

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

1. **Roll Call**

This is the Public Meeting of Wednesday, February 9, 2022. Chairman Garip called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll call was then taken and the following members were present: Mayor Labrosse, Deputy Mayor Canestrino, Mr. Contini, Mr. Allegretta, Mr. Martucci, Mr. Dib and Chairman Garip.

**ABSENT:** Vice-Chairman Chiusolo

**LATE ARRIVAL:** None

**EARLY DEPARTURE:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Joseph L. Mecca, Jr., Esq.; Kim O. Furbacher, Certified Court Reporter; Gregory J. Polyniak, P.E., P.P., Neglia Engineering; Bridget McLaughlin, Zoning Officer; and Nancy L. Holm, Esq., Redevelopment Counsel; and Michael Mistretta, P.P., C.L.A., Affordable Housing Planner.

2. **Payment of Bills**

MOTION TO APPROVE BILLS AS SUBMITTED. MOTION MADE BY MR. CONTINI. SECOND BY MR. ALLEGRETTA. MOTION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, DEPUTY MAYOR CANESTRINO, MR. CONTINI, MR. ALLEGRETTA, MR. MARTUCCI, MR. DIB, AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

3. **Approval of Minutes of January 12, 2022**

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF JANUARY 12, 2022. MOTION MADE BY MR. ALLEGRETTA. SECOND BY MAYOR LABROSSE. MOTION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, DEPUTY MAYOR CANESTRINO, MR. CONTINI, MR. ALLEGRETTA, MR. DIB AND CHAIRMAN GARIP, WITH MR. MARTUCCI ABSTAINING.

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

DATE: February 9, 2022

4. MEMORIALIZATIONS:

a. Memorialization of Resolution for the appointment of Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, Zoning Board Counsel, Planning & Engineering Consultant, and Certified Shorthand Reporter: Fernando Garip, John Chiusolo, Michael Allegretta, The Mecca Law Firm, Neglia Engineering Associates, and Laura A. Carucci, CSR, RPR.

MOTION TO MEMORIALIZE MADE BY MAYOR LABROSSE. SECOND BY MR. CONTINI. MEMORIALIZATION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, DEPUTY MAYOR CANESTRINO, MR. CONTINI, MR. ALLEGRETTA, MR. DIB, AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

**b. 359 Main MF 2020-Q LLC  
Block 408, Lots 1 & 16  
SP#16-21 V#16-21**

Memorialization of Resolution for site plan approval in connection with a mixed-use building consisting of one hundred ten (110) units, a dog walking area, amenity space, rooftop outdoor space with 4,653 square feet of retail space and an outdoor seating area.

NO ACTION TAKEN.

**c. Investigation study for 123 Anderson Street  
(Block 425 Lot 1)**

Resolution recommending the determination that the property constitutes an "area in need of redevelopment" without condemnation in accordance with the criteria set forth in N.J.S.A. 40A:12-5 per resolution 448-21.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

DATE: February 9, 2022

**d. Resolution: ORDINANCE NO. 08-2022  
AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ARTICLE II, "DEVELOPMENT  
FEES" OF CHAPTER 45A OF THE CITY CODE,  
"AFFORDABLE HOUSING," TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT  
STATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING REGULATIONS**

Mr. Mistretta greeted the board. Mr. Mistretta stated: Our office is in Cranford, New Jersey. My office, Harbor Consultants, has been serving as the affordable housing planner for the City of Hackensack since 2017. My firm has represented the city in all affordable housing matters since that time. We originally prepared the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan for the city. It was dated December 31st, 2020.

Mr. Mistretta stated: There was a change in the plan which triggered an amendment to the settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center, which the city council subsequently entered into which was dated November 2021. Now, that amended settlement agreement requires an amendment to this Housing Element and Fair Share Plan before we move forward.

**MICHAEL MISTRETTA, P.P., C.L.A., sworn/affirm.**

Mr. Mistretta testified: The main change, why we're here tonight is the previous plan that we had, the city was depending on the construction of 100 percent affordable housing projects in order to fill a gap in the plan. And that was what was previously approved.

What has happened subsequently to that is the city has negotiated an inclusionary housing development with a developer to construct, again, an inclusionary housing development on what's known as parking lot T in city owned property which this board has already --

Chairman Garip asked: Can you just tell the board where that is?

Deputy Mayor Canestrino stated: State Street south of the fire department, on the fire department side.

Mayor Labrosse stated: Where the mosque is.

Chairman Garip stated: On that parking lot and what is the agreement here is to construct something there that is 100 percent affordable housing, is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. Mistretta responded: It's going to be an inclusionary housing development.

And the board may be familiar, because there's already been a redevelopment study approved designating the area as an area in need of

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

redevelopment. And the board has sustained a redevelopment plan for this project as well. And the language in that plan basically states that we're going to capture a minimum of 60 affordable housing units on this site. You can see it on the slide.

Chairman Garip asked: Well, 60 out of how many?

Mr. Mistretta responded: 268.

(Hearing was opened to the public. No public wished to comment.)

Mr. Mecca stated: Again, in order to move this along, I did also prepare a resolution or actually Ms. Holm prepared a resolution or somebody from her office that you have received by email I believe yesterday. So if the board's inclined to approve or to recommend these changes.

Chairman Garip asked: This Housing Element as part of the Fair Share Plan?

Mr. Mecca responded: Yes.

Chairman Garip asked: The motion would be?

Mr. Mecca responded: To adopt the amendment.

Chairman Garip stated: Adopt this and move it forward to the City Council with the memorialization at the same time. Is that correct?

Mr. Mecca responded: Yes.

MOTION MADE BY MR. DIB. SECONDED BY MR. ALLEGRETTA. MOTION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, DEPUTY MAYOR CANESTRINO, MR. CONTINI, MR. ALLEGRETTA, MR. MARTUCCI, MR. DIB AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

**e. Resolution: Recommendation to approve the Open Space Plan**

NO ACTION TAKEN

**5. APPLICATIONS:**

**a. Cornerstone Capital Investment Hackensack, LLC  
85-99 State Street  
Block 214, Lots 19-22  
SP#20-20 V#20-20**

The Applicant requests Site Plan Approval to demolish the existing warehouse building, commercial building and associated improvements to construct a new six (6) story multifamily residential building of sixty-seven (67) units, consisting of twenty-eight (28) one-bedroom units, nineteen (19) one-bedroom

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

plus den units, and twenty (20) two-bedroom units. Additionally, the Applicant proposes one hundred and twelve (112) parking spaces, exclusive of six (6) tandem parking spaces. Additional improvements include curbing, transformer, parking lot striping, lighting, landscape improvements and an underground detention system to accommodate runoff. Additionally, the Applicant proposes water and sanitary connections to the State Street right-of-way.

A P P E A R A N C E S

THE MECCA LAW FIRM  
 BY: JOSEPH L. MECCA, JR., ESQUIRE  
 87 S. Farview Avenue  
 Box 384  
 Paramus, New Jersey 07653  
 877-551-3012  
 Counsel to the Board

LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD SCHKOLNICK, LLC.  
 BY: RICHARD SCHKOLNICK, ESQUIRE  
 75 Main Street, Suite 201  
 Millburn, New Jersey 07041  
 973-232-5061  
 rick@schkolnicklaw.com  
 Counsel to the Applicant

E X H I B I T S

- A-4 EV Parking Exhibit, last revised 2/2/22
- A-5 Landscape rendering dated 2/9/22

P U B L I C H E A R I N G

Mr. Schkolnick greeted the board. Mr. Schkolnick stated: The property is at 85-99 State Street and it's identified on the city's tax maps as Block 214, Lots 19-22. It's the old Salvation Army building, and that's actually been demolished already. So there's no existing warehouse, the existing building was demolished. And we saw you a while ago, but

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

that's when we were in front of you, but we've obviously been working on some changes to address the concerns that have been expressed.

We started with about 13 or 14 variances. And, with some very minor tweaks, we're really down just to one variance.

Chairman Garip asked: Which is?

Mr. Schkolnick responded: Which is lot coverage, and some very, very minor, sort of one foot on the parking aisles, and we'll go over this in detail.

When we got started, we were at 67 units. We're down to 60 units.

We've reduced the number of two bedroom units. When we first got started, we were at 24, and now we're down to 12. So we've lowered the two bedroom count. I mentioned, almost all the variances have been eliminated.

There was a concern about setbacks on front yards, and we've brought the building back so that we comply with the setbacks on the front yard except for some bay windows on the upper floors. The building structure itself is now compliant with the setbacks.

The rear yard setback, that's been eliminated next to our neighbors.

The height ratio variances, those have all been eliminated from the plan that's in front of you, and that was obviously a reduction in the size of the building.

We had variances for inadequate landscape buffer. We've been able to eliminate that as long as we have one clarification. On our plans, we say the planting of the trees would be 5 to 6 feet, and Mr. Polyniak pointed out that we have to have six feet. So as long as we just change the note on the plans about the initial planting height of our trees, we eliminate the request that we previously had for a landscape buffer variance.

We had parking in the front yard that was inside the building. That's been eliminated.

We eliminated the tandem parking spaces. That was a concern of the board, and so we got rid of those tandem spaces.

Our parking ratio is now up to 1.66, 1.66 per unit, and we think that's one of the highest in Hackensack in the last few years.

We had RSIS, Residential Site Improvement Standards, deviation on the number of parking spaces. That's now been eliminated, so long as we add two more EV parking charging stations. So we had 15 in a supplemental drawing that we submitted. Mr.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

Polyniak, on his calculation, said we need 17. Obviously we'll add the two more EV spaces, one of which has to be in a handicap spot. When we do that, we get compliant on the parking.

Now, we do get a credit on parking under that new state statute that deals with the EV stations. We get a credit of 10 spaces, but if the board feels that we need more spaces, we are agreeable to a condition of approval to purchase additional spaces in the city-owned lot. So if parking is a concern, and even though we're at the 1.66 and we comply because of the EV credit, we could even go above and beyond that.

So what do we have left? What do we have left?

On our internal drive aisles, we have a one foot deviation from the city ordinance. We have 24 feet. That actually complies with RSIS. The city ordinance is 25 feet. So we're one foot off on the internal drive aisles, but we do comply with RSIS.

On 15 of the 100 spaces, we're proposing 8x18, 8x18 rather than 9x18, so we're one foot short there. But the city ordinance does allow us to have 30 percent of our spaces with a width of 7.5.

So, you know, our position, we can have up to 30 spaces that are compact, we only have 15 spaces that are compact, and we're not off by that much, 7.5 feet on our proposal -- excuse me, we have eight feet. We have eight feet in width, and 7.5 is allowed under the city ordinance.

So what's left in terms of the variances. We have those bay windows that come out. We could eliminate them, but it's really an architectural feature, it's not the building itself. So we do need some variance relief, because our bay windows in the front yard.

And then the main variance, Chairman, that's on the lot coverage. We have reduced that slightly to 62 percent. We started --

Chairman Garip asked: What is the requirement, Mr. Schkolnick?

Mr. Schkolnick responded: The requirement is 33 1/3.

**J A M E S T. V I R G O N A, RA**, c/o Virgona & Virgona Architects, 125 River Road, Suite 201, Edgewater, New Jersey 07020, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

Mr. Virgona's credentials were accepted by the board.

Mr. Virgona testified: I'd like to give a recap of some of my previous testimony on just the changes

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

we've made. I know that Mr. Schkolnick has made a brief introduction to the project.

We have made approximately 12 changes to the plan, if we had to quantify them. I'm going to share that with you at this time.

The plans that I am presenting tonight have been revised on 1/19/22, revision four. I'm going to make that a general statement, because all plans have that revision date. These plans are numbered AR-1, as well as A-1 through A-9.

"AR" is the designation for architectural rendering; A-1 through A-9 is the designation for architectural drawings, preliminary. The project has undergone some transformations. We've made some design changes. In a nutshell, I'm going to just elaborate on some of the ones we feel significant to the project.

We made a reduction, of course, in the project density from 63 units to 60 units. The original application was filed with 67. So to avoid confusion, we have downsized from a 67-unit project to one you currently see at 60, with an interim filing of 63 that we have not testified to.

The 60 units is somewhat significant in that not only did we reduce the density for that, but we've also changed the unit distributions for that. We had 24 two-bedrooms in the prior scheme, we now have 12. A net reduction in the interim 63-unit project to this project sees a reduction in 16 bedrooms removed from the project. As a result of those bedrooms being removed, we now have a project that has a different parking requirement.

So the second thing that changed in the project or the second part of the project that I want to discuss is that we made a reduction in the parking requirement but increased our parking ratio so that we would become RSIS compliant using, of course, the state model ordinance for EVs. That part of the testimony will be addressed by the engineer, but I bring that to the board's attention because as we go through the plans we'll see that the garage has changed in configuration.

We were permitted to or at least took the liberty of changing the configuration when we reduced the density and reduced the number of bedrooms in the project.

Before you is an architectural site plan. I'd like to just describe basic changes we made to this site plan. This is on sheet AR-3 -- excuse me, A-3.

In this plan, which depicts our ground floor, we

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

have made some changes. We, of course, eliminated the portion of the ramp that was in the western portion of the rear yard of the project. That ramp was creating a variance for our project. Diagrammatically, you'll see a red line. This red line describes where the ramp was originally in this project. It was here. We have eliminated that ramp and moved the ramp to the interior of our garage, which you could see is this curved structure.

When we moved it to the interior of the garage, it also allowed us to make another modification, which is that the relocation of the ramp now has less of an impact on any of the neighbors.

To the west of us and to the northwest of us, in these two locations, here and here, we have 22-foot high or 24-foot high single story light industrial buildings with no windows on those facades. So the ramp really affects none of the adjoining neighbors. We also were able to, by making this adjustment with the ramp moved, create a 15 foot rear yard against the neighbor to the west, which is a compliant rear yard. That is the setback to the garage structure.

And in the front on State Street, facing State Street, we were able to eliminate or push the building back this distance, which is about five feet from the original proposal, to create a 20-foot setback at the ground floor level, thereby providing more planting and buffer along State Street. That also, I believe, will align our building with the adjoining building to the north, which is the residential building, the three and a half story residential building to the north.

Those are the basic changes made on the garage. In addition, what we've done is, after much debate -- and when I say "much debate," I mean months of debate -- we had made a decision to eliminate the egress and entrance into the garage from State Street. There were three reasons why we thought that was best. The engineer is going to testify to that, but I just want to bring to the board's attention that that driveway elimination was done for these three reasons.

No. 1. Of course, it permits the ability to retain a parking space on State Street.

No. 2. There's a bus stop adjoining what was once the driveway location, which is here. That bus stop presented a little bit of a conflict or a little bit of a challenge to fit within this design. We thought it would be cleaner not to have it.

3. All the traffic is now routed to Myer Street, with one entrance and exit into the garage. That

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

means that we don't have to consider with this plan left turns off of State Street crossing traffic into this garage or exit from this garage making left turns to head north on State Street, which is a busy road and we felt was worth maybe making these adjustments or eliminating this entrance for those conflicts.

We've eliminated, of course, the ramp on this side and the Myer Street side and put the ramp as an internal ramp to the garage. That also allows us just to have one curb cut on Myer Street, which again allows us to retain an additional parking space on Myer Street, as well as one single access source of control for security into and out of the garage.

So we thought those benefits outweighed perhaps introducing this second exit or entrance on State Street. For debate later, the engineer will testify to that and the board can ask those questions later.

In addition to those changes, with the ramp configurations, the garage shift, the increased rear yard, the increased ground floor setbacks on State Street for the front yard, we've also adjusted the building envelope.

The building envelope, which would be these lines, along with the curb of the ramp and then the additional side to the north, all comply with the height ratios required by the ordinance. This is the plan, A-3, No. 2, and No. 3A-3, show a diagram of our footprint at the podium level and at the upper residential level. I show both of those because the podium level is a lower structure of 24 feet high. The ramp, of course, is even less than 24 feet high, the ramp is only 13 feet high.

All of these structures comply with the height ratio setbacks that we have provided with our 15-foot setback.

The height ratio is the dashed line requirement. So in the case of this rear podium structure, the actual ordinance that will determine our setback is the minimum setbacks for rear yards of 15 feet, not the height ratio ordinance. The building is too low.

When we move on to the residential floors, which are floors 3, 4, 5, and 6, those floors meet the height ratio which is required of those floors and those walls denoted by this dashed line for the minimum setbacks requirement.

We have increased the rear yard, as well as another modification to the west and northwest of the property. There was a building owner here who was concerned about people throwing trash to his

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

building. Well, when we reconfigured our building, we removed portions of our rear building that projected into this notch of the property.

So by doing that, we have reduced the footprint of the residential portion of the structure. Not only do we now comply with the height setbacks everywhere on the building for the height ratio, but we've reduced the actual residential in area of the building.

Each one of these areas per floor that we saved or removed from the building was approximately 1,400 square feet, 1,500 square feet, depending on the floor.

In total, the overall building area was reduced by almost 18,000 square feet.

We've also made, and this is one of the major changes, a design change to the exterior.

Because we were able to create greater setbacks at the ground floor level, we took liberty to create bay windows in the design. These colored bay bricks. So one of the changes we made was to add bay windows to the building.

The bay windows are divided into 22-foot wide pieces, along with some small two-story accent bays that are about eight feet wide, which occur on floors 3 and 4. These bay windows, of course, break up the facade, but they add depth to the facade. So there's a one foot break, this -- excuse me. The small bays in white, which are light gray, they appear white, are 17-foot from the property line. The larger bays, which is the brick bays, are actually 18 feet from the property line. The metal panels that we see here in light gray are 20-foot from the property line.

And the dark metal panels here that we see running a course across the top frieze and down accent the entranceway are actually 21 feet setback. So we've exceeded the setback on parts of the building, met the setback at the 20-foot mark for another large portion of the building, and then the bay windows are the accents that project into the front yard.

We feel that while we are violating that setback with the bay windows, they add a lot of interest to the building. We've also designed the building to be more colorful, less monochromatic. The previous design had something of grays and off-whites. We have decided to introduce some color into the building. We feel that will mix in better with the neighborhood.

And, finally, we've redesigned the entrance into

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

the building. We feel that the entrance gives the building a more stately look, more hierarchy at the entranceway, more interest of the building, nicer response to the city core.

Those are primarily the changes that we've made to the project, and that concludes most of the things I would like to include in my testimony, barring of course any clarifications and questions from the board.

**M A T H E W W I L D E R, P. E., P. P., C F M,** c/o Morgan Engineering, LLC, 130 Central Avenue, Island Heights, New Jersey 08754, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Wilder's credentials were accepted by the board.

Mr. Wilder testified: Okay. So this is the grading plan from the site plan set that was submitted. That site plan is dated 10/15/20 and last revised 1/14/22.

I first just wanted to speak to, as Mr. Virgona outlined, the cause and the benefits that I see from the elimination to the State Street driveway. The bus stop -- I think this is abundantly clear, we're all familiar with the area. We're aware of the bus stop that exists that the driveway was in conflict with.

Beyond that, as Mr. Polyniak outlined within his letter, there was a fire hydrant that was in conflict with that State Street driveway as well which would have needed to be relocated. And the debate Mr. Virgona spoke to, it was fervent at times just for the fact that we were trying to put forth an application we thought this board would appreciate. Certainly Mr. Sroka had made comment ahead of the first meeting where he expressed concerns with the movements associated with the State Street driveway.

So with the relocation of the ramp to the interior of the building, we viewed it as a way that we could really check off a lot of boxes of concerns that were raised to us. So that was the reason and the premise that we had eliminated that driveway.

You'll notice that we still sort of show that drop-off area, whether it's Amazon deliveries, but it also connects to the trash room as well at this point. Previously the trash room was located and accessed from the inside of the building; now there's a direct access from the trash room to the exterior of the building, which prevents the need for trash vehicles to circulate within the building.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

So while the architectural plans are numerous, not from just a unit count reduction but also the operation of the site, we thought that it was a pretty large improvement.

The next plan I'm going to pull up is the EV parking exhibit, which is just my site layout plan, again dated 10/15/20, last revised 2/2/22.

On this plan, we've indicated the EV parking stations as these small red rectangles.

Mr. Polyniak talked about the need for one of the EV parking spaces to be associated with the handicap space. We've done that.

So we currently are showing 15. We had proposed 15 EV parking spaces based on the number that we were proposing of 100, and Mr. Polyniak notes that the 15 should be under the required of 110. So we'll certainly add the two additional EV charging stations. As I indicated, we already have them associated with the handicap accessible space, so we'll add them into locations that are logical and make sense.

Mr. Schkolnick stated: And we're going to call that exhibit A-4, that's the next one, just what we're doing here, if you don't mind.

Mr. Wilder testified: So I'm going to jump back to an exhibit that we had shared back in April of last year, which was a landscape rendering exhibit, and that is dated 2/2/21.

So this is the prior plan. As Mr. Virgona talked about, here is the ramp to the second floor. We had quite a bit of discussion at the prior meeting about the tandem parking spaces, and they created a variance, and there were concerns about access into and out of those tandem spaces. We've eliminated the tandem spaces. Again, you can see the State Street driveway over here.

I pulled this up just so I can share a new landscape rendering that we prepared, which is dated 2/9/22, and I guess we'll call this A-5.

And it's simply just to show the increased landscape buffer around the property and along the State Street frontage.

Mr. Polyniak notes that the landscape buffers, we've partially satisfied them. We have no intent to request variances for those landscape buffers. I believe we need to decrease the spacing between the buffers and increase the plant size, but we will certainly do that to address those variances that remain.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Mat, just to confirm, our

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

notes say the initial tree planting is 5 to 6 feet. We can obviously change that to be six feet. Is that accurate?

Mr. Wilder responded: Yes, it is.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: And Mr. Polyniak pointed out that the separation between our plantings has to be no more than five feet, and I think we would have to attach a note to clarify that, if that's acceptable as well, of course, right?

Mr. Wilder responded: It is. It may result in a few additional plantings, which we have no issue adding, to ensure we meet that spacing requirement. I'm going to jump back to the site plan to just point out an oversight, unfortunately, that resulted on my plans when we were making these changes.

Previously, if you recall, we had an underground dry well that was taking runoff from the building, detaining it and attenuating it, slowly releasing it into the city system.

Just throughout the plan changes, what ended up happening unfortunately is that was simply frozen from our plan. Mr. Polyniak notes we had removed it from the plan review. He would be accurate. We have intent to remove the underground dry well. On a revised plan, it will be depicted.

Although the impervious coverage associated with the development has been slightly increased, the same size dry well would be proposed. And the reason it's sized the way it is is it's the space that we have available to us.

So without question, we certainly are going to provide the stormwater attenuation to ensure that we don't overburden the city's existing conveyance system.

From an engineering standpoint, there is no real additional changes. Mr. Polyniak had a few comments that I think I can very quickly hit from a review of his letter.

Most of the items required no further revisions, but there are a few items that he asked us to confirm with testimony or provide some clarification on. The first relates to the building signage. The intent is that the address of the identification signage will be illuminated from dusk to dawn, and we take no exception to complying with Ordinance Section 175-714. Whether it's illumination levels, lighting, timers, things of that nature, we have no issue with complying with that.

Regarding city approvals, specifically the fire official's review and Mr. Sroka's review, as I

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

indicated from the plan revisions we've made, I hope that we've addressed Mr. Sroka's concerns, especially with the elimination of the State Street driveway, and, as Mr. Schkolnick indicated, the willingness to buy some parking spaces within the city-owned lot to bring us up, if the board was concerned about off-street parking.

The fire official had issued a letter in November of 2020. We take no exception to providing the details they requested, such as a KNOX box for access. So no exception to any of those comments.

We talked about the EV charging stations. Again, we will revise the plan to make sure we have 17 proposed EV stations.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: And one has to be a handicap, correct?

Mr. Wilder responded: Correct.

And that is currently what the proposal is, this handicap space would have the ability to charge at an EV station and we'll add a couple more as well. Mr. Polyniak also brought up a concern with this door located at the northeast corner of the building and the fact that the door opened up directly into a drive aisle. We will eliminate that door. We certainly don't want to create an unsafe condition where a vehicle would be backing out and may not see somebody coming in the door. So the alternative is that someone will have to walk down the sidewalk into the lobby, which we don't view as a large inconvenience compared to the safety concern with coming into that area, so we will eliminate that door, that's no issue.

Regarding stormwater, we were asked to provide some yard drains within the grass buffer setback areas. We've provided grass swales, but we have no issue providing the yard drains to collect the runoff to ensure that we have no impact on adjacent properties, and the yard drains we will connect into the underground dry well system and probably incorporate into that dry well system to, again, provide detention and attenuation before water is released to the city's system.

We have no issue with Mr. Polyniak's request as it relates to the proposed plantings along the street frontage and the elimination of the tree grates.

So this is the landscaping plan of my last set. The tree grates were previously shown within the sidewalks along both Myer Street and State Street. We'll eliminate those and then provide the detail as requested by Mr. Polyniak.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

And I would just like to point out one additional benefit to the elimination of the State Street driveway. It's just a more aesthetic planting design along that State Street driveway.

If there were a driveway here, obviously these plantings would need to be separated such that they wouldn't impact the driveway and to maintain certain sight lines. So, again, it provides a more continuous landscape design across the entire frontage, so I would again view that as a positive. I believe that addresses sort of my plan changes and sort of piggybacks on Mr. Virgona's comments, and also I hopefully addressed Mr. Polyniak's concerns and clarifications that were requested.

**C O R E Y C H A S E, P.E.**, c/o Dynamic Traffic, LLC, 245 Main Street, Suite #110, Chester, New Jersey 07930, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Chase's credentials were accepted by the board.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Mr. Chase, I had given some preliminary statements, which I'm sure you've heard.

On our drive aisles, we're proposing 24 feet. That actually complies with the Residential Site Improvement Standards. The city requires 25.

Do you have any professional opinions on whether that one foot deviation can be granted in a manner that keeps the project safe?

Mr. Chase responded: I do, and as you correctly noted, Mr. Schkolnick, the Residential Site Improvement Standards do set forth a two-way drive aisle requirement servicing that area of parking to be 24 feet in width. That's also consistent with recommendations by the Urban Land Institute and the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

So based on satisfying all those standards, a 24-foot drive aisle is sufficient to accommodate two-way travel with 90-degree parking.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Any material detriment to the zone plan and the zoning ordinance in terms of the 24 versus 25 feet?

Mr. Chase responded: There is not.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Then on the width of 15 of our parking spaces, on the width, we're short a foot. Can you talk about that in terms of what the city actually allows in its ordinance?

Mr. Chase responded: We are proposing several compact parking spaces which are eight feet in width, a one foot reduction from the requirement of the

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

nine-foot width.

The city does allow up to 30 percent of the spaces to be compact, and we have 28 compact spaces, so we're slightly below that allowable requirement. And, again, the spaces are all going to be assigned, so they'll be assigned accordingly to residents and the appropriate vehicles.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: So the city's objective standard would allow for a width of 7.5 feet, we're eight feet, correct?

Mr. Chase responded: Correct.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Okay. And arguably the RSIS doesn't talk about compact spaces. Is that correct?

Mr. Chase responded: It's silent on compact spaces, yes.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Even if it wasn't silent, any detriments in terms of the width of the parking spaces? Can this relief, if it's needed from the RSIS, be granted without any significant issues?

Mr. Chase responded: It can.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Okay. And that's a common modification to the RSIS, right, along with the width of the parking spaces?

Mr. Chase responded: It is very common when you're talking about spaces located within a garage.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: And, again, you mentioned that those could be assigned spaces. What benefit does that have?

Mr. Chase responded: That means that they'll be assigned to a resident so they'll be very familiar with the width and operation of that parking space.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: So from a traffic engineering standpoint, any issues with this application?

Mr. Chase responded: I don't see any, no.

**D A V I D S. S P A T Z, P.P.**, c/o Community Housing & Planning Associates, Inc., Harrington Park, New Jersey 07640, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Spatz's credentials were accepted by the board.

Mr. Spatz testified: The prior three witnesses described the changes that were made to the plan, I'll just touch on them, particularly as they relate to the variances from the original application as well as this application.

As was noted, the number of units have been reduced from 67 down to 60. The building footprint itself has been reduced as well.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

The bedroom mix now consists of one studio apartment, 29 one-bedroom units, 18 one-bedroom plus den units, and 12 two-bedroom units as well.

So in terms of the remaining variances, we had several height ratio variances. Those have all been eliminated.

The building itself now conforms to the front yard setback of 20 feet, but, as Mr. Virgona described, the bay windows project to 17 feet into the front yard setback, and we need a variance for that and I'll discuss that in a moment.

The rear yard variance from the original submission has been eliminated, and we have a 15-foot setback now provided.

There were parking locational variances. Parking was located in the front and side yards. That has been eliminated. Tandem parking was provided. Those have been eliminated as well. All parking spaces now have direct access to the circulation aisle and the design waiver for that has been eliminated.

In terms of landscape buffering, as Mr. Wilder had shown, that has been significantly increased and now we have a landscape buffering in the rear and side yards and the original variance has been eliminated.

In terms of the number of parking spaces, the number of spaces with the reduction in the number of units, the number of spaces required has been reduced, and with the credits for the EV charging stations, we have a conforming amount of parking. So there are a few variances which remain.

The first variance would be the front yard setback, where the bay windows project 17 feet where 20 feet is required. Mr. Virgona provided testimony regarding that. The positive impact from the design just makes a more attractive design, something that fits in better with the neighborhood. That has a positive benefit to the public and the aesthetics of the property. And he indicated that there were no negative impacts from the bay windows themselves projecting into the setback.

The drive aisles, 25-foot is required by your ordinance. Originally, we were at 23 feet. That has been increased to 24 feet, which meets the Residential Site Improvement Standards of your local ordinance. Mr. Chase provided testimony that there is sufficient backup space and maneuvering space within those aisles, the 24-foot is sufficient.

One of the other variances is parking space size. Mr. Chase also provided testimony to support the

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

sizes of the parking spaces as satisfactory. So the one significant variance that remains is the one related to building coverage, as was mentioned earlier.

Your ordinance permits 33.3 percent coverage. The coverage was 62.6 in our original submission. That's been reduced slightly to 62 percent, so we still require a variance. So in terms of building coverage, the typical negative impact from building coverage is massing of the building and impacts on drainage and runoff in terms of massing of the building.

We do meet all of the setback limitations. So even though the coverage itself is not met, the building meets all of the setbacks, so it certainly is not impactful on any of the surrounding properties because there are sufficient setbacks, light, air, and open space, for those. We meet the building height requirement.

So, again, although the coverage exceeds what is permitted, the building itself is not overly large. The massing of it is similar to what is the Meridia project directly across the street. In order to provide a sufficient amount of parking without having to go up higher, the building itself, the ground floor becomes slightly larger, but the tradeoff is providing a conforming amount of parking on the site, providing residential units that are reasonably sized, and so there is a positive benefit for that.

Your ordinance does permit a larger building coverage in a mixed use structure, which we could do, but we feel that a fully residential building really has a positive impact on the public, particularly in this neighborhood. There are no other commercial spaces in the immediate vicinity on the ground floor, so having a little larger coverage without putting in that commercial space I think has a positive impact, it reduces traffic in the area.

Use of a commercial space would require vehicles to park in the street, take up on-street parking, because they couldn't park within the building. So I think although the coverage was a little larger, it doesn't have any of the negative impacts associated with increased coverage in terms of drainage impacts.

Mr. Wilder provided testimony that all drainage was being handled on the property, so I think for that particular variance the positive impact of the design of the building outweighs anything that might be construed negative, and I think it would be appropriate to grant that variance.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

So I think that that discusses the variances, the few that are remaining, and I'll be available to answer questions at the later portion of the meeting.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: So, David, you gave testimony really on the (c)(2) standards, correct?

Mr. Spatz responded: That is correct, yes.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Where you're saying the benefits to the community outweigh any detriments.

I just want to come back to the detriments for a second. Is that okay?

Mr. Spatz responded: Certainly.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: And, again, you're offering the rationale under that (c)(2). Is that correct?

Mr. Spatz responded: I am, yes.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: So we have 33 percent permitted in terms of coverage when we're all residential, but if we're mixed use, we get to go to 60, and we're at 62, correct?

Mr. Spatz responded: That's correct, yes.

Mr. Schkolnick stated: And just go over it one more time, because it is a variance where the percentage is greater, but if we made part of the first floor commercial, we would be allowed 60 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. Spatz responded: That's correct. To have any type of a commercial operation within the ground floor would enable us to nearly double the permitted coverage on the property.

Again, I think not having that commercial space, having a fully residential structure I think is more important. It has a positive benefit. It certainly fits in with the neighborhood. There are no similar commercial spaces. The project across the street does not have the commercial space. A commercial space there would not necessarily just serve the residents of the building but would attract people from elsewhere in the general vicinity that would require additional vehicles driving into the area, requiring parking on the street. Currently we'd like to keep all of those spaces available for members of the public who are either visiting or in the neighborhood.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Okay. So just practically speaking, it's not really a great site for a commercial use in your view. Is that correct?

Mr. Spatz responded: It's not. It's not located within the commercial area. It is really a residential and some business in that area, but again, primarily residential. You have the apartment

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

building next to us, you have the Meridia project directly across the street, the performing arts center is across the street. There really is no need for a commercial space here, and it really doesn't fit in with the area.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: So under the (c)(2) criteria you think it's really a better planning alternative to make it all residential there?

Mr. Spatz responded: Yes, having a fully residential building I think fits in with the character of the neighborhood better. It does reduce some impacts, but the detriment to us is that it only permits a lesser building coverage on the site.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: If we added an element of commercial there, we get up to 60, we'd be entitled under the ordinances that are in effect up to 60, but you don't think it makes sense really from a planning perspective?

Mr. Spatz responded: That's correct. I think, again, fully residential I think makes the most sense, has the most positive impact on the surrounding properties because it is consistent with the development in the area.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: Okay. But compared to what's otherwise permitted in terms of massing, right, we're at 62, 60 would be permitted, do you see any detriment at all to the zone plan or zoning ordinance in terms of that massing criteria that goes along with the lot coverage? That's what I'm trying to get at here.

Mr. Spatz responded: No, I don't see anything substantially negative. As I said, we meet the setback standards, we meet the height ratio standards, we meet the height standards, so even though the building doesn't meet the coverage standards, all the other traditional methods of determining mass and impact are met by our project.

The one negative conceivably from excessive building coverage is impacts on drainage and landscaping, as Mr. Wilder testified to. The drainage is all being handled within the property. We have increased landscaping, that does meet your landscaping standard from the ordinance, so the traditional negative impacts from building coverage are not there in our site.

**G R E G O R Y J. P O L Y N I A K, P.E., P.P.,**  
having been duly sworn/affirmed.

Mr. Polyniak stated: The applicant's engineer did testify that they would address the comments within our review letter.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

We do still have some open questions as it relates to the project.

I know our letter outlines the overall parking requirements as it relates to RSIS and the EV ordinance or state statute would.

Can you please discuss that, Mr. Wilder, and just go through why you believe your parking lot satisfies both the Residential Site Improvement Standards and the EV ordinance or statute requirements.

Mr. Wilder responded: Sure. Not a problem. And I'll actually share my screen, if that's all right with everyone. I have a pretty detailed calculation.

This is the site layout plan of the site plan set that was submitted, again, which I believe we're referring to -- we didn't mark this as an exhibit. This is the set that was submitted, it's last revised 1/14/22.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: This was in the submittal documents, correct?

Mr. Wilder responded: Yes, yes, and I am specifically referring to this area.

So the state statute that was recently passed in July of last year basically says that 15 percent of the required parking must be proposed as EV parking. One third of that EV parking has to be built at the time of initial construction, and I believe the remaining two thirds need to be built within six years of the commencement of construction.

So because the statute was, I guess, burdening developers with additional fees to be spent, the statute actually does give something back to developers in that it counts each EV parking space as two spaces and it can count for up to 10 percent of the required parking.

So this area on my plan, which I'll refer to now, talks about the one bedroom, two bedroom counts, and the total number of units, what's required per RSIS and what the total number of required parking spaces for the development are.

So for the 48 one-bedroom units, we need 86.4 spaces; for the two bedroom units, we need 24. So our total demand is 110.4.

So the 10 percent reduction that we'd be able to apply to the parking demand, it would be 10 parking spaces. So it works out to be that we need 99.36 spaces. The alternative is to say we have 100 spaces and to then count the EV parking spaces a second time, but the long and short of it is, when we have the 17 parking spaces and with the parking space EV credit that we get, we need 100 parking spaces and we

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

propose 100 parking spaces, so we believe we are compliant with RSIS.

But, again, as Mr. Schkolnick had indicated in his opening, we certainly understand a concern of parking, especially in downtown areas. So if that concern still exists, we do agree to purchase some additional parking spaces, which I believe is somewhat common, to satisfy the board's concern if they believe there is a deficiency.

Mr. Polyniak stated: I had heard during the testimony that the spaces were going to be assigned to the individual units. A question exists.

Since you're going to have these EV charging stations, what would happen if you don't have 17 EV cars in the building, how would you rectify the spaces being assigned?

Mr. Wilder responded: So the statute is pretty clear, one third of the EV spaces need to be built initially, with the remaining two third coming within six years. If there are not 17 vehicles that have EV charging stations, the developer would be installing EV charging stations without the potential need or occupancy of a vehicle.

I think the state is looking forward, as most car manufacturers are as well, and I think there's a big push for EV parking. I think that maybe one of the shortfalls with EV really getting mass appeal is how do you energize the vehicle. You know, Tesla has their own supercharging stations and the EV charging stations are becoming more popular, but they're still not nearly popular enough so that people will justify getting an EV station, especially in a multifamily development.

In a single family home, where someone can install an EV station within their garage, it's far more accessible.

But to answer your question, Mr. Polyniak, if the need isn't there, the developer is still required to construct those charging stations.

Mr. Schkolnick stated: And I think, Greg, the shorter answer is it's going to have to evolve. The parking plan is not going to be a static thing, it will have to evolve a bit over time, as there are needs and cars and demands in the marketplace.

Mr. Mecca asked: Just to be clear, a regular car can park in an EV space if there's not enough EV cars? If you have five EV spaces and there's only three cars of residents with EV vehicles, a regular vehicle can park in that space or no?

Mr. Chase responded: Yes, there's nothing that

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

precludes a regular vehicle from parking in an EV spot.

Mr. Schkolnick stated: Again, the demands over time, that may change. The residents may be not so happy. And of course the owners are going to have to respond to that somehow.

Mr. Polyniak stated: In the parking lot on both levels, as I travel into the garage and travel toward the east, there are a series of dead-end parking aisles and the parking spaces are right along the garage wall.

Have you reviewed, Mr. Wilder, turning templates to make sure that if spaces are occupied adjacent to it, how you would enter and exit those parking spaces without either hitting the cars or hitting the wall?

Mr. Wilder responded: We have. And when we talked to -- Mr. Schkolnick indicated and Mr. Chase confirmed that we're proposing 28 compact parking spaces, but only 15 parking spaces that are 8x18. So the spaces that are, what I'll call, along the wall, because of the fact that you don't have the ability to sort of have your car swing into that space, we fully intend to designate those as compact spaces. And because the parking spaces will be assigned, those spaces will be assigned to individuals with smaller vehicles.

So, again, they're full size 9x18 parking spaces but we're calling them or classifying them as compact because they'll be assigned to folks with smaller vehicles to ensure that they can easily make the turning maneuvers into and out of the parking space.

**T I M O T H Y S R O K A**, Hackensack Police Department - Traffic, having been duly sworn/affirmed.

Officer Sroka stated: Mr. Polyniak actually addressed a lot of the thoughts that I had with relation to some of the issues with the parking, plus the testimony by the applicant in reference to what I had commented on with the garage controls. A lot of those were addressed in his revision plan with the denoting of the EV spaces and where they were.

The only thing I would ask in relation to the EV spaces is some sort of detailed assessment or drawing of, do those EV chargers stick into the parking space? How are they constructed into the building and where does the power supply run from that? Because, again, if we're talking like a stand-alone unit or a wall-mounted unit or if you have something like that, does it stick into the parking space where it would affect the parking of a regular vehicle as

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

opposed to an EV vehicle?

Chairman Garip asked: So the actual configuration of the EV spaces you're concerned about?

Officer Sroka responded: Yes, because the charging units were depicted on the overall site plan but there was not a detailed drawing as to what type of charging unit that would be in theory.

Chairman Garip asked: How much clearance does that take up, is what your question is?

Officer Sroka responded: Correct, because if you use as a comparison a Tesla type charging unit, those are substantial in size as opposed to what might be constructed in this project. So just for a little clarification on that, yes.

Chairman Garip stated: And also, Officer Sroka, once that question is answered, I just want you to comment on overflow parking and what kind of issues that might present from a traffic safety, pedestrian standpoint. But let's get to the EV.

Mr. Wilder stated: Let me see if I can answer your question.

So the intent is that they're going to be wall mounted units, nothing is freestanding.

Mr. Virgona stated: That's not true. I want to actually -- Mat hasn't had the opportunity to hear this, but I did an analysis of our -- when I did the reconfiguration of the garage, I anticipated at least six floor mounted large Tesla rapid stations, which are very large, they're about three feet by three feet. I would like to show the board where we anticipated those.

And it is where you show them, Mat, but they're not all wall mount. So if I can just show them what I'm thinking.

Mr. Schkolnick stated: We would certainly agree to approval of specific construction drawings to confirm there's not going to be any interference with the parking spaces.

Is that correct, Mr. Virgona?

Mr. Virgona responded: Correct.

**M O H A M E D A M I N**, 1150 Crescent Way, Fort Lee, New Jersey 07024, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:

Mr. Amin testified: I am actually a lawyer practicing in Hackensack today. I've been here since I graduated law school, I've been at 131 Main Street, you know, 2, 3 blocks away from this site and also the courthouse.

Chairman Garip asked: But you're testifying as

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

the owner/developer?

Mr. Amin responded: Yes, I'm the principal of the developer, correct.

Mr. Schkolnick asked: And you heard the Deputy Mayor's comments about what are we going to do with the overflow parking. Do you have some thoughts on that?

Mr. Amin responded: Yes.

So, you know, the EV statute is new to all of us. I know it's not required that we install all at once. There is a gradual period of time where we have to meet the required, you know, over I think a five-year period. I think the statute kind of contemplates that they're foreseeing the increased demand for EV and it's kind of a fluid situation. You know, we're going to have to obviously adapt, as people's tendency and uses of EV vehicles change over the next few years. They're saying there's going to be a huge shift in the next 5 to 10 years towards EV.

Right now, we're thinking one assigned unit per tenant and the free-for-all for the other 40. And if one resident has more than two vehicles and it's causing a problem, we're going to start charging perhaps for a second assigned spot.

With the overflow, we have some street parking, obviously immediately outside the building on State and Myer. I believe it was like 10 or 12 units. You know, there's also across the street, and at the Atlantic parking deck a block and a half away and that's where we foresee a few days out of the year where there are major holidays, where we would probably utilize, you know, we're going to be impacted by this heavy overflow of parking needs.

But I believe in general, you know, what we contemplate, we contemplate some not having vehicles, you know, given our proximity to a major bus stop hub a few blocks away. So we're hoping to have some commuters that would live in this building, but it's a flowing plan. We have to adapt to the needs of our tenants, obviously. With this new statute, it's kind of a bit unknown. We're trying to control what we know, but, like I said, it's a fluid situation.

Chairman Garip stated: People have cars, and this is not New York City where you can really live without a car. I'd love for that to be the case, but unfortunately the reality is that people who live out here generally have cars. And they may not use them to commute, they may be sitting in the building all day, but it's kind of hard to do without one still. There's no subway. You know, it's urban but not as

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

urban as some of the larger cities, where there are other options other than a bus station that's a few blocks away. It's not that simple. But we understand where you're coming from and we appreciate you taking a look at this, because it's a concern, I think, of the community where all of these people are going to go with their cars and visitors and parking and pedestrians. It's a busy thoroughfare there. You know, you can't just build gingerly along a busy thoroughfare where people have cars and there are pedestrians running around, you want to be careful, right.

So we had Officer Sroka and the mayor remind us that there is a public parking garage across the street, more or less, on Atlantic Street there and that's helpful, as long as it's safe from crossing on State, you know, that's a plus. But it is across the street and it does require some vigilance here, and it's something that you're sympathetic with living in Fort Lee.

Mr. Amin responded: Yes, of course.

Mayor Labrosse stated: Yes, the EV parking station statute. It just makes no sense to me to cut back on parking because somebody is buying an electric vehicle, it's still a car and there's still the same amount of people living in the building. None of that ratio changes.

And to me it would have been very easy to fix just by as a resident moved in or bought an electric car, it would be the owner's responsibility to furnish them with a charging station as they go.

So, you know, you have five this year, next year you have 25, that means you have to install 20 charging stations. All the electric and the conduit could have been run ahead of time to accomplish that. It just seems like instead of -- you know, we're putting in all these stations, demanding all these stations based on an unknown at this point. And like you said before, you could have 16 charging stations in six years and only have three EV cars, so you're going to have cars not even using them there. So that absolutely makes no sense to me, but that's just the mayor upset with what I think is a terrible statute.

Chairman Garip stated: Noted and noted for the record, mayor.

The hearing was opened for public comment. No public wished to comment.

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

BOARD DELIBERATION AND VOTE

MOTION TO APPROVE:

MOTION BY: A. Dib

SECOND BY: J. Labrosse

ROLL CALL: J. Labrosse - aye

K. Canestrino - aye

R. Contini - aye

M. Allegretta - aye

J. Martucci - aye

A. Dib - aye

F. Garip - aye

**6. Old Business: None**

**7. New Business:**

**A. ORDINANCE NO. 08-2022**

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ARTICLE II, "DEVELOPMENT FEES" OF CHAPTER 45A OF THE CITY CODE, "AFFORDABLE HOUSING," TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT STATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING REGULATIONS**

Ms. Holm stated: Good evening, everyone. There's just a few amendments that we need the planning board to determine are consistent with the master plan. In the development fee ordinance these were changes requested by the court master in the city's Mt. Laurel case.

Really, they're relatively minor, it's mostly strengthening the requirement of the imposition of development fees. Particularly when there's a (d) variance, there is a requirement for a six percent of equalized assess value fee, and there's language that said the developer's may be required and those are changed to shall be required. So that was one of the major points.

The rest of it is confirming that the city already has an affordable housing trust fund. The original ordinance says that one would be created. We just wanted to update it to state that the city already has a trust fund.

And then there's also additional language based upon the fact that there is no Council on Affordable Housing functioning at this time. It just changed the language to include a judgment of compliance and repose, which is what we would receive from the court

## PLANNING BOARD

## MINUTES

**DATE: February 9, 2022**

rather than substantive certification from COAH when the plan is finally approved. So those are the changes.

Deputy Mayor Canestrino stated that the council is in favor of the changes.

Mr. Mecca stated: If there's no further recommendations, I will prepare a letter. This is basically a consistency review, make sure the changes are consistent with the master plan. I'll write a letter to council indicating the board heard the presentation and that their finding that is consistent with the master plan. There's no resolution required.

**B. ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDED 463 MAIN STREET REDEVELOPMENT PLAN CONSISTING OF BLOCK 411, LOTS 2.01, 13, 14, 15, 16 AND 18.**

CARRIED TO THE MARCH 9, 2022 MEETING

**C. DISCUSSION: EXTENSION REQUEST  
195 South River Street, Block 39.06, Lots 7-20  
RESOLUTION #SP 7-18 AND V 17-18**

MOTION MADE BY MR. DIB. SECOND BY MR. CONTINI. MOTION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, DEPUTY MAYOR CANESTRINO, MR. CONTINI, MR. ALLEGRETTA, MR. DIB, AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

**D. DISCUSSION: EXTENSION REQUEST  
277 STANDISH GEORGE SERRANO AND LUCY SERRANO  
FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL 277 STANDISH  
AVENUE BLOCK 119, LOT 10 SUB #01-21 AND V  
#01-21**

MOTION MADE BY MR. DIB. SECOND BY MR. ALLEGRETTA. MOTION IS PASSED BY AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF MAYOR LABROSSE, DEPUTY MAYOR CANESTRINO, MR. CONTINI, MR. ALLEGRETTA, MR. DIB, AND CHAIRMAN GARIP.

**8. Adjournment**

MOTION MADE BY MAYOR LABROSSE. SECOND BY DEPUTY MAYOR CANESTRINO TO ADJOURN. MOTION IS PASSED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE. PLANNING BOARD MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:31 PM.