
site during rush hour will be extremely difficult.
And I think whatever efforts can be made to
alleviate pinch points or just whatever is going
to help with the flow of traffic on this site and
on this road -- which is a county road; correct?

MR. DEAN: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I think all

alternatives should be considered.

MR. DEAN: Yeah. There are two ways
to go about it. One, to solve it now. And
certainly, I defer to the collective wisdom of the
Board and your experience with other streets and
locations in the town. The second is this is an
owner-managed and run property. And if the front
entrance is so problematic, I can assure you the
applicant will get nothing but an ear full from
any resident that lives in the area, and he will
be immediately seeking corrective measures. So,
you know, there're two schools of thought. Let's
not necessarily solve a problem until one exists,
but let's plan for an improvement in the event
that one is needed. So I think on behalf of the
applicant -- unless there's a compelling desire to
solve that right now and make it better -- again,
I see no reason we can't improve that concern or
address that concern at this stage. It's just a
matter of when you would like to see that
implemented.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Let's hear from some
other Board members. Mr. LaPlace?

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a couple of questions. First of all, just to follow up on what the Chair was talking about. First of all, Mr. Dean, did you say there are two parking spaces per unit on this site?

MR. DEAN: The ratios aren't quite to that. Let me get the exact count, I don't want to misspeak. I'm sure --

MR. LAPLACE: Or was that the target or something?

MR. DEAN: We have 15, one-bedroom apartments, and that requires 27 spaces. And then we have the two-bedroom apartments all require two spaces. And then we have three-bedroom units that require a little bit higher. We have a total parking required supply of 325 for 162 units. So just by coincidence, the math actually works out to be virtually exactly two spaces per unit.

MR. LAPLACE: Wow. It just seems like the site is just really over-parked from a practical standpoint. Especially in the direction that design is going in site plan design nowadays, it's a lot of surface parking. And I share the
Chair's concern particular at the entrance there, you're going to have people stacking up. Right now, with Williams Nursery, it's almost impossible to make a left turn and you have to wait to make a right turn. That's anecdotal, but I can tell you I've been there many many, many times. Like for instance, those angled spaces around that loop in front of Building A, are they really necessary? I mean can you take them out and pull the driveway back a little bit or something?

MR. DEAN: Just so everyone is clear. You'll see -- and I don't have the ability to point -- most of the parking for this site is actually under the buildings. They've covered parking. There's one garage entrance for each buildings A and B. So the surface parking arises out of a couple of different reasons. One is RSIS which governs the design of all residential sites requires a parking supply of one-half space per unit for visitor and guest parking. And I don't recall the number of surface spaces we have, but by and large, that's what those surface spaces are. The majority of the residents will be parking underneath these buildings.

MR. LAPLACE: Well, anyway, my point
is that there's a lot of surface parking and maybe
the surface area could be put to better use. But
moving on to some other questions. Williams
Nursery, right now they're peak times of business
was and is or was weekends, holidays, not 9-to-5,
not rush hour during the week. The people that
live in this complex, even conservatively, let's
say half the people that don't have home offices
or be staying at home or retired, they need to be
leaving in the morning during rush hour and coming
back during rush hour. And your guess about
20-something movements to the left to go south on
Springfield, that's just a guess. I mean it could
be double that going into the center of Westfield
or heading points south. How is that going to
work because right now it's difficult to get out
of here on weekends when the nursery was open and
busy?

MR. DEAN: Sure. To a certain
extent, when we make our projections of how
traffic -- call it the "desire lines" -- if a
resident lives in one of these buildings and they
leave in the morning, what is the probability that
they'll go to the north towards the highway system
or turn and come into town. The existing patterns
that are on the street that are going right by the
site give us a bit of a snapshot as to those
patterns. And in the morning peak hour -- and
that's why I wanted to just share some of those
initial numbers -- in the morning, when stores
aren't open and it's really just people going to
work, we have just about 1,50000 people going
north on Springfield Avenue and 500 coming into
town. So it's about a 75/25 split in terms of
traffic which suggests there is a skew going north
towards Route 22. Our study didn't assume that.
We assumed that we would have 23 out of -- I want
to get you the right number, bear with me one
minute, we assumed that -- it's 23 out of 58
exiting vehicles is 40% are actually turning left
and going into town. The patterns show it to be
closer to 25. As traffic engineers are prone to
do, we err on the side of being conservative and
cautious and we did, I'd say, skew a bit more
traffic toward the center of town in the morning.
If it materializes and people want to go north,
obviously, they'll be less left-turning traffic
and more right-turning traffic. That's what has
kind of led to a lot of the design choices that
were made relative to that driveway.
We don't have any other means of
ingress and egress to the site. We do need to
provide left turns. Obviously, it benefits the
downtown area and that will be a desire on the
weekends. People will want to come and enjoy all
the other benefits of Westfield and some,
obviously, may be headed towards rail service. So
it's important to have a left turn.

MR. LAPLACE: Well, yeah. It's very
important. I think that's why we're very
concerned about it because right now, with the
garden center there, it's very hard to make a left
turn. But not only would people be heading
towards Westfield, and perhaps the train station,
Springfield Avenue goes into Cranford and brings
people to the parkway as well. So if someone
didn't want to try and get to the parkway in the
morning by 22, which I could understand why they
wouldn't want to do that, you can get some
regional -- people who are commuting regionally
heading, trying to make a left to go down
Springfield Avenue in a southerly and an easterly
way to get to the parkway. So I don't know, it's
going to be hard to see how many people are trying
to make that left, and I think it's going to be
very difficult. My last question is; What about transit? Where is the nearest bus stop? What's the bus service? I mean you just talked about cars, what about other modes of transportation?

MR. DEAN: Where we have communities or newer projects in downtown core areas, obviously, there's a lot of walkability to train stations and where bus service is available. When we look at this ITE data, some of the sites, the research sites that were used to compile the data, do, in fact, have some element of bus service or rail service. Just in 50 studies, statistically, some of them will be near it. It reflects not movements -- it only reflects the traffic that comes in and out of the communities, itself. So I don't like to rely and assume -- you know, we've done studies where we've looked at the demographics of the community and we know that "X%" use bus or "X%" use rail, and I could sometimes include that in my traffic study, but then it runs the risk. And candidly, as I'm often on the hot seat, I don't want to be unfairly criticized for saying, well, you know, you've underrepresented your traffic numbers because you've assumed that people will take the bus. I'd
rather not do that. I'd rather assume that the
projections are accurate for the purposes of
analysis and show that at a worst-case scenario,
this traffic can get in safely and efficiently.
To answer your question; I don't know where the
nearest bus stop is.

MR. LAPLACE: You're not aware what
the bus service is here or where there's a bus
stop?

MR. DEAN: I am not.

MR. LAPLACE: And what about
sidewalks? Will there be sidewalks in front of
this connecting to other walks?

MR. DEAN: Again, let's take a look
at the plan. I'm also looking you see what else
is out there in terms of connectivity.
Traditionally, there aren't a lot of sidewalks in
suburban New Jersey communities. The rationale
being is where is there to go. As we get a little
bit further north --

MR. LAPLACE: There's a county park
across the street and there're residential
neighborhoods right across the street as well that
are to the north of the park.

MR. DEAN: And there is some
sidewalk that has been put in as you get into the more commercial corridor areas like the Primrose School -- and I know that's Mountainside -- and it's intermittent along Springfield Avenue. With 162 units, I certainly can see some benefit in enhancing connectivity where possible. And we do have sidewalk along the site frontage, it does connect up to the traffic signal at Mill Lane, and it does allow for that connectivity to get into the park area and continue. I'll have to defer to Mr. Espasa. I don't know -- and I don't have a plan in front of me, I put that away, I'm sorry -- I just don't know whether we have sidewalk along our frontage, but it would end at the site. And so as we get to the neighborhood further to the south going toward Westfield, the center of town, there is no sidewalk. So, you know, it has to end somewhere.

We are showing it across the entire site frontage. I'll say this applicant is doing their part in terms of maintaining that pedestrian connectivity. But as we transition further south where there are predominantly single-family homes, there's no sidewalk along Springfield Avenue.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ASH: Can we talk about making a left turn from Springfield Avenue as you are heading north to south. Springfield Avenue narrows to one lane in each direction where this proposed ingress and egress driveway is located; right?

MR. DEAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ASH: So if somebody is making that left turn from Springfield Avenue into the site, is traffic going to back up behind that car while it's waiting to turn because there's no shoulder there; correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct. And that lane transition ends right at the entrance at the country club. So as you go immediately further south of Echo Lake Country Club, there is no shoulder. That left-turning issue is endemic to the site whether it's Williams Nursery or whether it's this proposal. And you are correct, there is no shoulder. You know, just literally every other driveway leading into the swim club, there's no shoulder. And so traffic waits for that vehicle as they find their gap in northbound. To a degree, the good news is people, as they're coming home at night, the traffic traveling northbound
isn't as heavy as it is in the morning and so
there's a greater frequency of gaps. But that's
not -- you know, that comes with the land, in
short.

CHAIRMAN ASH: In your professional
opinion, is there anything that can be done, is
there any improvement that can be made with the
county's permission to prevent cueing behind a
vehicle looking to turn left into the site? Is
there a dedicated turn lane? I don't think there
is.

MR. DEAN: There is not. And there
are utility poles right at the edge of the road.
The right-of-way is fairly narrow and it limits
the ability to do that. Plus, obviously, we get
into certain -- I hate to use this term -- but,
you know, cost-generative components that in terms
of acquiring right-of-way and putting another lane
on the road does become a bit of a challenge. In
terms of what we call "Level of Service" which is
the relative ease in turning left into the site,
our analysis did include that type of analysis.
And I'm just quickly looking for -- here we are.
We have a Level of Service B. And a "Level of
Service" is a term traffic engineers use akin to a
report card from grade school where A is really
great, super passing. And in traffic terms, it
means "very little delay." At the other end of
the scale, we have Level of Service F, and that
means a delay in excess of 50 seconds, five zero.
And left turns, no question, coming out of the
site are going to have a long delay and,
therefore, I'll say a poor level of service.
The good news is, coming in, and we
did look at this at night, it is a Level of
Service B, as in "boy" condition with an average
delay of 11 seconds. So we're not expecting --
and a cue which is a stacked vehicle is less than
one car. It's not as though there will be 30 cars
lined up trying to make a left into the site. The
nice aspect of a residential proposal is that
traffic is spread out, particularly in the
evening, right? Some people meet friends, some
people stay late to work, some people go to the
gym, you know, whatever. And the evening peak
hour tends to be more spread out over multiple
hours. Some people are home by 4:30, 5, 6, 7 and
so forth. So that inbound traffic is very much
less concentrated than we see in the morning. So
that's part of, again, putting it into context,
and I'm going to go back and look at the 
projections. For that left turn coming in, it's 
35 vehicles in an hour. So that's one car roughly 
every other minute. If it were double that or 
triple that where we're getting close to 100 
vehicles per hour, I'd say, yes, that's going to 
have an impact on southbound flow coming into town 
or continuing east into Cranford. With one car 
every other minute, it's light enough that I'd be 
hard-pressed to recommend a lane and more blacktop 
and more drainage and more stormwater impact for a 
relatively low volume demand.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you, 
Ms. Freedman.

MS. FREEDMAN: Yes. Thank you, 
Mr. Dean, your analysis was very thorough. I have 
an idea of how to maybe solve a lot of these 
problems, and you've probably thought of it too, 
and that would be to add an exit at the back. 
Now, I know you don't own property and the 
developer doesn't own property there, but there 
could be an easement, and I believe the swim club 
has an alternate exit. Were you aware of that? 

MR. DEAN: I'm very aware of that. 
And the swim club does have their exit out to a
side street -- is it Nomahegan, I don't want to
mispronounce it, but I'm sure I did -- where there
is a traffic signal. (Technical interference) is
outside of the control of this applicant. So
lacking any easement, and again, I would imagine
the swim club would have an opinion on that
additional traffic, it does run literally right
behind a number of single-family homes on a
cul-de-sac on Mohican Drive, and it does exit
between two homes. So sometimes the cure is not
always ideal. And that, unless, there was eminent
domain exercised by the governing body to provide
this property owner with a legal means to access
that, it's outside of the control of the applicant
to do it. There's just no legal way to do it,
unfortunately.

MS. FREEDMAN: In terms of traffic
safety, apparently the pool management feels that
it's not safe for their members to make a
left-hand turn onto Springfield Avenue. Were you
aware of that?

MR. DEAN: I have no basis or
knowledge of that. I can't --

MS. FREEDMAN: Well, they don't
allow their members to make a left-hand turn or
they didn't in the past. And so, that's a swim
club and this is an apartment complex. So there's
a lot more traffic on a daily basis during rush
hour from an apartment complex. So it just makes
me wonder why a swim club would find it unsafe,
but yet, an apartment complex would find it safe.

MR. DEAN: I don't know that it is
in fact unsafe for them to do that. I've looked
at it. There are clear lines of sight along
Springfield Avenue. The road is level and
straight in alignment. So in terms of pure
safety, I see no valid traffic engineering reason
for that restriction. On the other hand, as we
know through this process, sometimes there's an
accommodation to say, for example, neighbors one
driveway to lessen the impact on, say, an
immediately abutting house is proposed as one way,
and another driveway is proposed as the exit. And
so that no one particular property owner bears the
burden of -- I'll say living next to all of that
demand. I don't know the reasons. But insofar as
this application is concerned, we don't have a
right to get to that property.

MS. FREEDMAN: I see.

MR. DEAN: It, unfortunately, does
preclude that connection as possibly desirous as it may be. As I said, I think if this board or the governing body or even the swim club as part of this consideration tells us, "sure, we'll give an easement" okay, that may alter our thinking. But at this point, we have no means to do that. Even if everybody on this call loves the idea, we just don't have a way to do it.

MS. FREEDMAN: Okay. Well, I think we should just put that idea to the side and maybe revisit it. I did have an unrelated question having to do with your gap analysis. I know you said you used drones. If a car is exiting from the nursery now, did you calculate the wait time for, again, a left-hand turn coming out of the nursery, you would have to wait for traffic to clear on both sides, but are the lights coordinated so that that could happen or are they not coordinated?

MR. DEAN: They're not coordinated, as I know, but it happens anyway. It's just as lights change and they sequence, there are breaks in traffic. So as traffic approaches on Mill Lane, obviously, the signal cycles through and it creates time to allow that to exit. And that,
obviously, stops southbound traffic on Springfield Avenue. Granted, there is some traffic turning off of Mill Lane. And then at the other end, where we have -- now, I’m forgetting the name again. Is it Nomahegan? Am I pronouncing that right? Where that signal is at Broad Street, that's creating gaps as well. So they're not physically or programmed to create those breaks, but we have a lot of driveways and streets in between and all of those abutting residents, I'll say, capitalize on those breaks and that's what allows them the ability to get in and out, as does the country club.

MS. FREEDMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DEAN: That's why being in between those signals is very beneficial and that's why it does allow this site to work. There's no kidding, people will wait. And I think one question was, well, what do people do, and it's sort of like anyone who lives near a public school knows that there's a 10-minute window where it's chaos, and if I don't have kids in the school, you just quickly learn don't ever try to leave during those 10-minutes. And so people modify their behavior and future residents will
quickly figure when the best time, as it fits
their schedule, to leave will be. And we just do
that, it's human nature. We tend to avoid those
times where things are most problematic.

MS. FREEDMAN: Have you visited the
site, yourself, Mr. Dean.

MR. DEAN: I have. Yes, I have. I
haven't shopped at the nursery, but...

MS. FREEDMAN: Well, have you been
there at rush hour?

MR. DEAN: Yes.

MS. FREEDMAN: Okay. So you've
experienced it first-hand?

MR. DEAN: I have. It's difficult.
There's no disguising it, but I'm not here to
advocate designs that are unsafe. You know, I
bear a liability in this process in terms of my
opinion and evaluation. We always advocate for
the highest degree of safety. One of the things
we quickly identified is all of that access for
Williams Nursery is a little haphazard. And there
are trucks that come in and out of the site. All
of that activity, you know, landscapers and
delivery vehicles and such, all of that heavier
vehicle activity ceases by going to an exclusively
residential community. So sometimes the character
of the traffic, yes, there will be more traffic, but eliminating some of those other components
does have a net effect. And cleaning up the
access points. Making it less confusing for
motorists is certainly beneficial, and by moving
the site access -- I don't know the exact distance
-- but it's, approximately, probably 300-feet
further to the south and getting it further away
from Mill Lane, as well the country club, makes it
an easier site to get in and out of. And all of
that access doesn't need to occur in a four-lane
section where, you know, cars are merging. You
know, it's a bit more challenging.

MS. FREEDMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DEAN: You're welcome.

MR. DARDIA: Yes, hi. This is
Mike Dardia. I'd like to just ask a couple of
questions related to line-of-sight there at the
exit point there. I see that there are, I guess,
plans for at least two large trees right there.
Do you think that that will introduce any sort of
line-of-sight issues? And also, I have a question
about the sign that's going to be installed.
Where will that be installed and will that also
complicate things?

MR. DEAN: If I can ask Mr. Espasa; can we zoom in on that driveway again? It just makes it a little bit easier. Thank you, very much. You will see -- it's all proposed landscaping -- but you'll see what I assume are deciduous trees planted to the left and to the right of the driveway. When we establish clear sight lines, we want to ensure that a driver can see or has visibility 15-feet behind the gutter line or the curb line of the road, itself. And we have established those trees and the plantings well outside of that sight triangle, if you will, to allow motorists to see. It becomes balancing, and a lot of communities really like the street trees once they get that nice canopy. As long as it's not a coniferous tree and it's deciduous, it can be appropriately limbed to ensure that the lowest branches are at least 7-feet above grade so that drivers who are at a roughly 3-and-a-half-foot elevation can see underneath that tree canopy. I am satisfied that the intensional setback of those trees has been done judiciously to maintain those sight lines.

As we look to the right of the
driveway, you will see the identification sign that is proposed. And if we were to score a line, say, from the stop bar or just behind the stop bar and draw a line looking up on Springfield Avenue -- so Mr. Espasa, you have that nice colored...yeah, perfect -- so you will see as that keeps getting extended hundreds of feet to the north, and I know it's off the sheet, that's the perspective a motorist needs to have of approaching traffic coming southbound. And as we go further and further off the exhibit -- yeah, perfect -- you'll see from, hopefully, from that perspective because the road is straight at that point. You know, keep going north, you'll see that the sign has no impact on that visibility and that it is set back at the appropriate distance. So, yes, we did take that into consideration.

MR. DARDIA: Did you also do that same sort of line-of-sight exercise for the left? Because I know further up Springfield Avenue there's a curve. So it's a decline for those cars that are coming toward Route 22, they're coming down a curve -- and I know it's sort of past the Nomahegan property, Nomahegan Pool and Tennis property -- but still, they're coming down at a
pretty good clip. I don't know, are you taking
that into consideration? And I also have a couple
of other questions. First, the line-of-sight for
the left turn.

MR. DEAN: Sure. Well, the left
turn requires visibility in both directions. So
it requires, obviously, visibility around the sign
to the north and the trees so that motorists can
see traffic, say, at Mill Lane. And there's
absolute clear line-of-sight all the way through
Mill Lane, and then the road does start to bend a
little bit to the left and then a little bit to
the right. But as a motorist can see the traffic
signal, you know, they'll know immediately, okay,
if it's red, there's minimal expectation of
traffic coming down, say, off Route 22 because
Springfield Avenue has been stopped. As we look
in the other direction, and I don't want to
introduce a new exhibit, but just available on
Google Maps, one can do what's called "street
view" and there is a way to -- which is what I'm
doing to answer your question -- I can virtually
look down the road, and as I look to the south on
Springfield Avenue, I do see that the road curves
a little bit to the right and then it doubles back
onto the left. And I'm going to measure that distance just so it's on the record and we have it, but that line-of-sight, and again, I'm approximating, but around that curve, gives us 577-feet of sight distance at minimum of approaching traffic. And the speed limit is 35, and for that speed limit and visibility -- and there is a posted 20-mile-an-hour warning on the curve, but for that, we would need, approximately, 300 to 350-feet of sight distance and we have 575. So we do have the appropriate sight lines and ability for a motorist exiting the site to safely see approaching traffic. And the board and the public, we are subject to what we call "outside agency" but, yes, we do need the county to give us their blessing of this design. But in my opinion, from a traffic engineering and design perspective and the county zone standards for visibility, we meet their sight distance requirement.

MR. DARDIA: Okay. Just two more questions real quick. Regarding the traffic counts. You said the most recent one was done in 2019; is that correct?

MR. DEAN: Yes. And that data is appended to our report. It was actually compiled
by NJDOT. Monday through Thursday, April 8 to 11 of 2019. And date daily is consistent.

MR. DARDIA: Okay. My point is would there be -- my question is -- would there be any consideration to do another traffic count? And I know in your study it says, "it is likely to be several or more years before roadway volumes again reach those levels that existed pre-pandemic." But I'll just let you know, and I'm sure a lot of the folks from this board will let you know as well. But there's been quite an influx of new residents to Westfield. A lot of the older residents who may have been retired have moved out and new neighbors have come in. Younger families with cars. Now they're commuting. So I think that you might find that these traffic counts may have increased, and it might be worth your time to do another traffic count. Just a suggestion and I hope that there would be some consideration around that.

MR. DEAN: I mean, listen, it's what I do for a living, we do traffic counts. I think I want to understand and share with you, would that information in any way change the plan and design you have before you. And I think the
answer is no in that the driveway can only go along our frontage. And as of indicated, as we get further to the north, in my opinion, it's in a less desirable area because of the lane merge coming southbound on Springfield Avenue just before the country club, and then the widening just to the north of the site where we proposed the driveway. Let's just assume there are a few more cars on Springfield Avenue in 2022 than there were in 2019, it's not going to materially change my conclusions or findings or the parking or the location of the access or any one of these design components. I have been studying traffic volumes throughout the pandemic, and even in 2022 when I compare it to data that we have from '18, '19, '17, and so forth, it's still suppressed. People have perhaps permanently, but certainly have modified their behaviors in many cases their working environment, so that they no longer need to be part of that commuting flow. The only area where we've seen a little bit of change in traffic is -- they're lower volumes, but fewer people are taking mass transit. Whether that's a permanent circumstance remains to be seen. But, obviously, the pandemic health concerns, you know, people are
eschewing getting back on buses, getting back on trains in the same manner that they did previously. I don't have a crystal ball to tell you whether that's a permanent situation or not, but I think once we get through this, I suspect that the benefits attributed to rail service will get people back out of their cars and back on the trains. And then remote place work options, Zoom teams, you know, whatever the format is, we've all quickly adapted to do our jobs in a very difficult manner and a whole lot more efficient. Sorry for the long diatribe, but I do think that if I were to get the count, I feel very comfortable knowing that I do this day in and day out that it would still be less than I saw in 2019. But you've piqued my curiosity. Again, I don't think it's material to the application, but I'm equally curious myself.

MR. DARDIA: And I appreciate that Mr. Dean, very much. Just one last question. Regarding the county, any consideration about collaborating and to what degree?

MR. DEAN: We are required to collaborate with the county. We need the county planning board approval and by extension
engineering. And they also, like this process, review line of sight, capacity of the drainage system. I mean there are a lot of systems of checks and balances as we go through this process. But I am satisfied in my review. And I'll defer to Mr. Espasa or maybe Mr. Flannery if we've had any communication from the county. And each county does it differently. Some counties issue their reports to the local planning board through this process. Others defer action until the local board has rendered a decision before they, I'll say, become involved. You know, for example, that's standard practice in Essex County and Union County seems to follow suit. Not every time, but many times as well. They just have a lot of projects, and candidly, they just don't want to waste their time on a project that isn't going to see the light of day locally. Oftentimes, it's sequential instead of consecutive. I just, candidly, don't know where we are in this process. So I'll have to defer to the other professionals.

MR. DARDIA: I see. Thank you so much.

MR. DEAN: You're very welcome.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Dean, I have two
questions for you. One related to parking and one
related to traffic. I'm just going to begin on
the traffic side. You mentioned for those cars
who would be traveling southbound and making the
left turn into the development that you
anticipated about an 11-second delay for them to
make that left turn.

MR. DEAN: Right.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: I wanted to
understand if you accounted for a red light at the
corner of Springfield and Broad because, in
current state, that does back up all the way to
this property. So I'm wondering sort of how that
11-seconds is possible if there's no movement in
front of you.

MR. DEAN: If there's no movement in
front of us, then that car is just sitting in line
like everybody else is. What calculation
represents is when that vehicle gets to the
driveway if he hasn't been able to get in already
under the scenario there that by virtue of the
northbound volume and how it's staggered and
regulated by the signal, there could be up to an
11-second delay. And that's an average delay.

Some people will make it quicker, some people will
make it a little bit longer. But that's something that the applicant doesn't control and it starts to suggest, you know, whether it's; work with the county or means to improve the efficiency of those signals. You know, that's part of what we do outside of this process. We work with agencies to make those operations more efficient. And Mr. Battaglia is certainly qualified with his staff and working with the county to collectively come up with ideas to make that work better. And sometimes the solutions aren't easy ones, right, it takes more lanes and more capacity and acquisition of private property and that's not always -- you know, we can't just keep paving. We oftentimes look at ways to make the signals more efficient, improve in using technology to eliminate that kind of condition. Once the car gets to the driveway then, as I've indicated, the standard measured delay would be that of Level of Service B at 11-seconds.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. And I appreciate you mentioned the comment that "we can't just keep paving." Which I'm going to transition quickly to the parking question. I understand the current requirements for parking
based on the number one, two, and bedrooms, but you also noted that you would be meeting the electric car requirements. If you were to exceed the electric car requirements, you would be able to count those spaces at a minimum ratio of 2-to-1, thereby lowering the total number of spots that you need which would have several knockdown effects. One is it would add the ability to add more pervious coverage. And as well, it would also attract people who aren't necessarily looking for a guaranteed two to three spots per apartment when you think about who is going to be moving in and using it. So I'm curious if you thought about exceeding the electric car requirement to eliminate some of the requirement on parking?

MR. DEAN: Here's the conundrum is that much like your ordinance, the RSIS requirements are the defacto ordinance. And so applicants tend to come in with complying applications, right, whether it's maximum impervious coverage or heights of buildings, whatever the bulk standards are in your ordinance. And so with RSIS, we have a compliant plan. I recognize that the EV Ordinance does afford certain credits. When you think about it, it
almost makes no sense in that there is a requirement for a fixed number of parking spaces under the requirements. The EV language was intended -- and I have consulted with the author of that bill, Senator Smith, as to his intent because from a practical side, you sometimes have projects that are much smaller than 162 where that 2-for-1 credit makes no sense. Right? You have 16 units and you need 16 parking spaces, but two of them or three of them are phantom because they're EV spaces, it doesn't make sense. In this particular instance, we comply with, in effect, the ordinance. And so, if we had less parking -- I'll defer to counsel on both sides -- is that a variance? Is that a de minimis exception? And more importantly, the applicant, is that something they'd be willing to consider? The whole intent of that 2-for-1 credit was to incentivize developers to add them and in essence, give them a bonus. There may be an amendment to that bill that reconciles that credit because the spaces don't disappear, the need doesn't disappear, it's just, you know, it's sort of an administrative show game.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: But we've talked
about the bills around the 500-year versus the
100-year storm and there has been an agreement
that we would be focused on the current laws as
they are written today.

MR. DEAN: Correct. And we comply
with either make-ready or the spaces that need to
be implemented at first, what the applicant is not
doing is seeking the credit for those under the
2-for-1 to decrease the amount of parking. In
that, we have state legislation on one side that
allows the credit, and the other requirement being
RSIS that requires the fixed number of parking
spaces. And what Senator Smith told me directly,
verbatim, is -- and I know it's hearsay, but just
for the purposes of educating the Board -- is that
a variance would still need to be requested. The
2-for-1 credit allows or would provide the
justification for the variance, but a variance
would still be needed, you know, or design waiver,
whichever it may be. So there is that inability
to reconcile. And I agree with you, the
legislation is what it is in, you know, February
2022.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Would you consider
asking for that variance?
MR. DEAN: I'd have to defer to the applicant. I'm not the one --

MR. SAMMET: This is perhaps a good point for me to raise the parking requirement from the RSIS. I think, Mr. Goldstein, to your point, the applicant is providing an excess of parking spaces and that's regardless of the bonus for the EV charging spaces. So there is an excess. The RSIS requires 326 and the applicant has a total of 342 spaces. So there is some leeway there. The applicant has designed in more spaces than are minimally required by ordinance. I think that's where you're going with that Mr. Goldstein.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: It is. And it obviously speaks to our desire to be a good neighbor to the residents of Cranford. And while we're making improvements to the drainage as part of this plan, obviously, having less impervious surface would be a benefit. And then parking tends to fill up, you know, and we've seen this and who is attracted to residential units and how residential units are used long-term. So by lowering that number of parking, you're sort of creating multiple knockdown effects that are benefiting the committee.
MR. FLANNERY: Point taken. I just want to add another consideration here, of course, is what the applicant's models and experience show are the necessary amount of parking spaces for the residents. And the proposed parking, although, it is slightly in excess, it's based on the applicant's experience with other similar multi-family developments and the spaces needed in terms of demand from residents. Residents and visitors, I might add. So I just wanted the Board to be aware of that consideration as well. That we're not just talking about what's required as versus what's not. There is the consideration of demand by the residents.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm really glad Mr. Goldstein made those points. I'm a little confused. When I asked Mr. Dean a little earlier about the amount of parking on-site, he said it matched the required number and now we're hearing that the application has an excess of surface parking spaces, you know, or parking spaces than what's required. I'd like to have that clarified. I tend to trust our planner on this, and I think that there should be no --
the RSIS standards are ridiculous anyway in this
day and age, they're very suburban, and I don't
think anyone should exceed them. Personally, I
think -- as I said earlier -- I think this site is
over-parked and it'd be great to get back some
green space. But maybe Mr. Dean could clarify why
he said the amount of parking was what was
required and now we're hearing it's in excess of
what's required.

MR. DEAN: Sure. I'll clarify.

It's in my report and the numbers start to get a
little unyielding. We do have and have proposed
-- and Mr. Espasa or Flannery can correct me --
my report indicated 341 total parking spaces of
which 87 are surface. So they're the ones
outside. And the balance, 254 are in the garage.
Some of those garages are tandem spaces. So,
obviously, they're available to a single-unit
owner just for logistics. The RSIS requirements
are that we have half a space per unit outside,
meaning, available for visitors and guests. And
those are the exterior spaces of which we have 87.
So we have 6 surplus spaces outside. And then the
balance residential ones are in the garages,
they're covered and controlled parking available
for the individual residents. And with the need
to assign spaces to the units that have tandem
space, we couldn't assign or leave some of those
available for visitors and guests. So by my math,
we're 16, one-six, spaces over the requirement.

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Dean, would it be
reasonable for this Board to request as part of
site plan approval removal of at least 10 or maybe
16 spaces that are to the -- for instance, a big
concern I have -- and I think the Chair raised
this -- was the surface spaces that are near the
entrance going in by Springfield Avenue, there're
cars trying to get in and out of the complex. And
if we removed the spaces that are closest to the
entrance, closest to Springfield Avenue, there
might be a real benefit in terms of safety. Would
that be a reasonable consideration?

MR. DEAN: I'm a little unable to
address that. You'll see, for example, at
Building A -- and again, as we start to look at
some future residents whether they're disabled or
handicapped, obviously, having those spaces closer
to the building for that segment of the population
is desirable. You'll see the same for Buildings B
and C that there are surface spaces, you know,
immediately accessible to the building that don't require traveling across the main access aisle. So I can't answer the question --

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Dean, there's parking underneath each building with elevator access; correct?

MR. DEAN: Correct.

MR. LAPLACE: So that would accommodate anybody with accessibility issues?

MR. DEAN: Well, then we have the control of visitors and guests. And for those residents that are disabled, yes. For their guests, a little different situation. All I can say is that comment we can take under advisement. I'll leave have to leave it to the applicant and the team.

MR. LAPLACE: Are you concerned at all from a safety standpoint of those spaces that are along the, I guess it's the -- it's kind of hard to get our direction here -- I guess the southerly property line there that people would be backing out into the main entrance lane --

MR. DEAN: No. Not at all.

MR. LAPLACE: -- across from Building A there.
MR. DEAN: No. Not at all. Any parking lot a commercial building has parking that accesses a main aisle. What we want to do is ensure that we don't have spaces right on top of the entrance so that we don't have cars cueing out into the street. And again, we have two, in that case, maybe three car lengths for that one individual to back out and that's a momentary concern for them to exit, and then inbound traffic can continue. So, no. And that's a common design practice whether it's apartments, hospitals, right, I mean there's always perpendicular parking along corridors or aisles. So I don't see anything inherently wrong with that. The EV spaces, you'll see, are uniformly distributed between, you know, some in front of Building A, some in front of Building B. So those would be exterior spaces.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I hear your concerns, Mr. LaPlace, about providing too much parking. Certainly, we don't want to provide an excess of parking. Looking at the site plan, there's not a lot of loading areas that are shown. And I think the parking area kind of in the Building A
courtyard near the entrance and the additional surface parking between Buildings B and C, you know, in some ways, it needs to accommodate deliveries, Door Dash drivers, or Amazon vans and other traffic demands that are part of our modern lifestyle. And I think there needs to be some utility in the site for those types of trips and those kinds of 5-minute to 15-minute delivery-type parking. And I think having that surface parking available I think helps with that traffic flow. I also think there's a lot of tandem parking in the buildings. And even though each of those tandem spaces counts separately, I think practically, there may be some limited utility to a lot of those tandem parking spaces where you're going to have to rent those spaces or allocate those tandem spaces to one unit, one household that has two cars and can shuffle them back and forth as needed in the tandem spaces. I would maybe leave the surface parking areas as even recognizing that we don't want to be over-parked.

Ross, I'm sorry, did you have your hand up again?

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Chair, can I just clarify? I guess I wasn't really clear about the
surface spaces I'd like to see taken out. I'm not
talking about near the entrances because I think
you're right, you need some flexibility in terms
of visitors and deliveries. But that line of
parking, that long stretch of parking that's along
the southerly property line, and it's very close
to the entrance. I mean if people are trying to
get off of Springfield Avenue to get into the site
from downtown, from the center of town, they make
a right into the site, they have to slam on their
brakes if someone is pulling out of one of those
spaces. So I think if we could take some space
out, I would like from a safety point of view, to
take them at the heed of that row along the
southerly property line.

MS. FREEDMAN: I think that's a
great idea. It's a win-win.

MR. LAPLACE: Yeah. And then as far
as loading, you know, loading happens inside the
building too I think underneath; if I'm not
mistaken. I also wanted to say about the tandem
spots, even single-family homes with driveways
people have to park in a tandem fashion, so that
works itself out.

MR. FLANNERY: Mr. Dean, if you
could briefly explain the safety of those spaces closest to the entrance. I know that you touched on it before, but just to address Mr. LaPlace's comment.

MR. DEAN: Sure. I'll give you by way of example. NJDOT has a standard that there can't be a parking space within 50-feet of the gutter line of the highway. So the whole reason for that standard is can imagine traffic coming in off of, you know, call if a Route 22 with a travel speed on the highway of 50 -- now, no one is coming in the parking lot at 50, but they are approaching and entering at higher speeds. So DOT wants that setback to allow cars to safely decelerate, and if there is a vehicle as we look at that first space -- so it would be the southwest corner of that entrance -- so that that first space, should anyone be backing out -- and understand, these are the visitor's spots, so it begs the question how frequently will they be used -- that the inbound vehicle can see them, can slow down, and if there happens to be a second inbound vehicle right after them, that you can get two vehicles to store while that individual is backing out. And we meet that standard which is on a
state highway on a 35-mile-an-hour road. So I
find nothing inherently unsafe about any one of
those spaces. I don't put my initials on a report
or sign a report endorsing something that's
fundamentally unsafe. And all I can say is the
applicant is on this call, you know, we hear your
comments. We prefer to keep them. I find them
safe. It complies with the standards. And we can
just take it under consideration.

MR. LAPLACE: That would be good.
And just from an urban design standpoint, I'm glad
you put this graphic up or blew it up because you
can see those first couple of spaces are also the
ones closest to the neighboring house, and it'd be
nice not to have cars that close to the
neighboring property and to the house. That's
another thing to think about.

MR. DEAN: I think, again, in this
instance, you know, there's traffic side and then
there's parking side. We do have these standards
and they're drafted to provide the best balance
between enough parking and too much parking. I
certainly understand what your concerns are and
the applicant is hearing them. We will give that
appropriate consideration and thought. I
understand exactly what you're saying. Every little bit of blacktop that gets green spaces is that much letter.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Ross, why don't you go ahead, and then we'll hear from the public.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. Just to reiterate the point that Mr. LaPlace is making, you mentioned how these spots would be likely to be underutilized. I don't believe that was your exact word, but you mentioned how these spots wouldn't be utilized as much regardless. And then if you also factor in that you mentioned there's a two-car only cue for those people making a left turn or to go southbound on Springfield Avenue, the ability to back out of that spot -- which I completely accept your testimony about the safety -- but from a usability perspective, regardless of the safety, if there's likely to be a cue of people making a left, I effectively cannot back out because there're cars ready in that stack waiting to make a left turn. So while it might be safe crossing that center area from the people making the right -- sorry, the people who are making the right traveling northbound -- because they'll be people who would like to travel
southbound by making the left, the usability of those spaces is going to be fairly limited many times of the day.

MR. DEAN: I happen to agree. And I think the time that the visitor guest spots are most used, you know, things like holidays, and weekends, and week, Friday night, Saturday night. And we don't have the same circumstance of exiting and cueing that we would have, say, on a Tuesday morning. So Monday through Friday morning, I'd expect that those visitor spots would be infrequently used. You know, they're required by regulation and we have 6. We have 6 extra in the surface lot. And because -- and I've confirmed this -- all of the garage spaces underneath the buildings will be assigned to individual residents. So we can't accommodate the visitors underneath the building, there's just no public parking. So all of that occurs outside. Perfect example, we have Super Bowl Sunday coming up this week, is it likely that a few of these residents could be entertaining on a Sunday night, sure. But we don't have the same conditions when the visitor and guest parking is most used in terms of ambient traffic on the road, itself. I think the
scenario that was described, hey, people are coming home at evening rush hour, I can almost guarantee those spots will be virtually empty at 5:30/6:00 as people are coming home. You can't have visitors and guests if you're not home. It becomes self-regulating or operating in that those two scenarios never combine. I fully understand the concern, and again, message heard, loud and clear.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Don, can we go to the public attendees, please?

MR. SAMMET: Of course. Anyone from the public have any questions for Mr. Dean, please virtually raise your hand. I have Mr. Saltzman. Mr. Saltzman, if you unmute your mic, we should be able to hear you.

MR. SALTZMAN: Thank you. My name is David Saltzman. I live at 53 Manitou Circle in Westfield. It seems there might be a little bit too much consideration given to the residents of this location and how they're going to get in and out versus the rest of the people who live in Westfield. Mr. Dean, do you believe that this traffic study would not have been of value to the community to understand the impact of this
project?

MR. DEAN: Well, the study was prepared for public scrutiny and well as the Board's benefit. It's a public document that's been available to the planning office since, what, I think August of last summer, and available for review and consideration. The zoning was created to permit this development, and the traffic study is looking at the details of fulfilling that objective of this type of housing type. So I'm not understanding your question really.

MR. SALTZMAN: Very well. I guess what I -- let me change slightly. Was there a better way or a better location to put the ingress and egress from this new spot, specifically, it moved from sort of north to south, but it's moved really towards one of the narrowest portions of the road.

MR. DEAN: That was done by design. I don't know if you were on the call when I started my presentation. At the project's inception, before any buildings were put on the property and even units were allocated, the applicant asked me, and he said we have a limited amount of site frontage. The entire frontage, at
least the northern two-thirds is virtually
wide-open, unrestricted access. Where should we
have this driveway? Where is the safest and most
efficient location for this driveway? And in
looking at a choice, it could be along a four-lane
section of road or it could be along a two-lane
section of road where it is narrower. And given
the concerns of slightly higher speeds and what
drivers are doing as they're merging, you know,
two lanes into one or opening up from one lane
into two as people are adjusting between adjacent
lanes, that added element of traffic movement in a
busy corridor I thought added an element of
complexity that didn't need to be there. And so
the design choice was made -- I'll say at my
recommendation -- to put it at the one lane in
each direction section of the road furthest away
from the country club, furthest away from Mill
Lane. So, yes. We gave that a lot of
consideration at inception.

MR. SALTZMAN: Thank you. One last
thing. Are you at all concerned that some of
these additional empty parking spaces that will be
used for visitors will just, in fact, become
parking for the county park?
MR. DEAN: No. This will be an owner-managed project. It will be on-site maintenance, leasing staff, people overseeing this. And if there's any kind of, I'll say, abuse or trespass, corrective measures will be taken. Whether it's polite warnings, to outright towing. You know, it's difficult to regulate bad behavior, but we can certainly control it. And it's in the applicant's interest to manage his facility and keep it free from that kind of nuisance. So we're not expecting it.

MR. SALTZMAN: Thank you.

MR. DEAN: You're welcome.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Valerie Latona, unmute your mic. We should be able to hear you now.

MS. LATONA: Yes. This is Valerie Latona. I'm the Vice President of Operations with the Nomahegan Tennis Club, and I wanted to address a number of points. First, I wanted to say that it seems like it's a no-win situation in many ways, which I can understand. But I want to stress a couple of things. One, one of the board members had mentioned making a left-hand turn being a safety concern which is why
we ended up exiting our traffic out the (technical interference) and it is indeed a safety concern.

As Mr. Dardia had mentioned, while the speed limit may be 35, nobody goes 35. So these Cars are coming down the road, if there isn't back-to-back traffic, as another board number had mentioned, they're coming down at a pretty high rate of speed, and to make a left while looking out at the right is very dangerous. And I don't want anyone to get hurt, but I do think that there could be a potential for a fair number of accidents. Particularly, if (technical interference) they can't get out, they need to go somewhere, they have a train to catch, they're picking up kids from somewhere. Whatever it be. But I think there is potential for accidents.

So it has been a safety concern for Nomahegan, which is why we put our traffic out the back. And as neighborly as we do want to be, unfortunately, we're not going to provide easement through our complex for this property. So I did want to clarify that as well. And then the other thing, the traffic study that was done, I know that it's hard to do an analysis and have it mimic real life, but anecdotally, I've been a resident
of Westfield for 17 years, a member of Nomahegan for 10 years, it is almost impossible at any time of the day to make a left-hand turn. Now, somebody else has brought up making a left-hand turn coming from the opposite direction, but now you have other trucks, you have these Amazon trucks, you have mail trucks.

I'm not really asking a question. I just want to state that having been a neighbor to this facility for so many years that I am extremely concerned mainly about the left-hand turns and that there isn't enough space there for backup and potential for accidents coming out of the facility. While I don't have a question, I wish that there was a way this could be mitigated. I don't see any answer, so I can understand your predicament. But I did want to put it out there that having been at Nomahegan for so many years and as the vice president of operations it is a safety concern of ours to have members turning left. And that's only during summer months when kids aren't even in school, and it's not even during rush hour mainly. I mean our club doesn't really open until 10:00 in the morning, although, we have tennis earlier. So I just want to put
that out there as a statement. And that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Don, I see, Mr. Basta.

MR. BASTA: Yes, hi. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes. Can you just state your name and address for the record, please.

MR. BASTA: Sure. My name is Michael Basta. I live at 827 Highland Avenue in Westfield, New Jersey. I'm a member of the Nomahegan Swim and Tennis Club. I'm also a member of Echo Lake Country Club. I'm actually the current president and a member of the board of directors at Echo Lake Country Club. Just a couple of things that I want to point out, and certainly, I've been listening to all this testimony and the data and I think similar to several members of the board and several members of the public. I probably had a unique experience in experiencing this area. I've been a member of Echo Lake Country Club for 12 years. Either me or my wife traffics in that area probably on average about four or five times a week. We're also loyal
customers of what is currently Williams Nursery.

So certainly albeit anecdotal, a couple of
observations on the traffic in this area.

MR. FLANNERY: Excuse me. I'm sorry
to interrupt. So sorry. Mr. Chairman, as a point
of order, are we asking questions at this point? Are we receiving testimony from the public? If we're receiving testimony, I think we should swear in members of the public.

CHAIRMAN ASH: At this time, we're asking questions of Mr. Dean.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you.

MR. BASTA: I do have a couple of observations and then I do have a question about what was observed in relation to these observations of mine; if that's deemed appropriate.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yeah. I'll allow it.

Go ahead.

MR. BASTA: Just a couple few things and some of this has been mentioned in part. Again, having had so much experience in this area, a couple of things to highlight from my experience. When you talk about a left-hand turn -- and I'll just use my experience in watching a
left-hand turn out of Williams Nursery currently -- certainly listened to the data on the gap analysis and the number of seconds that are observed in that data, I can say that -- and I also heard testimony that residents will have to patiently wait their turn before they get the gap that is sufficient for them to make the left-hand turn out. Having watched countless cars come out of Williams Nursery over the course of 12 years, what really kind of happens is wait for a little bit of gap, slam on the gas and try to kind of shoot that gap. I've only observed an accident there. I don't know if there's data that supports any other, but I think that has become a significant issue. And I think when you look at the rush hour times in the morning, after school, and in the evening, when you look at Springfield Avenue going south towards the Town of Westfield coming through the traffic signal, the best way that I can describe what that experience has become -- and it's much different today than it was a decade ago, pre-pandemic and to a lesser extent, during the pandemic -- is it's a little bit of a New-York-City-shoot-the-signal, try to get out of the box and kind of stack up left or
right to get out of the box there. In fact, one of our board members had an accident when he was still waiting to turn right into Echo Lake Country Club from a truck coming through. So I think any left-hand turn Springfield Avenue that is incremental will exacerbate that problem. So I certainly listened to the data and maybe I misunderstood the drone observations that were captured, but when we talk about those dynamics that we currently see, and that frankly, the Board has some real concerns about the safety of not only of our members and guests but, obviously, all of the cars and individuals who are in this very, very congested area.

Did that drone footage capture any of those dynamics that I'm describing or was that not the purpose of the drone footage to look at those areas?

MR. DEAN: The drone study was conducted merely by elevating the device above the site and it recorded everything that goes on. So whether it was the country club traffic entering and exiting, whether it was backups from east broad or backups from Mill, all of that was observed and you can see it in real-time from an
aerial perspective. Unlike the experience you might have driving in your car and in that 30 to 40 seconds of turning, driving, and moving through the area, we get to see it over the course of 30 minutes, you know, looking at the peak times of operation. And the reason that we fly it is we want to measure the breaks in traffic and whenever they occur. So the dynamics of the road, the sequencing of the lights, whether cars are turning in and out of the country club or the swim club, all of that gets captured. And when we count the gaps, we then study looking at where the site driveway is and we can zoom in and then measure, using a stopwatch, measure how much time is available for our site traffic in the morning and then in the evening to be able to find a gap that's not "shooting it" the way you've described, that is finding a gap of 6.9-seconds.

And we found 88 instances in the morning where traffic can turn left -- and that's a half-an-hour -- but we only need 23 of those gaps for our site to work. So we have a cushion of, what's that, almost four times to accommodate more traffic. Now, that means people will wait. And, you know, the site, itself, was like a little
detention basin for traffic, and when the conditions so allowed downstream, that our traffic can then leave. But knowing that we have 88 such opportunities in 30 minutes in the morning tells me our traffic is going to be able to safely get out. If we didn't have enough gaps, I couldn't support this. You know, we'd be looking at turning restrictions or some other alternative.

But following this review -- and this gap study, the drone footage, is not something that we normally do. We knew that this was a sensitive issue for the community and we wanted to really closely look at it and not just do the basic computer modeling that we typically do just inputting the volumes and the speed limit and all the other conditions. We wanted to actually measure it. That's why I feel confident. I'm not advocating that's unsafe. But also, the Board and the community should feel that, yes, it's a busy corridor, but this certainly can fit within its location, and it's appropriately sighted for the proposed development.

We don't have a choice, though. I mean there's only so much frontage, and as you've heard, we're not getting an easement through the
swim club, so we're out of options to access the
site. And that is an issue that is -- that's why
I said it's endemic to the continued use of site
whether it's Williams or this proposal. The
benefit of this proposal is changing the dynamic
of that traffic, consolidating the access points,
and getting it as far south as possible, where the
road is, in my opinion, more suitable to
accommodate this demand than further to the north.
And we looked at it. We looked at putting the
driveway opposite the entrance to the country
club. I ruled that out for a variety of reasons
lane just because of the lane widths and the
transitions and not wanting to conflict with your
traffic on behalf of the country club. Offsetting
T-intersections are safer than four-way
intersections. And it's just because at a
four-way intersection, you have a lot of lefts and
rights and throughs all going on at once, and two
sides competing for the same breaks in traffic.
When you split them as T-intersections, they can
both operate independent of one another. It is a
more efficient and a safer design. But we went
through all of those options during the design
phase. I don't know if that answers your
questions, but that's what the drone footage showed. It just showed all the scenarios you've described. We focused on the gap study, but it was done in real-time.

MR. BASTA: And just one more question. Very early in your testimony, I know you noted, obviously, the proximity at both now and earlier in your testimony of the two driveways, and I know you said you looked at traffic data from Echo Lake Country Club. I think I believe, you described it as not much and at what maybe you assumed or assume or presume to be kind of high golf season. I was just wondering if you had any specifics on what kind of data was in your model from whatever observation period you utilized from there.

MR. DEAN: We counted the country club driveway on July 25, 2019. And did it at the same morning and afternoon rush hours, and I think mid-July is, if you're a member, I have to believe that's fairly peak. In the morning, there were 18 vehicles that turned left and 22 vehicles that turned right leaving the club. And at night, it was split evenly; 17 turned left and 17 turned right. In the evening, there were also 25 coming
northbound on Springfield turning left into the club, and 17 coming from the north and turning right. So, you know, they're numbers, but they're, I would say, on-scale with what the site is projected to do. We might have 35 instead of 17, but I mean it's not 135 either.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DEAN: You're very welcome.

MR. SAMMET: Does anyone else have questions for Mr. Dean? I see no hands raised, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you.

Mr. Flannery?

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you, Mr. Ash.

Those are all the witnesses I have this evening. I don't know what the Board's pleasure is if we want to continue discussing potential conditions or if there are further questions from the Board of the witness or if the professionals want to weigh in on anything.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Don, did you want to add something?

MR. SAMMET: Not in relation to really the discussions we're having this evening. I have two reports. I suggest to the Board a
number of conditions related to affordable housing. Some regarding compliance with the EV Charging Ordinance which is now part of state law as well, and some other conditions of which the applicant provided testimony to mostly at the prior hearing in December in regard to the materials, which there was testimony actually tonight. Some additional plantings, the use of decorative lamps, direct access from the playgrounds to the path at Nomahegan Park. I think there was discussion this evening about the monument sign being made smaller in overall dimension, but also complying with the maximum square footage allowed by the sign ordinance. The detail for wall-mounted fixture was provided. And those are primarily the conditions I have noted here.

That would be my recommendation for the Board when we look at this. Of course, we know the use is permitted as part of our affordable housing plan. The density is permitted. And I think we heard some good suggestions from the Board about the potential for some site modifications, which is, of course, up for your discussion. I'll leave Dave to his
recommendations. I believe the applicant has complied with most, if not all, of Dave's suggestions as well, but I leave that to him of course.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Thanks, Don. Yes, the applicant has thus far complied with all my comments in my report. I would like to see some further plans as we discussed tonight about additional pervious pavement to aid the stormwater. The applicant said they would think about that. I think that would be a nice addition to the plans. But, otherwise, so far, they've done well.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Looking at your site plan, you do identify different paved areas as being porous concrete. Do you see that?

MR. FLANNERY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ASH: With the exhibit that's currently up, that would be the surface parking at the kind of the southern side there, that whole strip if you keep -- I'm pointing at my screen like you can see it, but you can't -- that whole strip of surface parking that runs along the southern property line, that is all identified as being porous concrete on your site plan; right?
MR. FLANNERY: I'm going to have to defer to Mr. Espasa on that. I believe so.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Can we get Mr. Espasa back?

MR. FLANNERY: Yeah. Let's have him back.

MR. ESPASA: Can you hear me?

MR. FLANNERY: I can hear you.

There you go.

MR. ESPASA: Let me just bring up the stormwater plan just to confirm it. We have the entire row of parking as porous pavement, and up here as well.

CHAIRMAN ASH: What areas can -- you know, where can it be expanded?

MR. ESPASA: I just want to say if the concern is really reducing the flooding, porous pavement, you know, does a lot for cleaning the water, it doesn't do a lot for reducing run of it. It allows some infiltration into the groundwater, but your biggest bang for your buck is to extend your stormwater and retention basins. Add more piping, add more storage. That's really going to get you what you're looking for in terms of reducing peak runoffs for the different storm
events.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay. Well, let's explore that. And I see the applicant nodding his head affirmatively.

MR. HILLER: Yeah. I think that to increase the porous pavement, Mr. Chairman, it would not be the most effective way to take care of Cranford's concerns. If we could increase some of the underground pipe storage, like that, when there was a huge storm event, there would be more volume in the pipes to hold that water, you know, coming down before it's discharged slowly into the stream. So I think that we should go for the biggest bang for the buck. And if we want to help out Cranford and be good neighbors, which we do, we would consider increasing the volume of the underground storage detention system.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Mr. Battaglia.

MR. BATTAGLIA: That's fine. That's what I was thinking. I'm thinking that the porous pavement would go into some kind of storage underneath and we'd be increasing storage by increasing porous pavement area. If they just want to increase the storage area, that's also fine.
MR. HILLER: We think that would be the most effective way to help Cranford. That's what we want to do. To increase the porous pavement I think it would have certain benefits. But if we really want to reduce the storm runoff according to our engineer, that's how we want to help the Board be good neighbors, please.

MR. BATTAGLIA: So then you're talking about increasing all of your storage underneath the pavement.

MR. HILLER: Not all of it. We have to look at it where we can do it and where it makes sense. We're already exceeding all of the regulations, greatly exceeding them, so it's not like, you know, we just put this together to meet the bare minimum, we came up with a very robust stormwater management plan, but we're willing to increase the volume of the storage, Mr. Battaglia, to have more of the runoff retained on-site before it's slowly released into the stream corridor.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Noted.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Is there some language that we can agree to tonight to memorialize that condition?

MR. HILLER: Peter?
CHAIRMAN ASH: He called on you, Mr. Flannery.

MR. FLANNERY: I think we can agree to provide additional porous pavement where necessary to complement the increased pipe storage of the stormwater system for the project. Something to that effect.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Is there a certain additional threshold that would be a target, Mr. Battaglia? Is there some firm commitment we can agree to?

MR. BATTAGLIA: You guys, in my mind, I'm thinking something like a 5 to 10% increase.

MR. HILLER: Rob, do you think you can live with that okay and fit it in that one area? You know, the other area near the county park, I don't think we have much space. So we can only work with this area by Buildings C really.

MR. ESPASA: Correct. This area is too tight. I think we can do it.

MR. HILLER: We're going to target -- guys, we're going to target 5% and if we can do better easily, we'll try to do a little bit better also. We're going to do the best that we can with
it being practical. There's also, you know, in previous testimony, neighbors brought up high water table issues, so it's not like we can just fit anything that we want underground here. We have to work with the engineering constraints. And Mr. Battaglia will, I'm sure, make sure that we do what reasonably we could do. And we'll target a 5% increase in storage volume.

MR. BATTAGLIA: That's acceptable to me if it's acceptable to tell Board.

CHAIRMAN ASH: At this time, let's open it up to public comment, so anyone from the public who wishes to comment generally or on any specific issue related to this application.

MR. SAMMET: Anyone with a comment, please virtually raise your hand so we can allow you to speak. You just need to virtually raise your hand. This is for comments now on the overall application. No one is raising their hand. Oh, wait, here we go. NewYorkpuzzle.

MS. O'LEARY: Hi. This is Lisa O'Leary from Cranford again. I just want to make sure I understand what's being proposed here in terms of the additional stormwater collection. At first, I thought I hear 5 to 10% or more, but
then it sounded like during the course of the
conversation it got reduced to 5%. I'd like a
little clarification on what the target is.

MR. FLANNERY: I believe it's at
least 5% more than 5% if feasible.

MR. BATTAGLIA: Correct.

MS. O'LEARY: Okay. Thank you. Oh,
I'm sorry I actually have -- am I still unmuted?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes. Go ahead.

MS. O'LEARY: My other question is
will Cranford have an opportunity to have their
engineers or whomever it is that was proposed
earlier speak to the right people at Westfield?
And I'm no expert in this area by any means, but
it sounded like there was an offer on the part of
Cranford to do that.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Well, what we can do,
and it will not be specific to this application,
but Westfield is currently re-examining its
ordinance requirements related to stormwater,
other infrastructure, and resiliency requirements.
And I think it would make sense as part of that
effort, and certainly, if the mayor was still on
the panel right now, she could speak to this in
better and more detail than I can, but I think it
should be a regional effort, and Westfield should
work with Cranford and neighboring municipalities
to come up with solutions to address problems that
are not confined to our borders. That
conversation between Cranford's engineering and
Westfield's engineering should be part of that
broader effort.

MS. O'LEARY: Thank you, very much.
I appreciate that.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Latona.

MS. LATONA: I just wanted to say
that this facility is beautiful. I think that
it's very well designed. And I know that's it's
undergone a lot of criticism and commentary and I
appreciated the fact that the developers and the
engineers are willing to work with Cranford and
with Nomahegan, and hopefully with this traffic
situation. But I do think it could be stated
overall that I think that this facility will be an
improvement to the Town of Westfield town. I know
that there's been a lot of concern about
low-income housing and the addition of these
things, but I think they've done a pretty amazing
job developing it and designing it and I just
thought that it should be put out there.
CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Anyone else from the public? Going once? Going twice? All right. We will close that portion of the application. And I'll allow Mr. Flannery some closing remarks.

MR. FLANNERY: Yes. Thank you. I'd like to thank the Board for its consideration of this application. I just want to emphasize that this proposal for the 162 inclusionary units is part of Westfield's affordable housing plan, it's part of the settlement of its declaratory judgment action, and ensures that there's affordable housing for low and moderate-income households in the region. I believe the project is very well designed, both aesthetically from an architectural standpoint in terms of high-quality materials and layout. In terms of the engineering, I believe it also is very well designed in that it not only meets but also exceeds stormwater requirements. And there are various sustainability measures as well as a safe and efficient design for traffic and pedestrian access as well. And I believe that with the conditions set forth in the record, this is an excellent application. I ask that the Board approve it. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you, Mr. Flannery. Okay, Board. What say you? Mr. LaPlace? You are on mute, sir.

MR. LAPLACE: Getting late. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think this is a very good application with benefits to the community that have already been eloquently stated by both members of the community and the applicant's representative. I thank the applicant for agreeing to the conditions that have been raised by staff and would be inclined to support this application with an additional condition. And the condition is a result of our concern, I think, I say many of the members of the Board, as well as members of the audience, have spoken about the concerns at that single point of access to the site, that one entrance on Springfield Avenue. So I'd like to make the proposed condition for approval that the four regular parking spaces that are at the southwesterly corner of the site closest to the Springfield Avenue entrance and along the southerly property line, those first four spaces as you come into the site on your right be eliminated from the plan. That would make the area around the entrance to the site much
safer, and the applicant would still have an excess of surface parking spaces exceeding what the minimum parking requirement is. So I'd like to make that proposed condition as part of the move for approval.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you.

MR. FLANNERY: If I can interject here. I don't know if it's proper because the Board is deliberating. I just want to add would it be possible to have those spaces banked? So if there was demand in the future, an application could be made to create those spaces. I just want to leave the option open in the event that there is high demand at the site.

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Chair, can I reply to that?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Go ahead.

MR. LAPLACE: Normally, I would be open to that if it wasn't a safety issue. The problem with those four spaces -- and four is a minimum, I would take out more if it was up to me, but I'm only asking for four -- is that they're the ones closest to the entrance, and that's where the potential points of conflict are as far as cars pulling out, cars trying to get off
Springfield Avenue into the site. So I really
think with those first four spaces eliminated, we
have a safer design. I'm inclined not to see them
as banked parking. I'd rather just see it as
where there's no parking as you first come into
the site.

MS. FREEDMAN: And I support that,
Michael, for all of those same reasons.

MR. LAPLACE: Thank you, Ann.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Any other members of
the Board?

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Chairman, for
Mr. Mascera, if I should enumerate the conditions
as I saw them in my reports?

CHAIRMAN ASH: That would be
helpful.

MR. SAMMET: For the Board, of
course. I'll do it quickly. From my report dated
November 12, 2021, Compliance with Conditions
Numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5. Then also, that the
materials and color scheme shown on Exhibit A-5 --
materials and color scheme be similar to those
marked as Exhibit A-5 this evening. I believe
it's shown on the revised plans and was testified
to, with another condition that additional
plantings be placed to screen that southerly side-yard parking area from Springfield Avenue. I think that's appropriate even we're removing an additional four spaces at that location. That there be direct access from the playground area to the bicycle-pedestrian path in Nomahegan Park. That the monument sign be compliant with the Land Use Ordinance requirements. That the decorative lamppost and fixture head be utilized along the pedestrian areas of the site. Basically, anywhere except that southerly side of the parking area, the surface parking area. And that the applicant -- scratch that one. And then finally, the conditions recommended in my November 19, 2021, report. I think I got it all.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I would also support the comments by Mr. LaPlace and Ms. Freedman as to the four parking spaces. And a commitment to increasing the stormwater discharge storage by a minimum of 5% along with the potential for more porous paving to be further reviewed by the town engineer. Anyone else?

MR. MASCERA: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify, the minimum 5% is a minimum, and that's a condition. The additional porous is if
possible, but not a firm condition.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Correct.

MR. SAMMET: I suppose the standard condition of the applicant obtain site plan approval from the Union County Planning Board.

MR. MASCERA: Yes. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Right. And if no one else has comments, I would make a motion to approve the application with those stated, enumerated conditions.

MR. SAMMET: That's a motion by Chairman Ash. Is there a second?

MS. FREEDMAN: I'll second it.

MR. CEBERIO: I'll second it.

MR. SAMMET: I see there's Mr. Ceberio and Ms. Freedman. I don't know who went first.

MS. FREEDMAN: I'll defer to Matt, my younger brother.

MR. SAMMET: Okay. Second to my younger brother, Mr. Ceberio.

MS. FREEDMAN: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: I'll take the roll.

Chairman Ash.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes.
MR. SAMMET: Mr. Ceberio.

MR. CEBERIO: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Councilman Dardia.

MR. DARDIA: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Harrison, I believe you need to abstain.

MS. HARRISON: Abstain.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Goldstein.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Jansveld.

MS. JANSVELD: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. LaPlace.

MR. LAPLACE: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: Ms. Carreras.

MS. CARRERAS: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: And Ms. Freedman.

MS. FREEDMAN: Yes.

MR. SAMMET: It's approved with conditions.

MR. FLANNERY: Thank you, very much.

MR. HILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, everybody.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you. Does anyone need a very break before we move on?

MS. FREEDMAN: Yes.
MR. SAMMET: Yes, please.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay. All right. A five-minute, really five-minute brief --

MS. HARRISON: Can I ask how long you expect us to go tonight?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Well, we've got another application.

MS. HARRISON: I don't see how that's possible.

CHAIRMAN ASH: We do have a lot of public attendees who I think have been waiting, I think we owe it to them to at least continue. Unless you feel strongly otherwise.

MS. HARRISON: I just don't know. I'm just asking how much longer. I mean is this going to go to midnight? Or -- I physically won't be able to make it much longer, but I would like to give all of these applications my brightest, sharpest mind. I'm fine for a while longer, but not until 1:00 in the morning.

CHAIRMAN ASH: That's understood. I guess I'll poll the Board. Is there a desire to maybe table the rest of the agenda? Don, is there --

MR. SAMMET: The referrals from the
governing body, we should handle. The Board does have a specific time frame in which to act on that. I know the ordinance is up for a public hearing tomorrow, the governing body. And I could get through those two administrative items really quickly.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay.

MS. HARRISON: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, that’s only my opinion. If no one else feels that way, I will power through.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Well, I mean look I’m not trying to keep us up past our collective bedtimes. I’ll poll the Board. Show of hands, should we continue to hear the next application and finish the agenda or is there a preference to adjourn it until the next meeting?

MR. DARDIA: I would prefer to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN ASH: All right. Show of hands to adjourn.

MS. JANSVELD: Well, Chair, my question is don’t we have a lot of items next meeting also? So I’m just wondering if we’ll have the same issue.

MS. HARRISON: Should we have a
special meeting?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Well, I think there is a volume on the docket, but we take things in order and we do what we can and we don't know what the time constraints will be necessarily.

MR. LAPLACE: Chair, I think you made a really interesting point or empathetic point when you said that some people have been waiting all evening to hear this one. I guess the problem is we won't get through the whole thing, but maybe starting it. I don't know. I don't know how my colleagues feel on the Board. But we are starting to get backed up a little.

CHAIRMAN ASH: I was asking for a show of hands for adjournment. So let me get the Board's --

MR. SAMMET: Maybe for Maria, we should do a poll, audio.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay.

MS. FREEDMAN: Is the poll to take the items that the council's going to vote on tomorrow and then just push PB19-02 to next month?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes. Although I believe we will need the applicant's consent which, you know, we have not asked for yet. And
I'm trying to balance the interest here of everyone being ready and everyone having waited all night, but the Board not wanting to rush testimony or a decision on the application. So I think all things being equal and if the applicant is agreeable, I'd rather not rush things. And I tend to agree with Anastasia that we owe it to the applicant and all other interested parties to give it one-hundred percent of our effort and attention. So I guess --

MR. LAPLACE: Chair, can we bring on the representative for the applicant to ask them?

CHAIRMAN ASH: We can. I believe that's Mr. Hall.

MR. SAMMET: I can bring him in if you like. Mr. Hall, I'm bringing you in as a panelist.

MR. LAPLACE: Don, will we need an extension of time?

MR. SAMMET: Well, it's an interesting question because this came up before. This application was subject to a Superior Court judgment, and the court didn't give a time frame to the Board. So I'm not quite sure. At think at some point last year there was some discussion
between Mr. Trembulak and Mr. Hall on that matter.

MS. HARRISON: It was also up in
front of us a couple of times and didn't they pull
it twice? Is this the same one?

MR. SAMMET: Yes.

MS. HARRISON: They pulled it twice
when we had time.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Good evening,

Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: Good evening, everyone.

It's been a long night, I agree.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes. You've heard
the Board's discussion about this.

MR. HALL: Could I ask? I mean, it
strikes me as a very simple application. I don't
know you needed to ponder, it's going to take a
long time. As Mr. Sammet summarized, it's a
conforming minor subdivision, no variances. As
you did with the Schnitzer application back in
December, there's no -- and as your attorney, who
unfortunately couldn't be here tonight -- said
previously, there really are no issues. We create
lots, there's no development proposed. The idea
is to create two lots and record them, and if
somebody buys them and wants to build down the
road, they'll have to comply with everything. So I don't know what -- are we going to redo what happened with Schnitzer where you spent hours on hearing things that turned out being irrelevant. My client has been patient, waiting, and there have been delays, I haven't complained. I'm just not sure where you're headed. I'd like to resolve it like everyone else. I see your dilemma, but I just don't want to waste my time or your time any further. I think it can and should be approved rather quickly. I mean if under the statute you could even -- some towns are authorized to delegate minor subdivisions to a subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Well, that's not the case here.

MR. HALL: I understand. I understand. Your ordinance --

CHAIRMAN ASH: Notwithstanding your description of the application and the simplicity of it, there are genuine concerns of the neighborhood and neighbors and we will hear all of those concerns. You've heard our discussion, and we've brought you on to ask you if adjournment is something you would agree to.

MR. HALL: Well, unfortunately, I
can't consult with my client, and without that consent, I can't agree. I think the court intended this. I think the Schnitzer application, your decision, I don't know how -- I understand you want to hear people's concerns, but those concerns don't relate to any relative -- relevant issue in your jurisdiction, to my knowledge.

MR. MASCERA: Mr. Hall, if I might. This is Greg Mascera speaking. Your position is noted by the Board. The Board has the obligation to hear the concerns of neighbors. The Board has the obligation to consider the application on its face without referencing the Schnitzer application. Your application will stand on its own. The Board is asking you for your consent to adjourn. It is 11:00 p.m., 11:12 p.m. You have adjourned the application on at least one occasion. The Board recognizes its responsibility and wants to give this application the diligence that it deserves. And the Board is asking you for your consent.

MR. HALL: Yeah. Well, this happened back in November, I believe it was, and Mr. Foerst did not agree to an adjournment, and you adjourned it anyway. I mean I'd rather not
consent just to be consistent. But if you want to
adjourn it, adjourn it.

MR. MASCERA: I think, as Mr. Sammet
had said, and I don't know whether you were able
to hear -- I'm not sure when this application
would be deemed complete so that the Board has to
be concerned about statutory approval, which,
obviously, the Boards did not want to grant. So
without your consent, it would be difficult for
the Board not to hear the application tonight.
Although, I don't know that you want to go back to
Superior Court with consent. I think the Board is
respectfully asking that you consent to an
adjournment. You'd be first on the agenda at the
next meeting. And as a land use attorney, you
know that this often happens. And it happens
probably more times than not.

MR. HALL: Well, I reluctantly will
consent because I agree, I don't want to go back
to court. Maybe we'll wind up there anyway. But
if it's first on the agenda at the next meeting,
let's go then.

CHAIRMAN ASH: We'll make that
accommodation.

MR. HALL: I'd appreciate that.
CHAIRMAN ASH: Then we will adjourn PB19-02 until -- what is it, March 7?

MR. SAMMET: March 7, and we will be virtual again. I'm just playing it safe and scheduling us virtual.

MR. HALL: There's no new notice then, Mr. Sammet?

MR. SAMMET: Right.

MR. HALL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay. That's it.

MR. MASCERA: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: Thank you. Have a good night.

MR. SAMMET: Mr. Chairman, at your discretion, of course, I'll proceed with the two administrative matters. I can do those very quickly.

CHAIRMAN ASH: All right. Thank you.

MR. SAMMET: The first item under other business for you is the proposed destination of three additional historical properties in town. One is the Coffee Kiosk, so-called "Coffee Kiosk" at the South Avenue train stations. It's recently been renovated, and the commission has recommended
to the governing body that it be -- excuse me, I have to get rid of Mr. Hall here -- the commission has recommended to the governing body that it be designated as a local historic landmark.

The second property, one of our board members knows very well as she lives in it, is 23 Stoneleigh Park. So I believe, Anastasia, you may need to abstain on any vote on that.

And the third property is the property at 112 Ferris Place, which also is subject to the provisions of the Prospect and Ferris Redevelopment Plan. That redevelopment plan calls for the preservation of 112 Ferris and its reuse for historic purchases and for historic events and learning.

As far as the planning board's review, you look to determine if these properties, their designation, would be consistent with the Town Master Plan. And also, if the properties are identified in your Master Plan. I can tell you that the properties are identified in your Master Plan in Historic Preservation Element. And also, that you have a goal in your Master Plan to promote the conservation of various historic sites, structures, and districts.
Of course, local designation would encourage their preservation and any upkeep and improvement of those homes to be consistent with the historic character of them for review by the Historic Preservation Commission of improvements made to those properties. So the mayor and council have not yet introduced an ordinance to designate these properties, but they have referred over the proposal to designate them by the Historic Preservation Commission.

My recommendations to you is that you find them, that their designation be consistent with the Town Master Plan, and that you recommend that the governing body amend the town Land Use Ordinance to include the properties as local historic sites and that the zoning map be amended to identify those properties as historic sites.

So that's the first item. I don't know if anyone wants to -- I don't know, Greg, if this referral, it's not really a resolution that the Board has done, but they've kind of done an informal vote, I guess you would say, on them. Michael, hi.

MR. LAPLACE: I'd like to -- I'm
sorry, Gary.

MR. MASCERA: I thought he was asking me a question. Whatever your procedure is typically, Mr. Sammet, is absolutely acceptable. It is one ordinance with the three properties; correct?

MR. SAMMET: Well, the ordinance has not yet been drafted. The council has referred this over, sort of, for an advisory opinion of the Board as if to the designation of these three properties be consistent with the Master Plan.

MR. MASCERA: I think you could consolidate it and do whatever you want with it. Simply a letter from you on behalf of the planning board to the governing body.

MR. SAMMET: No problem.

MR. LAPLACE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes.

MR. LAPLACE: I would like to ask the Board to formally endorse it by vote; this motion to designate these three properties as locally designated landmarks. I think they're an interesting grouping. The kiosk is a publically owned facility, so the Town of Westfield is setting an example for preserving our heritage,
our built environment, our built heritage,
historic buildings. I think the one on Ferris is
an interesting example of where a historic
building will become part of a new development.
So it's an interesting example of historic
preservation not only being a catalyst for new
development but balancing the old and new. And
then, third, I want to say to Ms. Harrison and her
family how much I commend them for making this
move because, hopefully, it will catch on in
Stoneleigh Park which is such an important,
potential landmark district. And she's really --
er her and her family are really being leaders in
this important effort to preserve Westfield's
heritage.

On all three counts, these are
important properties that deserve landmark
designation and protection. And I certainly fully
endorse this.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Okay. Thank you.
Ross, you had your hand up?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah. I just had a
question on the first property. And
congratulations Anastasia, I think it's wonderful
what you're doing. And very excited for seeing
the redevelopment of Ferris Place, incorporate the existing structure that's there. I did have one question around sort of the Master Plan calling out the idea of utilizing the parking spaces that are available to the Town of Westfield as redevelopment zones, and specifically around transit-oriented development. And I just wanted to sort of bring up the possibility that the kiosk could actually have the negative implications when we think about how that property is redeveloped. I'm not trying to minimize the historical significance at all. I think it's worthy of a quick conversation if it does impede our ability to take the appropriate steps with that property.

MR. LAPLACE: Chair, can I comment on that? That's an interesting issue.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Yes.

MR. LAPLACE: My reaction to that would be that the kiosk is actually -- I guess it's technically within the parking lot area, although, it's up on the sidewalk. I think it's oriented more towards the station building, the south-side station building which is still an operating train station. As you may know, the north-side train station, which is another
historic building owned by the town, is slated to become a restaurant, slated to become a business. So I think this is consistent with the Master Plan in terms of taking these publicly held resources and making them more economically viable as well as preserving their structures. I don't think it would preclude redevelopment on the south side, but I understand your concern.

MR. SAMMET: Yeah. I agree with Michael as well. I think, if anything, it shines a light on the kiosk as well as a main train station building. In this case, particularly the kiosk. And it shows any potential redevelopers as well as the town as a whole, the importance of the structure to the character of downtown, and that these things should be -- historic structures should be incorporated and thought of as part of as any redevelopment project. And the 112 Ferris is an excellent example of that. The redevelopment plan was adopted for the historic designation. But the thought of doing both at the same time, or just about the same time, they went hand-in-hand really.

MR. CEBERIO: I was going to say the same thing, Don. That site, it's one where you
have this historic resource on the same property
in essence in what could become a redevelopment or
is a redevelopment site. I think it's similar in
that respect. I think legally that should
restrict the development in any way and,
hopefully, it's just a component of the larger
project.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah. I guess the
only point I had on it was that Ferris Place was a
little different in that there was a developer
bringing the project forward. So they were able
to bring those projects forward in conjunction,
where this decision is being made prior to a
developer being established. It was just
something I thought was worth conversation. But I
appreciate the points you've both made.

MR. SAMMET: I think there was a
motion by Mr. LaPlace; is that correct?

MR. LAPLACE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ASH: And to clarify, it's
a motion to recommend the historic designation.

MR. SAMMET: The historic
designation of these three properties and define
that this is in compliance with the Master Plan.

MS. FREEDMAN: I'll second that.

(Crosstalk.)

CHAIRMAN ASH: And for the record, (indiscernible) in Don's January 12, 2022 memo.

MR. SAMMET: There's a motion by Mr. LaPlace and seconded by Ms. Freedman. All in favor.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SAMMET: Any opposed.

Abstentions.

MS. HARRISON: Abstained.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Abstained.

MR. SAMMET: I'll just jump right into the next; if that's all right. The ordinance referred to you is really a tweak to the sign ordinance. It doesn't change permitted, number of signs or size of signs, or location of signs. All it does is allow for signage for multi-family developments in all our affordable housing overlay zones like they're permitted for some districts that have been in place that permit multi-family development. A good example is this evening's application for the old Williams Nursery site, or the Williams Nursery site, where they proposed a
sign. When the overlay zone districts were established not too long ago, about three years ago, there's a gap in the ordinance, if you will, where there is no sign provision for a multi-family development in an overlay zone. So this would simply allow for our overlay zone apartments to also have signage the same size, the same kind of location regulations as for other multi-family developments in town. And are overlays are -- where are they -- they're on North and South Ave. And that's all.

CHAIRMAN ASH: So we need a motion to find that General Ordinance 2022-3 as introduced is not inconsistent with the Master Plan.

MS. FREEDMAN: I'll propose that.

MR. SAMMET: By Mr. Freedman.

MR. MASCERA: Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the language be that "is consistent with Master Plan."

MR. SAMMET: I'm just smirking because, Greg, we've had other attorneys describe it as it's "not inconsistent with the Master Plan."

MR. LAPLACE: I think every town
talks about it.

MR. SAMMET: Yeah, right. It's one of those things. Everyone means the same thing, it's just how they say it.

MR. MASCEMA: I'll defer to Mr. Trembulak.

MR. LAPLACE: Are we looking for a second still? I'll second it.

MR. SAMMET: Seconded by Mr. LaPlace. All in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SAMMET: Any opposed. Any abstentions? None. Thank you, everyone. It's last, I hope I was clear on what I was talking about.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Thank you.

MR. LAPLACE: Very clear.

CHAIRMAN ASH: Motion to adjourn.

MS. HARRISON: (Indicating.)

MR. DARDIA: (Indicating.)

MR. SAMMET: Motion to adjourn by Ms. Harrison, seconded by Councilman Dardia.

MR. SAMMET: All in favor.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SAMMET: All right, everybody,
pleasant dreams. Site plan subcommittee, I'll reach out to you. Good night, all.

- - -

(The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 p.m.)

- - -
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