

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING**  
**Wednesday      June 7, 2023**

Present:

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

Mr. Jesse Lilley  
Mr. Jeremy Katzeff  
Mr. Chris Bernardo  
Mr. Alvaro Gonzalez, Engineer  
Mr. Greg Mascera, Planning Board Attorney  
Mr. Phillip Epps, Zoning Officer  
Marcie Maccarelli, Acting Planning Board  
Secretary

---

Meeting called to order at 7:32 pm by Chair Pearson. Mr. Neale has recused from the meeting. Mr. Katzeff arrived after the meeting had already begun at 7:34 pm.

**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 announces that the minutes from the regular meeting on May 25, 2023, and the minutes from this evening's special meeting, will both be voted on at the regular meeting on June 22, 2023.

**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 this evening Mr. Sean Savage, Engineer, will be giving testimony in regard to the revised storm water report and to also address the questions and issues brought forth in the letters from Boswell Engineering dated 06/01/23 and 06/06/23. Mr. Savage states that he is going to go through the changes listed on the letter dated 05/10/23.

**Sheet #1:** The listing of each individual plan sheet has been updated on the left to reflect the revision block update. They also added the overall calculation of the lot coverage, building heights & average grade elevation utilized.

**Sheet #2:** No change.

**Sheet #3:** Demolition plan - no changes.

**Sheet #4:** Tree location removal sheet. The limit of the proposed work was adjusted. The 20 x 20 emergency pull off Afterglow, sidewalk added along Sunset west entrance.

**Sheet #5:** Geometry sheet - sidewalk added along Sunset/Afterglow west entrance, wall reduction on the south side of the building & steps added. Sidewalk added between garage & retaining wall. Emergency access added.

**Sheet #6:** Grading – sidewalk side entrance near Afterglow shown. The south side wall was reduced to 6 feet max retaining with steps, down from 16 - 18 foot. The retaining wall on the north side of the drop off has been reduced to 4-foot max. The elevation by the new sidewalk has been updated.

**Sheet #7:** Utilities sheet – Foley water quality structures have been added in 2 spots: 1 outside of the garage and another northwest of the basin. Under drains for parking spaces have been added. The slope of Outlet structure 5 to Manhole 6 has been decreased. Two sanitary cleanouts have been converted to manholes. Mr. Savage points out where they are located on projector map (#7 & #3). There were some slight rim elevation adjustments made.

**Sheet #8:** Profile sheet – Trench drain to Basin B profile had been revised to add the water quality unit. Basin A to manhole, same changes. Sanitary sewers have been changed to manholes 5, 7 & 9 and there are some rim changes on the structures. Clean out has been changed to manhole 3.

**Sheet #9:** Per the lighting plan, the temperature of the lights has been set at 3,000 kelvins. Lights for a new section of sidewalk are shown, cobra head light and added additional overhead light. Chair Pearson asks about “A”s spilling into street. Mr. Savage states that those are the existing cobra headlights from the project that is currently on the site, but that they did add some “A”s.

**Sheet #10:** Lighting detail sheet – no change.

**Sheet #11:** Soil erosion – Revised to reflect the addition of the emergency pull off area & the new sidewalk. It shows where the drainage & sanitary pipes are and where clean outs were changed to manholes. Shows change to wall & grading, although that is unrelated to soil erosion. The background layout was changed, specifically the retaining wall along the north & south side of the driveway. Chair Pearson says that the property size in Verona is 5.06 acres and asks what the limit of disturbance is. Mr. Savage responds that it is 5.18, greater than the size of the property but that includes areas for utility installations, emergency access pull off, sanitary tie in and additional sidewalk. Chair Pearson states that she is trying to make a connection between the storm water plan that says the disturbance would be limited on the site, and this plan that shows a 100% disturbance.

**Sheet #12:** No changes.

**Sheet #13:** Construction – revised the permeable pavement to show under drains. The 3 inch perforated pipes not reflected in detail.

**Sheet #14:** Construction detail - emergency gate access detail, no parking emergency access only related to the pull off, off of Afterglow.

**Sheet #15:** No changes.

Mr. Savage states that is the extent of the changes. Chair Pearson opens it up to the Board for questions, finding none they will move on to address the Boswell memo. Starting with variances & waivers: Mr. Inglesino says that for #11 – a waiver was requested in regard to the site plan sheet size. Mr. Savage states that there are 2 lines in regard to setbacks, a 30 foot landscape buffer (closest to Sunset) and the front yard 50 foot setback line in relation to buildings and parking. In the northeast part of the site, there are a couple of parking spaces that cross into the front yard setback – these can be seen on the Geometry sheet, Sheet #5. At one point these spots had been encroaching on the 30 foot landscape buffer, which the existing parking in that area does, but that has been pulled back. Mr. Inglesino asks Mr. Savage to explain the reason for the two surface parking. He says that they are located outside of the building, closest to the move-in door providing additional surface parking potentially for visitors or temporary parking for people moving in & out. Mr. Inglesino asks if it would be possible to get rid of the two surface parking areas and Mr. Savage says yes. Chair Pearson reminds them that they have 381 spots and asks how many are required. Mr. Savage states that 381 is the minimum requirement to remain compliant. Councilman McEvoy asks if the loading area is in setback. Mr. Savage states that each EV spot counts as two, as an offset, and Mr. Inglesino states that the spaces aren’t required to meet the minimum parking requirement. Mr. Savage states that he feels that those spots are beneficial, and it is only

a minor encroachment compared to what it will provide. Mayor Roman states that he believes that the setback does appear to have room & its intended use is for a box truck to be able to back in to load/unload tenants who are moving. He thinks that it may be less helpful if there were cars in the way parking there. The parking & setback are intended to protect the neighborhood and he would encourage that as the focus, Mayor Roman would prefer two less spots if it would help minimize the impact on the neighborhood. Mr. Katzeff asks what the Board's options are. Chair Pearson says that there is an option to grant a variance. Mr. Inglesino would like to provide the Board with some additional information before they make a decision on the spaces. Mr. Savage states that the existing lower parking area is staying the same and touches the property line. Mr. Katzeff states that it is de minimis change and it is not worth holding up the site plan over it. Mr. Hyndman asks if there is commercial property across from those spots. Mr. Savage says yes. Mr. Mascera says it wasn't a setback issue because it was in the landscape buffer. When the driveway was redesigned, they were able to pull it back. Mr. Hyndman agrees with Mr. Katzeff, it makes it more functional, it's across the street from a commercial property, they have landscaping that can mitigate it & it won't make or break the project. It will help the circulation & it should stay. Vice Chair Freschi, Mr. Bernardo, & Mr. Lilley all state that they agree with Mr. Katzeff's statement on the matter. Mr. DeOld also agrees with Mr. Katzeff but has concerns as far as variance issues. Mr. Camuti agrees with Mr. Katzeff, its already paved & outside of the landscape, so he's ok with it. He feels it would help with the community & traffic patterns and cited example of DoorDash/UberEats using the spots. Chair Pearson had been concerned with queues at the traffic light and feels that this will help. Mayor Roman states that he agrees to leave to spots.

Councilman McEvoy asks about a separate issue: Could the domestic sprinklers at the door be moved over? Moving the loading area towards the building to add spots at the end inside that 50-foot area. Mr. Savage states that it will function better as it is. Councilman McEvoy states that he doesn't want to take away parking but would prefer a design change. Mayor Roman points out that there is existing pavement there and the service entrances are in that spot so it would be problematic to reconfigure that as well. Mr. Mascera points out that on page 15 of Exhibit C from the original plan in February; the developer states that they may need a slight deviation from the parking plan. Mr. Inglesino agrees & states that it is consistent with Section 14 of the settlement agreement. Chair Pearson states that it seems that the Board is in agreement on it, but that it doesn't need to be voted on now, it will entered as a condition of approval.

Mr. Savage puts page 6 of the plan on the projector & explains that the retaining wall by garage has been reduced to a 4 foot maximum. Mr. Inglesino states that Mr. Ten Kate's comment in the Boswell memo about B was that retaining walls are not allowed in the front yard in excess of 4 feet and that has been adjusted to comply. The other wall at the south side of the building is C, which can only be a maximum of 6 feet. Mr. Inglesino states that they comply with that one as well. Mr. Savage states that after speaking with Boswell, they discussed the wall nearest the transformers that ends by the dog run. A section of that wall is 16.5 feet high. Mr. Inglesino states that they are only seeking relief concerning the wall by the transformer. Mr. Savage states that it is located on the eastern side of the building, looking from the parking area towards the transformer. The grade drops very steeply, so it is necessary, but it is tucked away on the site, so it is not obtrusive. It is not visible from the Montclair side at all. Mr. Savage explains specifics of the wall: 50 feet +/- of the length of the wall is 6 feet tall or higher and one third of that is the dog run area and 20 feet +/- of the length of the wall is 14 to 20 feet high in the transformer area. Mayor Roman asks why it needs to be so high. Mr. Savage responds that it is due to the slope of the property, the grade on the east side. Mayor Roman asks if the code typically asks developers to do set back terraced walls in situations like this. The answer comes, yes a 6-foot wall with a 3-foot terrace. Mr. Inglesino asks if there could be trees or other plantings put in front of the wall. Mr. Savage states that there may be a way to soften it, but he doesn't think that plantings will work because of the proximity to the transformers. He said it might be possible by the fence portion near the dog run. Mayor Roman asks what would happen if the Board says no to the 16 foot wall and the developers have to build in Montclair. Mr. Inglesino states that would be in violation of the settlement agreement. Mayor Roman asks if they would need permits from Montclair for grading or to build a retaining wall. Mr. Inglesino says not for grading, but yes

for a wall. Councilman McEvoy asks if the transformer platform could be raised. Do they have to be at grade with the dog run or the entrance? Mayor Roman states that the intent of the code is to avoid construction like these 16-foot walls & terracing is preferential. Mr. Inglesino states that it is possible that they could get rid of the dog run. Councilman McEvoy suggests that the transformer platform be raised, and the dog run is shifted forward so that a wall could be tiered into the dog park to bring the wall down to 8 or 10 feet. Mr. Savage states that he thinks there may be access issues involved with raising the transformer platform, but it could be moved by shortening the dog run to allow for a tiered wall. Mr. Savage states that it is possible to move the transformers over by shrinking the dog run. If the transformers are turned to run parallel to the curb of the loading space, they could cut into the dog run just a little the need for the wall would be less. Mr. Katzeff asks what is behind the ledge currently. Foliage and would you keep it? Mr. Savage responds that the area is being regraded, so it is lawn. Mr. Katzeff asks how much of the exposed higher end of the wall will be visible. Mr. Savage answers that none of it can be seen from the Montclair side, from Bloomfield Ave. Mayor Roman states that his concern is looking from Sunset into the property. Mr. Savage states that from the parking lot looking towards the property there will be a 16-foot piece of wall visible, with the transformers in front of it & the dog run in front of that. From Sunset, the view would be less visible because of the elevation and the location of the wall. Mayor Roman is concerned about a monolithic structure of that height giving an industrial look, which is why it is not allowed in the ordinance. He would like to see a way to mitigate the condition, especially now that he has been made aware that there is a 4-foot fence that will be installed on top of the wall.

Mr. Savage states that any walls over 30 inches have to have a 4 foot fence on top of them. Councilman McEvoy clarifies that according to the Zoning ordinance if a fence is on top of a retaining wall it is included in the height of the wall, unless it is stepped back 3 feet. Mr. Inglesino says that the State Building Code that requires the fence and that trumps the town ordinance. Mayor Roman clarifies that the town ordinance intends to have the fence placed behind the wall and not on top of it. If the fence is off set from the wall, then you measure only the wall itself, in an effort to not have large monolithic structures and the offset must be 3 feet horizontally. Mr. Savage states that on the south side it could be offset 3 feet, on the other side they would have to move the wall 3 feet to allow for the off set to avoid building in Montclair. Mr. Camuti says that he thinks that the wall would be a benefit to the dog run because of ball play and asks if there is a vestibule system in place as opposed to just a gate to enter/exit the dog run area. Councilman McEvoy says that he would be amenable to an 8 foot wall, but a 16 foot wall is excessive. If the transformers can be moved, move them. If the retaining wall comes in 3 feet, making the dog run 3 feet smaller, it wouldn't make much difference to the run but it would mean less excavation. He is also concerned with the possibility of a child climbing a 16 foot fence and the danger that it lends itself to. Mr. Lilley asks what the height of the transformers are. Mr. Savage states that he believes they are about 5 feet tall. Mr. Lilley asks if they could be shielded with a shorter fence. Mr. Savage responds yes, a 5 - 6 foot fence could go around it. Chair Pearson asks about the fencing - would it be solid. Mr. Savage states that it is typically a 4-foot black chain link fence; but they are flexible with a style of fence that they could use. A solid fence could be used, but it's also possible that they could hide it with plantings. There is room to move the transformers, but it will definitely reduce the dog run, it is unclear by how much. Mr. Inglesino says that it could be a condition of approval to relocate the transformers for the purpose of reducing the wall height, even if it minimizes the dog run. Mr. Mascera suggests the Chair take an informal poll of the Board to gauge their interest in this as designed or if they would like to see it revised. The Board Members who would like to see the plan revised are: Mr. Lilley, Mr. DeOld, Chair Pearson, Mayor Roman & Councilman McEvoy. Mr. Camuti, Mr. Katzeff, Mr. Hyndman, Mr. Bernardo & Vice Chair Freschi are all okay with the plan as designed. Mr. Mascera suggests that it is made a condition of approval, subject to the engineer & applicant coming up with a revised plan to mitigate the severity of the deviation. Mayor Roman asks Chair Pearson if they would like to provide other guidance to the applicant as far as fencing on top of walls is concerned. Mayor Roman would prefer to see horizontal offset along the fencing where possible and no additional loss of vegetation. He asks for compliance to the ordinance to the greatest extent possible. Mr. Inglesino agrees that they are willing to do that. Councilman McEvoy reminds that it is 3 feet, not 1 foot, so that it can be landscaped appropriately.

Mr. Savage goes through the letter from Boswell regarding concerns / questions that they had regarding the number of truck trips. He anticipates in the range of 2,400 loads of export and 500 import coming in & out of Bloomfield Avenue. He anticipates compliance with numbers 2 & 3. Number 4 is about the retaining wall; it will be poured concrete and the details have already been discussed. Numbers 5 & 6 he is in agreement with. Parking is the focus of numbers 7 & 8 – no comment for this. Number 9 is in regard to the revised architect EV plans. They will be providing 34 spaces but will provide up to 58 total as needed for the tenants as they need them. Mr. Savage states that the conduit is run to 100% of the stalls, but to allow for flexibility will be creating 34 active spots to start with, additional spots are EV ready and will be added as tenants request them for specific units. Mr. Inglesino states that two of the town wells are currently offline. He says that he is aware that there is currently a shortage of water and if addition needs to be purchased from PSEG then they will approach the township on that, but that is a township issue. In response to number 16 - Mr. Savage says they will not be performing the hydrogen test until the wells are back online. Mr. Inglesino says that they will agree to do that as a condition once the wells are back online. Mayor Roman says that the wells may not be back online for a year. Mr. Savage states that they can do the test now if the Board would prefer, but he feels it would be more accurate if he waits to do it. Mayor Roman says that the town engineer should advise if it would be accurate if the test would be done now. Mr. Inglesino states that they will agree to do it as a condition of approval and that they will be directed by the town on when to do the test. Mr. Savage states that the cleaning & inspecting video was done and submitted. Meter testing was agreed to as well. In regard to numbers 18, 19, & 20 - Mr. Savage states that they will comply.

Mr. Inglesino says that there are infrastructure improvements that are needed in regard to the project, and they will do those, as stated in the agreement. Mr. Savage states that the traffic comments have been addressed in the June 6<sup>th</sup> Boswell letter. Mr. Savage states that in regard to the Landscaping comments, they will agree to do what is asked for as a condition of approval. Chair Pearson advises that there were some errors on the Tycher memo in regard to some plantings. Mr. Inglesino says that it will be cleaned up. Chair Pearson asks that the applicant have a landscape performance bond & at least a 2 year guarantee; Mr. Inglesino states that they will. In regard to number 26, Mr. Savage notes that the lights are dark sky compliant. Councilman McEvoy restates in regard to the light spillage on the west side of the parking lot, there is a concern with the lights being put in as low as possible to avoid spillage affecting the neighbors. Mr. Inglesino states that they agree and that it can go in as a condition of approval. In regard to number 27, the necessary changes have been made per Chair Pearson. Mr. Savage states that for number 28 they have agreed to revisit it again in 6 months.

Number 29 addresses fire prevention concerns – Mr. Savage states that the truck turning plan that was submitted for a 48-foot truck does require a K turn, but that the island in the middle has a mountable curb that truck can go up on if necessary. This was discussed extensively at the Township Council meeting. Chair Pearson states that number 30 has been addressed. In regard to number 31, Mr. Savage states that they have added a 20 by 20 drop off area and that there is no code that says that the building needs to be accessed from 360 degrees by fire truck. Mr. Inglesino states that it was addressed on 10/27/22 by Mr. Raker and while there is nothing in the code that requires vehicular access from all sides, there is safe ladder access from all sides and from stairwells. Mayor Roman states that after speaking with the Fire Chief, he expressed concern for the need for sprinklers in the garage, safe ladder access from all sides of the building and fire ladder truck access from 3 sides of the building. Mr. Savage responds that the max grade is 3 on 1 which is typical – still walkable & mowable and there is ground ladder access available on all sides. Chair Pearson asks about the location of the water connections for the Fire Department. Mr. Savage states that it has not yet been determined but that it will be worked out in coordination with the Fire Department and Mr. Inglesino states that it will be a condition of approval. Mr. Gonzalez states that they have complied with the request from his office & there is sufficient pedestrian access. Mr. Savage states that they have also added an additional hydrant & signage to the property, and the signs will be back lit. Chair Pearson calls for a short recess at 9:31pm and the meeting resumed at 9:42pm.

Chair Pearson asks if there are any questions from the public for the applicant and reminds them of OPMA.

**Mr. Chris Reilly, Verona:** He asks about the retaining wall behind the transformers & dog run. How will that wall effect the sound? Will the sound produced by the transformer & dog park noise bounce off that wall towards residents? Mr. Savage states that he is not a sound expert & cannot answer that. Chair Pearson says that hopefully it will be mitigated by landscaping. Mayor Roman states that transformers tend to be quiet when they are new & louder as they get older. There could be some reflective sound, but the amount would need to be determined by a professional. Mr. Reilly asked if trucks would use the two spots in the setback area. Mr. Savage responds that they were not envisioned for trucks, but that anyone that can fit in can use them.

Public participation is now closed by Chair Pearson and the meeting will move on to review the Stormwater management portion. Chair Pearson asks Mr. Savage to provide a brief overview of the changes that have been made. Mr. Savages states that the main change was from the Delmarva hydrograph to the Standard. The new calculations show an increase in the peak run off rate, but the volume is the same. The drainage analysis is the same and there has been no change to the storm water systems. They have reduced run off rates as follows: 2-year storm - 50% / 10 year storm - 75% / 100 year storm - 80%. They are meeting DEP requirements in the other 3 drainage areas and the area & volume are less. Chair Pearson asks if there are any that are not being met. Mr. Savage responds no; all four areas meet the requirements. He states that two water quality structures have been added, although they were not required. They are not filter type structures; they get cleaned out by a vacuum truck. Chair Pearson asks if it will be effective in a heavy storm. Mr. Savage states that is not how they are designed; they are designed for frequent storms not heavy storms. He advises that Basin C has an under drain system where the water gets filtered and then continues on to Basin A. A small orifice will be installed at the bottom of the outlet structure. Chair Pearson asks Mr. Gonzalez how to fix this issue. Mr. Gonzalez advises they must slow down the rate of flow thru the layers, 2 or 3 layers of sand & gravel. The model has to be fixed because the hydraulic structure is a detention rather than a filtration. Mr. Savage states that it could be made a condition of approval; it currently is in accordance with the DEP requirements but that he can work with the Town Engineer on specifics. Chair Pearson reminds Mr. Savage that the Board & the public should also know what is discussed; it should not be entirely "offline" between the engineers. Mr. Inglesino says that they are willing to work with the Board engineer and that they are complying.

Mr. Hyndman asks is it correct that if Mr. Savage speaks with the Engineer and is told that the design for the bio retention basin doesn't work, he will need to come back to the Board. The response is yes. Mr. Savage says that the DEP has approved the design. Mr. Gonzalez states that detention & infiltration work differently. Mr. Savage says that the mix in the bioretention is specific using the DEP's soil best management practices. Mr. Gonzalez states that he doesn't agree. Mr. Inglesino asks why that will not suffice. Mr. Gonzalez states that Mr. Savage is mixing the guidelines by designing one structure while using the guidelines of another. Mr. Savage states that the water that out falls this basin goes into Basin A in the garage and it meets the percentage reduction of the DEP. He states that it was added to provide green infrastructure. Mr. Savage states that there is a hole in the bottom of the basin, an orifice, that would allow the water to go to Basin A and act as an emergency outlet. Mr. Gonzalez states that they haven't demonstrated how the model was set up, the infiltration rates & overflow. Mr. Inglesino asks if the orifice solves the problem. Mr. Gonzales responds that he doesn't know because hydraulics don't work that way so Mr. Savage would need to demonstrate that the model works. Mr. Hyndman asks if this model does work, would it meet the DEP requirements for green infrastructure. Mr. Gonzalez responds, "No" because it was designed as a detention structure, not a bioretention structure. Mr. Inglesino states that the engineers will get together and that everyone should be guided by the settlement agreement.

Chair Pearson moves forward to issue number 2, appendix B of the storm water management report. Mr. Savage states that to comply with they would just need to revise the basin so that it would comply at 3 feet.

Chair Pearson asks if it is compliant with the BMP manual, that the bottom of the basin would be above the high water by 1 foot. Mr. Gonzalez says that it effects the groundwater flow underground. Mr. Savage responds we can have that discussion and our Geo. Tech. could look at the testing that has been done further. Chair Pearson states that per the BMP manual, if the test pits are not done July through April mottling is the only other indication of the seasonal high water table at another time of year. Mr. Savage states that when excavating 20 feet down in the rock & looking at the hydrology of the site a conversation may need to be had about that. Mr. Gonzalez states that he would like to talk about the possible impact of the groundwater flow and how pattern flow may be effected. Chair Pearson also suggests that they pin down how they will stave off floatation. Mr. Inglesino asks if they have all of the Board Engineer's comments. Mr. Gonzalez responds yes.

Chair Pearson directs Mr. Savage to move on to numbers 3 & 4. Mr. Savage states that there are four analysis points that were being looked at. In three of them, they are meeting the requirements set by the DEP for quantity reduction & in 1 they are meeting it in volume with run off rate reductions. They are looking at adding some additional language to spell that out in the storm water report. Mr. Gonzalez says that the language needs to be added for clarity. Mr. Savage states that in number 4, the tables show the volume not the same total as mentioned in the comments he received in the Boswell memo. He sent a draft in March that may have caused confusion. Mr. Gonzalez states that the Delmarva hydrograph has a longer base hydrograph than the Standard, so they may have the same volume but Mr. Savage should double check & confirm. Mr. Savage agrees and says that they may add some language to the report to reflect that – the area under the curve is the same. It comes up skinnier, but the volume is the same. Mr. Savage states that the results in tables 5, 7 & 8 have all increased with the exception of the last column, volume. Table 6 was unchanged because of the percent reductions. Mr. Savage states that he will have this noted in the storm water report or in a follow up letter for clarification. Mr. Gonzalez asks Mr. Savage to take a look & double check and he agrees. Chair Pearson asks for any questions or suggestions from the Board for the applicant. Seeing none, she asks if there are any questions from the public. There are none.

Mr. Mascera announces that the application will be carried to the June 22, 2023 meeting at the Verona Community Center at 7:30 PM with no further notice required by the applicant. It is announced that the Board will be having a Special Meeting on June 13, 2023 at 7:30 pm where the Board will go into Executive Session.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Adjourn**

After a motion made by Chair Pearson and seconded by Mr. Katzeff, there was a unanimous vote to adjourn at 10:54 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.*