

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Thursday, February 23, 2023

Present:

Chairperson Jessica Pearson
Vice Chair David Freschi
Mayor Alex Roman
Councilman Jack McEvoy
Mr. Steven Neale
Mr. Jason Hyndman
Mr. Al DeOld

Mr. Jesse Lilley
Mr. Jeremy Katzeff
Mr. Chris Bernardo
Mr. Greg Mascera, Planning Board Attorney
Mr. Michael DeCarlo, Zoning Officer
Marcie Maccarelli, Acting Planning Board Secretary

Meeting called to order at 7:34 PM by Chair Pearson. Frank Dobiszewski from Boswell Engineering is also present. Chair Pearson notes that the following members have been sworn in:

1. Mr. Jeremy Katzeff – Alternate Member #1 - Term Ends 6/30/2023
2. Mr. Chris Bernardo – Alternate Member #2 - Term Ends 6/30/2024

Pledge of Allegiance:

Chairperson Pearson reads Open Public Meetings Act Statement.

Public Hearing

Chairperson Pearson asks if anyone from the public would like to address the board on topics not on this meeting's agenda. No members of the public came forward.

Minutes

Chairperson Pearson asks for a motion to approve the minutes from a meeting held on January 26, 2023, Mr. Katzeff makes the motion, Vice Chairman Freschi seconds. Mr. Bernardo abstains, all others present vote in favor. Minutes are approved.

Resolution 2023-01: AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING AND ENCOURAGING ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY/SERVICE EQUIPMENT (EVSE) & MAKEREADY PARKING SPACES

Chairperson Pearson asks for a motion to approve Resolution 2023-01, Councilman McEvoy makes the motion, Mr. Hyndman seconds. Mr. Bernardo abstains, all others present vote in favor. Resolution passes.

Resolution 2023-02: Approving Revised Site Plan for PIRHL- Block 2301, Lot 1401 (formerly - Lots 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, & a portion of lot 18)

Chairperson Pearson asks for a motion to approve Resolution 2023-02, Mayor Roman makes the motion, Mr. Katzeff seconds. Mr. Bernardo abstains, all others present vote in favor. Resolution passes.

Mr. Neale recuses himself from hearing Application 2022-04 and advises that he will be leaving the meeting.

Continued Hearing of Application 2022-04 Preliminary & Final Site Plan for 1 Sunset Avenue, Block 303 Lot 1

Mr. John Inglesino reintroduces himself as the applicant's attorney and gives a recap of the previous testimony given at the Board's previous meetings. Mr. Inglesino advises that there will be two witnesses this evening: Mr. Matt Seckler, of Stonefield Engineering and Mr. Jonathan Schwartz, who is a principal in the applicant who will later testify with respect to operations. Mr. Inglesino introduces Mr. Seckler as their traffic expert for the project. Mr. Mascera swears in Mr. Seckler. The Board accepts him as an expert.

Mr. Seckler begins by describing existing roadway network around the site, and how it operates. The site is located at the intersection of Sunset Avenue, a lesser roadway and Bloomfield Avenue, a principle arterial roadway. He states that there is a stark difference between school traffic & that from residential buildings with regards to the style of traffic that they have.

He states that the queuing that occurs in the morning during drop off the passenger cars and minibuses back up past the first driveway. It goes up to the second driveway of the site causing a significant amount of congestion of 10 -15 vehicle lengths back from the intersection of Sunset & Bloomfield. Bloomfield takes up the majority of green time at that light, as it is a high volume road. Sunset only gets 14 - 22 seconds of green time, every two minutes. Most of the time at that light is allotted to Bloomfield Avenue because that is where the steady flow of traffic is. He asserts that the significant backup in the queue is because of the current condition due to the school traffic. They also note that the angle of the intersection & the tight radii at the turn make it more difficult for the larger wheelbase vehicles to make turns. These are all existing conditions.

Mr. Seckler then discussed the proposed site's traffic; how much traffic will be generated by this development and how it will affect the roadway network and the queuing at the Sunset Ave-Bloomfield Avenue light.

The light on Sunset is considered and E level of service because of the way the light is timed. The traffic light is controlled by Essex County. They discussed with the county the possibility of putting in a right turn lane and were informed that it would have no benefit to this intersection. As part of this application, after conversations with the county, the applicant is going to be required to pay into the County's Traffic Signal Improvement Fund where the county can use the money at their discretion to: add a right turn lane later if they felt that it was needed or to increase the technology at the intersection or improve the pedestrian approaches at the intersection. The applicant is in agreement to add that money to the Improvement Fund.

Mr. Seckler states that the project has been designed to comply with the parking requirements of the ordinance and with the number of EV parking spaces that are required.

Mayor Roman asks if there's a substantial difference between these two types of developments in regard to offsite traffic. Mr. Seckler answers that almost all of the traffic generated by the school is at the beginning and end of the school day and between those times, it is minimal. A multifamily development has a very different traffic profile where the traffic is spread over the day, especially since work from home is such a common thing now. Mayor Roman asks if they analyzed the traffic in terms of a full day generation as opposed to simply peak hour. Mr. Seckler responds that Mayor Roman is 100% correct in terms of the flow within the site and states that over the day the number of trips generated from the proposed site would be about 900. He does not have the totals over the entire day in the existing school condition, but he would guess that it would be under 300.

Chair Pearson states that is an increase of roughly 600 trips. How does that leave someone sitting for only 100 seconds at a light? Mr. Seckler states that those additional 600 - 700 trips are spread throughout the day. Chair Pearson would like to refer back to table # 2. It shows "weekend afternoon peak hour" and it has the existing private school showing 101 trips on a weekend which seemed unusual. Mr. Seckler advises that it should say "weekday" not weekend.

Councilman McEvoy asks for verification that Mr. Seckler's figures include: UPS, FEDEX, etc.? Mr. Seckler responds that it includes any trip that entered or exited a site including those services.

Mayor Roman asks to talk again about full day trip generation of 900 cars. Mr. Seckler responds that they focus on the rush hours; 6% or 7% of the traffic comes from each peak hours and not an even distribution of cars per day. Mayor Roman says that with a 100-second cycle at that light, it is hard to see how there would not be a queue; just out of the sheer number of trips that the site is generating. Mr. Seckler says that by no means is everyone going to be lucky enough on this street to be able to pull up to a green light at Sunset, there will be a queue but the queue will not be as bad as it is today during the school rush hour peaks. Outside of the peaks, you will see less than one car per minute.

Mr. Hyndman asks if Mr. Seckler analyzed the total traffic coming from Sunset Avenue, and what percentage of that traffic coming in & out of Sunset would be attributed to this new development-would it include those 900 trips? Mr. Seckler says that there has not been a 24 hour study done of the street. Chair Pearson suggests a recess so that Mr. Seckler can set up his exhibits to be sharable with the Board on the screen.

Chair Pearson calls for a break at 8:15 PM. The meeting is called back to order at 8:21 PM.

Mr. Seckler continues with explaining many of his reports finding using a screen to display his figures.

Chair Pearson asks questions regarding the use of each driveway, and about how specific trucks and services will use them. Mr. Seckler states that the first driveway will be used for deliveries such as furniture, a move in/move out, garbage pickup, etc. but that Mr. Schwartz would be better able to answer those questions.

Mr. Lilley asks, if they accounted for arriving traffic coming from the opposite direction on Sunset. Mr. Seckler says that there are no right turns permitted into the site from either driveway and it can be considered its own cul-de-sac. Mr. Seckler states that he plans to show exhibits that illustrate what the current driveway design is and what the proposed design is to help prevent and or discourage cars from making a right turn in to the site.

Mr. Mascera swears in Frank Dobiszewski from Boswell Engineering, the Township is engineering firm. He asks Mr. Seckler about the size of the queue lengths. Mr. Seckler responds that the existing que lengths in the morning was 10.5 vehicles, or 210 feet and went down to about five vehicles, or 105 feet (20 feet per vehicle). Mr. Dobiszewski asks whether the queues back up across the existing driveway? Mr. Seckler responds yes.

Mr. Dobiszewski asked if vehicles turning right off Bloomfield Avenue, would come upon a vehicle that's queued waiting to make a left into that first driveway. Mr. Seckler responds that this is possible, but that there is sufficient stopping sight distance to see any vehicle queued to make a left turn into the site. Mr. Dobiszewski voices concern about cars traveling towards Bloomfield Avenue and whether they would have enough sight distance in order to react to a queue without a rear-end accident. Mr. Seckler responds that from his observations there is sufficient sight distance. Mr. Dobiszewski asks that supporting data be sent to his office. He about existing accident frequency and type at the intersection. Mr. Seckler says that based on the NJ Voyager website, there was a single car accident over a 5-year range, and there were also two accidents on the approach of Sunset towards Bloomfield Avenue. Mr. Dobiszewski asks if the data was the actual traffic signal data from the county for Claremont & Bloomfield Avenues. Mr. Seckler responds yes. Mr. Dobiszewski expressed disagreement with Mr. Seckler in regard to the trip generation, that the data is older, from the 1990s, predating Amazon Prime, Door Dash, Lyft, etc.. Seckler agrees that that some of the data may not account for those services. Mr. Freschi asks if the demographics/sociodemographic of the residents also skew that data. Mr. Seckler believes it may be similar to the expectations of other apartment dwellers. Councilman McEvoy asks if the money being given by the applicant to the County Fund will be enough to put a right hand turn lane in. Mr. Seckler says that he does not know but that have been told by the county that they do not feel it is warranted.

Mr. Seckler addresses the Matrix New World Site Plan dated 01/11/23 changes: the main driveway will only permit right turns out & there will be signage that shows no left turn. The main driveway loop has been made to be more of an oval, has been expanded to allow for better accessibility for fire trucks and queuing of Lyft, Uber, DoorDash, etc. to not impact the circulation pattern. The access to the parking garage does meet the statutory requirement in quantity and EV spaces as required.

The second driveway is for trash pickup, larger deliveries, loading, move in/out, etc. all of which would be scheduled as well as some additional surface parking. Turning templates : UPS Truck Turning exhibit, modified circle prepared by Matrix New World dated 12/21/22 shows a delivery vehicle & 3 passengers cars in the circle showing that it would be able to travel through the driveway. Chair Pearson asks if a vehicle could get through if a vehicle was double-parked. Mr. Seckler answers yes, but that double-parking wouldn't be necessary. Next discussed is the Fire Truck 48 ft. turning exhibit prepared by Matrix New World dated 01/11/23. It shows the fire truck entering the site via left turn driving around & can do a K turn and then leave the driveway making a right hand turn. The fire department has not reviewed the revised plans and there was some conversation as to where the standpipe is for the pumper truck to hook up. Mr. Inglesino says that the fire department has seen this and they are currently awaiting their comments regarding a potential additional hydrant & standpipe. It was the ladder truck that was measured for the drawings, even though it says pumper on the plans. The applicant will advise of the location for the pumper truck connection at a later time. The sight distances are appropriate. The newer design makes it more difficult for drivers to make illegal exits/entrances. Mr. Hyndman asks about the engineering controls that prohibit the left out and right in from Sunset – and asks if we could allow larger vehicles to make those maneuvers but not allow smaller passenger vehicles to do the same. Mr. Seckler opines that this allowance could not be made for only certain vehicles.

Mr. Lilley asks if there enough room to accommodate two UPS trucks or Amazon trucks turning into the driveway. Mr. Seckler answers that yes, it would be able to support both. There will be signage to advise of no left turn out of the property towards Sunset as well. SU30 and a Garbage truck do have to do a K turn maneuver in the lower driveway, but those will be scheduled. A smaller vehicle would be able to get an unloading truck but some maneuvering may be required for a larger vehicle. Councilman McEvoy asks if people walking along the curb line of the street from the Main

driveway to Afterglow would disrupt traffic. Mr. Seckler states that it would cause the speed to be decreased but that it would also decrease the capacity of a road if someone is walking on it. Mr. DeCarlo asks about Geometry plan of the site plan (sheet 5 of 16) – a proposed loading area – why doesn't the template show the vehicle parked in that spot if it's the loading / unloading area. Mr. Seckler advised that it was showing it circulating, but it should also show it getting in/out. They could make that change.

Chair Pearson asks if anyone from the public has questions for Mr. Seckler.

Chris Reilly, 60 Sunset Avenue - Asks if the traffic study took into consideration that many residents currently don't take Sunset to Bloomfield because of the existing school traffic? The study measured the traffic in 2019 & 2022 but does not anticipate what changes local neighborhood residents may make to their driving habits. Mr. Reilly also asked if bicycle riders were included in the traffic study. Mr. Seckler states that any cyclists that were present during the days that they did their study were counted. Mr. Reilly asked about the ability for moving vans to use the service driveway and was advised that yes, SU30 or smaller moving vehicles would be able to fit. He also stated that he disagrees with the report from 10/24/22 as it pertains to public transportation.

Liz Green-Korlouk, 88 Afterglow Avenue – Asks if SU30 trucks are the same size as a UPS truck – response was that the newer UPS trucks are a little smaller, similar to a 22-foot truck. If a standard car is 20 – 25 ft. long, how many vehicles will get through the light at Sunset? The green light is 17 – 20 seconds, so provided all the drivers are prompt, a car could theoretically go every 2 seconds which would equal about 7 - 10 passenger cars. Buses or trucks take longer to proceed through and the grade / angle have an effect on that as well. Ms. Green-Korlouk asked where the visitor parking would be. Visitors will park in the garage as well as the residents.

Jonathan McElroy, 76 Sunset Avenue – Asks if there is street parking allowed for this area, in front of the building. A little past the driveways on Sunset, yes there is a small amount of street parking on the right side. Mr. McElroy is curious about the street parking and how that would affect the traffic flow. There have not been any discussions regarding changing the parking regulations on the street related to this, that would be a separate matter. He also wanted to verify No Left Turns allowed, and was advised that the No Left Turn as discussed is “carved in stone”.

Brian Conroy, 24 Sunset Avenue – Advises that he is a professional engineer in three States asks why Mr. Savage, who is a civil engineer as opposed to a traffic engineer, prepared the truck movement plans and are the movements in compliance with Ashton. Mr. Seckler stated that he has reviewed and accepted the plans. The fire truck pumper, which is actually the ladder truck, is a field-measured vehicle & does not fit nicely into the Ashton design but is specific to this town. Mr. Savage & the applicant went and measured the vehicle as shown on the plans. Mr. Conroy requests that measurements for the vehicle be added to the plans for documentation. He additionally has questions regarding the location of the trash room, where the garbage truck will be operating for pick up & what the pick-up hours will be. The location of the trash room was pointed out on the plans; it has a compactor & connects to a service corridor so the trash can be wheeled down to the door to the area for pickup. The hours for pick up will be scheduled, but Mr. Schwartz will answer any operational questions when he serves as a witness. Mr. Conroy asked about the changes to the front of the building and if the Fire Department requires the ability to make a K turn. In addition, he asks if it would be possible for the parking in that area be reduced. The space was made larger to accommodate the fire vehicle as requested by the Fire Department so they would not have to back up on to the street. The changes were an attempt to maximize circulation without encroaching into the buffer. Mr. Conroy asks for the duration of the light cycle from Sunset to Bloomfield to be explained including the queuing of the cars. The traffic light is controlled by Essex County so the timing cannot be adjusted. The green light is 14 – 20 seconds, a car could potentially go every 2 seconds which would equal about 7 - 10 passenger cars.

Chair Pearson asks about the conflicting information at the bottom of page 4 which says that Sunset/Bloomfield/Claremont “... is calculated to operate at overall service of level A during weekday morning & weekday evening peak hours with individual movements of an acceptable level of service E. Mr. Seckler explains that Bloomfield Ave performs at level A while Sunset Avenue, an E.

Liz Green-Korlouk, 88 Afterglow Avenue – Asks is the driveway in the same location where it currently is or will it be moved? Mr. Seckler states that the driveway furthest from the intersection is in the same location, however the

radius will be made tighter to make a right turn more difficult and the lower driveway will be shifted a tiny bit, but will be generally the same.

Abby Chirico, 66 Sunset Avenue – Asks regarding the monies that the applicant gave to the county, if the county deems that a right hand turn lane is needed later is there sufficient space (land) to do that? Mr. Seckler stated that he believes they may have to acquire more land.

Nora Brenneis, 47 Afterglow Way – Asks if they are able to disclose the amount that was donated to the county for the traffic fund. Mr. Schwartz will be able to answer that. She expressed her concerns about the left hand turns and potential for people breaking the law to do that. She suggested a traffic camera be installed to issue tickets for offenders. Mr. Mascera advised that tickets issued based on traffic cameras are not legal in New Jersey. Ms. Brenneis stated that she disagrees with the idea that cars get through the intersection at 2-second intervals and that she believes no more than five cars can get through during one green light.

Maria Squilanti, 6 Bellclaire Place - Asks for clarification on where the cars will be coming out from versus the trucks. Mr. Seckler stated that 90 - 99% of the cars will be coming out of the driveway that is furthest from Bloomfield Avenue. He showed on the survey where the parking garage is and advised that the resident & visitor parking will be in the garage.

Michelle Snyder, 68 Afterglow Avenue – Asks if there will be no parking on Afterglow Avenue and Afterglow Way, like on Sunset. Chairperson Pearson advises that there is legal parking on the right side of Sunset. Whatever parking is currently allowed on Afterglow will continue to exist.

Chairperson Pearson asks if there is any other member of the public or member of the board who has final questions for this witness. As there were no other questions, the Chair called for a short recess.

Chair Pearson calls for a break at 10:05 PM. The meeting is called back to order at 10:22 PM.

Chair Pearson states that, as it is getting late, we hope to have Mr. Schwartz do his presentation but hold questions until the Special Meeting on March 16th at 7:30pm. She asks if he would be able to comeback and attend at that time and he agrees that he will return.

Mr. Inglesino calls Mr. Jonathan Schwartz as his next witness; Mr. Schwartz is the owner/operator of this project and is sworn in. Mr. Schwartz advises that there will be 6 – 7 employees on site and one or two of them would live on site. A potential a 24-hour doorman is still to be determined. Mr. Schwartz states that all move ins/outs are scheduled and the building management dictates the size of truck that can be used. He then demonstrates on the survey where the trucks can park for loading/unloading. Mr. Schwartz states that David Antonio, from the county, advised him that an additional right turn lane would not be warranted. They have received an email regarding the same, but are still waiting for a formal letter from the county. Due to the size of the project, the county is expecting between a \$75,000 – 100,000 contribution to potentially go towards upgrading the traffic light technology.

Mr. Schwartz explains how the trash and recycling are managed on the site; and advises that there is a trash room on each floor with a chute where the residents bring their garbage & recycling refuse. Private garbage services will be provided.

Mr. Inglesino brings up that there were questions regarding parking for both tenant & visitor. Mr. Schwartz states that each tenant is allotted no more than two spaces and they are specifically assigned per unit. Visitor parking is located in the garage as well, there are 10 – 15 designated spots and after business hours the spots in the surface lot, that are typically for employee or contractor parking, could be used for overflow visitor parking. In the event that there is a doorman, there will be a “butterfly system” where a resident will have a FOB that will open the garage on its own. Visitors would contact the doorman to be let in, and if there is no doorman, the system will allow you to call the tenant to open the garage remotely. Mr. Inglesino asks Mr. Schwartz about two parking spots located in the front yard, which would require a variance. Mr. Schwartz states that it would be beneficial to maintain those two spots located in the front yard because it is better to have as many spots as possible inside that lot. Mr. Schwartz discusses private snow removal. He states that bulk garbage items are not allowed to be put out with the general garbage. Mr. Schwartz states that the generator is tested once a week and runs for about fifteen minutes each time. Mr. Inglesino states that there

were questions regarding the pool being serviced and asks Mr. Schwartz to explain the procedure. He responds that it is done by both the lifeguards and a pool maintenance company that handles the chlorine & other such maintenance. Mr. Inglesino states that is the last of the questions that he had compiled and that Mr. Schwartz will address any other questions the Board or public may have.

Councilman McEvoy asks for confirmation that the generator is tested once a week and for fifteen minutes. Mr. Schwartz responds yes and during daytime hours. Councilman McEvoy asks: How many visitor parking spaces are there? Mr. Schwartz advises that for a project like this it is generally 10 – 15 spots, per code. Councilman McEvoy asks if there are set construction hours, once the building is done, in individual units. Mr. Schwartz answers during the day and during business hours. Mr. Katzeff asks when they will decide whether to hire a doorman and asks how many other projects that are comparable to this have door attendants and states that a doorman would help make sure people are following the traffic rules. Mr. Schwartz says that door attendants are in about 50% of his buildings and adds that it will take around three years for this project to be approved and built so they will consider a doorman then. Mayor Roman asks for details in regard to the recreational amenities & the management of the same. Mr. Schwartz mentions private offices for tenant use, a lobby with a lounge area, coffee bar, a large fitness room, yoga room, card rooms, indoor golf, etc. and discusses hours of operation. Mr. Schwartz adds that no outdoor speakers are planned, the pool closes at 6 and outdoor passive areas will close by 10 pm.

Chair Pearson asks where maintenance people, lifeguards, letter carriers, etc. will park. Mr. Schwartz responds that the nine surface parking spots would be for employees, maintenance people and the like. Chair Pearson and Mayor Roman have questions regarding garbage & recycling compactors and add that all multi-family buildings in Verona require a recycling plan. Mr. Schwartz advises that recycling is once a week for all types of materials and there will be multiple bins provided to separate them in each trash room and that a letter would be sent to tenants with directives and additional letters for those that fail to comply. Mr. Schwartz advises that the building will be using a private trash hauler and will not be using any municipal services to get rid of waste.

Mr. DeCarlo asks if the roof of the building would be used cellular communication towers or equipment. Mr. Schwartz states that he has no intention to lease their roofs for cellular towers. Mr. Inglesino states that they would definitely agree to the condition that they won't lease roof space for this purpose.

Mr. Bernardo asks Mr. Schwartz is there any project that he can point to as a comparable project, in regards to the general impact to the neighborhood and immediate area. Mr. Schwartz refers to relatively nearby: in Livingston called The Hillside Club. Mr. Bernardo asks about the impact is on single family residential homes and how close is it to single family residential homes in those areas. Mr. Schwartz states that the property in Livingston has single family homes all around it. Mr. Bernardo reiterates that he thinks it would be a good idea for those other projects to be looked at to see what is happening in those communities because this is such a change for this neighborhood.

Mr. DeCarlo confirmed with Mr. Schwartz that coffee bar in the interior space, will be strictly for the residents.

Mayor Roman references the earlier discussed 900 trips as opposed to the current 200 – 300 trips. He questions how this won't have an impact on the surrounding area. Mr. Schwartz responds that the traffic will not be condensed into the peak hours in the morning & afternoon, but rather spread out during the course of the day. Mayor Roman references Mr. Schwartz's project in Livingston and reports that on one side of it is a fitness center, on the other side is the Livingston Senior Community Center, three houses on one side, and across the street is both residential and a church. He states that while it is a little similar to the Verona project, he does not find this to be very analogous.

Mayor Roman asks if there will there be any impact on the homes whose properties back up to their property line. Will they see or hear anything different than the existing state. Mr. Schwartz says that it will be different in that they will see a different building than the existing one. Mayor Roman raises questions about the lighting on the top level of the parking garage structure. Mr. Schwartz says that they are still doing research and Sean Savage from Matrix is going to speak to that when he comes before the Board. They think there are some lights that can be a bit lower, that would shine down into the parking areas, and that would mitigate any light spill; but Mr. Savage would testify to that. Chair Pearson asks how Emergency Services will reach people located on the back of this site with their equipment – will they have to go through the building. Mr. Schwartz responds that this is an NFP13 building with sprinklers. Chair Pearson clarifies that she is not referring to a fire emergency, rather a health issue for one or more people – how would EMS (fire/police/rescue) be able to access the rear of the site. Mr. Schwartz states that the build has elevators that can fit a stretcher, as required, as well as staircases. Mr. Inglesino states that they added an additional staircase at the request of the Board. Chair Pearson states that the staircase was a very important concern of our fire and rescue but that now there is no way to get a vehicle to the back of the building. Mr. Schwartz states that it is not required by code. Chair Pearson stated that it is a concern of hers, and of both the Verona EMS staff and the OEM staff and that they've

expressed it in writing. Mr. Mascera states that it meets zoning codes, local & state codes, and while it is new to Verona there are hundreds and thousands of buildings in New Jersey where you can't get a vehicle to the back of the building and if there's an emergency someone would have to travel through an elevator or stairwell. There is nothing that can be done about it from a legal standpoint or from the applicant's standpoint.

Mayor Roman mentions that there are open issues/questions regarding fire department accessibility to provide effective fire prevention to the building. He reiterates that the building is going to be sprinklered to NFPA13 but asks if they intend to have any further discussion about fire/EMS operations related to the building or to respond to the questions asked by the Engineer. Mr. Schwartz says that they are happy to have more discussions. Mr. Inglesino says that he's not sure that they are aware of what questions are open. Mayor Roman advises that the new Boswell report does ask about the ability to put ground ladders on the back of the building, a hard escape access path of some sort. Mr. Inglesino says he understands but that he feels that there has been extensive testimony with regard to those issues. Chair Pearson states that Mr. has never testified on his own site plans. Mr. Inglesino states that those aren't the 1st iterations of the site plans. Chair Pearson advises that he has given supplemental comments to help the architect and to explain certain aspects, but he has yet to testify; so there has not been extensive testimony. Mayor Roman cites comments 52 - 55 in the Boswell report that don't appear to have answers to them. He mentions that Verona does have a new Engineering firm, but he would like to ensure that the applicant does respond to everything that has been asked. Mr. Inglesino agrees with Mayor Roman and says that there are parts of the letter that were not addressed tonight because they are appropriate for other experts. There are architectural & engineering comments in the report that will be addressed by their experts at another time. Mayor Roman asks Mr. Inglesino to verify that the appropriate expert will address all of the supplemental comments in the report when they return before the Board and Mr. Inglesino responds in the affirmative. Mr. Lilley asks if the projected \$75 - 100,000 would specifically go towards improving the Bloomfield Ave / Sunset Ave intersection. Mr. Schwartz says that is what he was told, but that it could probably be used for whatever they want. Mr. Lilley asks does that mean it's not a guarantee that it would be used for this intersection and Mr. Schwartz says it would be up to the county. Mr. Inglesino advises that from the applicant's perspective, they would be asked to pay into the county transportation fund and have no authority on how the money is spent once it is in the fund. Chair Pearson asks Mr. Schwartz if he will be present at the next meeting and he responds that yes, he will be. She states that our expert and the public still need an opportunity to ask their questions, but because of the late hour, she will be wrapping up the meeting. Mr. Schwartz will be the lead when discussions resume at the special meeting on March 16th. She asks if Mr. Savage will attend the next meeting and Mr. Inglesino says he will have to confer with his client and get back to the Board with that information long before the 16th to allow the members to prepare.

It is announced that the application will be carried to the March 16, 2023 special meeting at the Verona Community Center at 7:30 PM with no further notice required by the applicant. For the information of the public, it is also announced that the next regular meeting will be on March 23rd, the week after the special meeting.

Adjourn

After a motion made by Chair Pearson and seconded by Mayor Roman there was a unanimous vote to adjourn at 10:58 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcie Maccarelli
Acting Planning Board Secretary

PLEASE NOTE: Meeting minutes are a summation of the hearing. If you are interested in a verbatim transcript from this or any proceeding, please contact the Planning Board office at 973-857-4777.