

Frenchtown Planning Board
Reorganization & Special Meeting
January 13, 2016
7:30 P.M.

Randi Eckel called the Reorganization and Special Meeting to Order at 7:30 P.M. and stated that all the requirements of the "Open Public Meeting Law" have been met. The meeting has been advertised, the Agenda has been posted in the Borough Hall and copies distributed to the designated newspapers.

OATH OF OFFICE

Board Attorney Hirsch administered the Oaths of Office to Mayor Brad Myhre (Class I) William Sullivan (Class III), Gerry Case (Class II), Rocco Musolino (Class IV), Gordon Dragt (Class IV) and Jack Weeks (Alternate I) They all accepted their Oath of Office.

ROLL CALL

Present:	Absent:
Case	Dougherty
DenBleyker	
Dragt	
Eckel	
Musolino	
Myhre	
Scott	
Sullivan	
Suttle	
Weeks	

NOMINATION OF CHAIRMAN

Mayor Myhre asked for nominations for Chairman of the Board. John DenBleyker nominated Randi Eckel for Chairman of the Board. Cathy Suttle seconded the nomination. No other nominations were made. The Planning Board elected Randi Eckel Chairman of the Planning Board by favorable voice vote.

Chairman Eckel took over the meeting.

NOMINATION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Chairman Eckel asked for nominations for Vice-Chairman of the Board. Jack Weeks nominated John DenBleyker for Vice-Chairman of the Board. William Sullivan seconded the nomination. No other nominations were made. The Planning Board elected John DenBleyker Vice-Chairman of the Planning Board by favorable voice vote.

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters listed on the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the Planning/Zoning Board of Adjustment and will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. There will be no separate discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately.

Chairman Eckel noted that Cathy Suttle, Sarah Scott and she did review the meeting schedule to avoid all holidays for all religions. She also noted that these resolutions will appoint the same team of professionals for the Board. Their fee amounts are the same as last year. Chairman Eckel noted that most fees are covered by escrows posted by applicants.

On motion by William Sullivan, seconded by Brad Myhre, and carried by unanimous favorable roll call vote, the Planning Board approved the consent agenda approving Resolution #2016-01 - #2016-08 as follows:

**FRENCHTOWN BOROUGH
PLANNING BOARD**

RESOLUTION #2016-01

Dates, Time and Place for 2016 Regular Meetings and 2017 Reorganization & Regular Meeting

WHEREAS, Section 13 of the “Open Public Meeting Act”, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975, requires that at least once a year every Public Body shall post and mail to the newspapers designated by said body, a schedule of the location, date and time of each Regular Meeting of said Body during the succeeding year.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown, County of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey, as follows:

1. The Regular Meetings of the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown, County of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey, shall be held at 7:30 p.m. at the Borough Hall, 29 Second Street, Frenchtown, New Jersey, on the Fourth Wednesday of each month, for the year 2016, with the exception of the months of November and December. The Regular Meeting for the month of November and December shall be the second Wednesday.

The Meeting dates and time of all Regular Meetings for 2016 and the Reorganization and Regular Meeting for 2017 are as follows:

January 27	7:30 p.m.	Regular Meeting
February 24	7:30 p.m.	
March 23	7:30 p.m.	
April 27	7:30 p.m.	
May 25	7:30 p.m.	
June 22	7:30 p.m.	
July 27	7:30 p.m.	
August 24	7:30 p.m.	
September 28	7:30 p.m.	
October 26	7:30 p.m.	
November 9	7:30 p.m.	
December 14	7:30 p.m.	
January 25, 2017	7:30 p.m.	Reorganization & Regular Meeting

2. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd, Secretary
Frenchtown Planning Board

**FRENCHTOWN BOROUGH
PLANNING BOARD**

RESOLUTION #2016-02

Designated Newspapers

BE IT RESOLVED that the following newspapers shall be designated for the advertising of Legal and Public Notices for the Borough of Frenchtown:

Hunterdon County Democrat, Flemington, New Jersey
The Express Times, Easton, PA
Courier News, Bridgewater, New Jersey
The Star Ledger, Newark, New Jersey

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd, Secretary
Frenchtown Planning Board

**RESOLUTION #2016-03
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR AN
ATTORNEY TO SERVE AS PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY FOR THE BOROUGH
OF FRENCHTOWN**

WHEREAS, the Planning Board for the Borough of Frenchtown has a need to acquire an Attorney to serve as Planning Board Attorney as a non-fair and open contract pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 19:44A-20.5; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined and certified in writing that the value of the acquisition will exceed \$17,500; and,

WHEREAS, the anticipated term of this contract is 1 year; and

WHEREAS, Archer & Greiner has submitted a proposal dated December 15, 2015 indicating they will provide that attorney services for the amount of \$200.00 per hour in addition to costs incurred for out of pocket and travel expenses; and

WHEREAS, Guliet Hirsch of Archer and Greiner has completed and submitted a Business Entity Disclosure Certification which certifies that Archer & Greiner has not made any reportable contributions to a political or candidate committee in the Borough of Frenchtown to the Mayor or Common Council or County Committees in the previous year, and that the contract will prohibit Archer & Greiner from making any reportable contributions through the term of the contract, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Financial Officer has certified the availability of funds for this annual contract as required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:30-5.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown will authorize the Chairman to enter into a contract with Archer & Greiner as described herein; and

BE IT FURHTER RESOLVED that the Business Disclosure Entity Certification and the Determination of Value be placed on file with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that notice of this action will be published in the Hunterdon County Democrat.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd,
Planning Board Secretary

**RESOLUTION #2016-04
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR A PLANNER
TO SERVE AS PLANNING BOARD PLANNER FOR THE BOROUGH OF
FRENCHTOWN**

WHEREAS, the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown has a need to acquire a Planner to serve as Planning Board Planner as a non-fair and open contract pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 19:44A-20.5; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined and certified in writing that the value of the acquisition will exceed \$17,500; and,

WHEREAS, the anticipated term of this contract is 1 year; and

WHEREAS, Elizabeth McKenzie has submitted a proposal dated December 16, 2015 indicating she will provide planner services for the amount \$175.00 per hour; and

WHEREAS, Elizabeth McKenzie has completed and submitted a Business Entity Disclosure Certification which certifies that Elizabeth McKenzie has not made any reportable contributions to a political or candidate committee in the Borough of Frenchtown to the Mayor or Common Council or County Committees in the previous year, and that the contract will prohibit Elizabeth McKenzie from making any reportable contributions through the term of the contract, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Financial Officer has certified the availability of funds for this annual contract as required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:30-5.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown authorizes the Chairman to enter into a contract with Elizabeth McKenzie as described herein; and

BE IT FURHTER RESOLVED that the Business Disclosure Entity Certification and the Determination of Value be placed on file with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that notice of this action will be published in the Hunterdon County Democrat.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd,
Planning Board Secretary

RESOLUTION #2016-05
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR AN ENGINEER
TO SERVE AS PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER FOR THE BOROUGH OF
FRENCHTOWN

WHEREAS, the Planning Board for the Borough of Frenchtown has a need to acquire a professional engineer to serve as the Board's Engineer as a non-fair and open contract pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 19:44A-20.5; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined and certified in writing that the value of the acquisition will exceed \$17,500; and,

WHEREAS, the anticipated term of this contract is 1 year; and

WHEREAS, Robert J. Clerico of Van Cleef Engineering has submitted a proposal dated 12/28/15 indicating they will provide engineering services for the amount of \$135.00 per hour; and

WHEREAS, Robert J. Clerico of VanCleef Engineering has completed and submitted a Business Entity Disclosure Certification which certifies that VanCleef Engineering has not made any reportable contributions to a political or candidate committee in the Borough of Frenchtown to the Mayor or Common Council or County Committees in the previous year, and that the

contract will prohibit VanCleef Engineering from making any reportable contributions through the term of the contract, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Financial Officer has certified the availability of funds for this annual contract as required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:30-5.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown authorizes the Chairman to enter into a contract with Robert J. Clerico of VanCleef Engineering as described herein; and

BE IT FURHTER RESOLVED that the Business Disclosure Entity Certification and the Determination of Value be placed on file with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that notice of this action will be published in the Hunterdon County Democrat.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd,
Planning Board Secretary

RESOLUTION #2016-06
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR AN
ARCHITECT TO SERVE AS PLANNING BOARD ARCHITECT FOR THE BOROUGH
OF FRENCHTOWN

WHEREAS, the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown has a need to acquire an Architect to serve as the Planning Board Architect as a non-fair and open contract pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 19:44A-20.5; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined and certified in writing that the value of the acquisition will exceed \$17,500; and,

WHEREAS, the anticipated term of this contract is 1 year; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Pickell of Pickell Architecture LLC. has submitted a proposal on 01/7/16 indicating they will provide architectural services for the amount \$150.00 per hour; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Pickell has completed and submitted a Business Entity Disclosure Certification which certifies that Christopher Pickell has not made any reportable contributions to a political or candidate committee in the Borough of Frenchtown to the Mayor or Common Council or County Committees in the previous year, and that the contract will prohibit Christopher Pickell from making any reportable contributions through the term of the contract, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Financial Officer has certified the availability of funds for this annual contract as required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:30-5.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown authorizes the Chairman to enter into a contract with Christopher Pickell as described herein; and

BE IT FURHTER RESOLVED that the Business Disclosure Entity Certification and the Determination of Value be placed on file with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that notice of this action will be published in the Hunterdon County Democrat.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd,
Planning Board Secretary

RESOLUTION #2016-07
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR A
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT TO SERVE AS PLANNING BOARD LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECT FOR THE BOROUGH OF FRENCHTOWN

WHEREAS, the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown has a need to acquire a Landscape Architect to serve as the Planning Board Landscape Architect as a non-fair and open contract pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 19:44A-20.5; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined and certified in writing that the value of the acquisition will exceed \$17,500; and,

WHEREAS, the anticipated term of this contract is 1 year; and

WHEREAS, Brian Bosenberg has submitted a proposal dated 1/8/16 indicating he will provide Landscape Architect services for the amount \$145.00 per hour; and

WHEREAS, Brian Bosenberg has completed and submitted a Business Entity Disclosure Certification which certifies that Brian Bosenberg has not made any reportable contributions to a political or candidate committee in the Borough of Frenchtown to the Mayor or Common Council or County Committees in the previous year, and that the contract will prohibit Brian Bosenberg from making any reportable contributions through the term of the contract, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Financial Officer has certified the availability of funds for this annual contract as required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:30-5.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown authorizes the Chairman to enter into a contract with Brian Bosenberg as described herein; and

BE IT FURHTER RESOLVED that the Business Disclosure Entity Certification and the Determination of Value be placed on file with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that notice of this action will be published in the Hunterdon County Democrat.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd,
Planning Board Secretary

**FRENCHTOWN BOROUGH
PLANNING BOARD**

**RESOLUTION #2016-08
PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS**

WHEREAS there exists a need for the Planning Board to hire an Attorney to serve as the Board Attorney, an Engineer to serve as the Board Engineer, a Planner to serve as the Board Planner; a Landscape Architect to serve as the Board Landscape Architect and an Architect to serve as the Board Architect; and

WHEREAS the Local Public Contracts Law, N.J.S.A. 40:11-1 et. seq. requires that the Resolution authorizing the award of contracts for “Professional Services” without competitive bids and the contracts themselves must be available for public inspection; and

WHEREAS sufficient funds are available in the 2016 Temporary Budget and will be made available in the 2016 Municipal Budget for the Borough of Frenchtown for such services,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Borough of Frenchtown, County of Hunterdon, State of New Jersey, as follows:

1. The Planning Board Chairman and Board Secretary are hereby authorized and directed to execute an agreement with the following persons and/or firms for the year 2016:
 - a. Guliet Hirsch, Archer & Greiner, Attorney
 - b. Robert Clerico, Van Cleef Engineering, Engineer
 - c. Elizabeth McKenzie, Planner
 - d. Christopher Pickell, Pickell Architecture, LLC, Architect
 - e. Brian Bosenberg, B.W. Bosenberg & Company, Inc., Landscape Architect

2. These contracts are being awarded as described above without competitive bidding as “Professional Services” as defined under the appropriate section of the Local Public Contracts Law because each of the above mentioned individuals is a member in good standing of his respective profession.

3. Notice of this action shall be printed in the Hunterdon County Democrat.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Brenda S. Shepherd, Secretary
Frenchtown Planning Board

NEW BUSINESS:

Redevelopment concept for Ceramics Plant property

William Sullivan, John DenBleyker and Rocco Musolino stepped down on this agenda item due to proximity.

Chairman Eckel noted that Engineers William Burr and John Jahr from Maser Consulting are here this evening to review the traffic report.

Chairman Eckel also noted that Mr. Meiskin has a presentation for the Board this evening. Attorney Michael DeSapio, representing Frenchtown 7, LLC noted that his client received a copy of the new draft Redevelopment Plan and did provide the Fiscal Impact Study.

Attorney Michael DeSapio thanked the Board for holding a special meeting because of the time constraints. He turned the floor over the Architect Lucas. Attorney Hirsch asked that the exhibits be marked into the record. Architect Lucas requested that the Board mark each of the items submitted to the Board at the December 16, 2015 meeting as Exhibits. He noted that the last exhibit marked at the November meeting was A-13. The following were marked as Exhibits into the record:

- A-14 – three story brick elevation - 12/16/15
- A-15 – three story elevation with siding - 12/16/15
- A-16 – two and half story brick elevation – 12/16/15
- A-17 – two and half story with siding elevation with gable dormer – 12/16/15
- A-18 – two and half story rear elevation – 12/16/15
- A-19 – two and half story side elevation – 12/16/15
- A-20 – three story rear elevation – 12/16/15
- A-21 - elevation of Harrison Street between 8th and 9th – 12/16/15
- A-22 – elevation of Harrison Street between 9th and ballfield – 12/16/15
- A-23 – cross section from Harrison Street toward the river – 12/16/15

Chairman Eckel requested that the applicant go through the exhibits that were submitted to the Board since last meeting. Architect Lucas noted that two new perspectives were submitted. Entered as Exhibit A-24 is the birds eye perspective from the roof of the school and Exhibit A-25 is the birds eye perspective from the ground level of the school.

Architect Lucas noted that there is a variety of things that these two perspective invoke. It shows alternatives of the streetscape on Harrison Street from the two other locations. We looked at doing things with a 2 ½ story level all the way across Harrison Street. To give the Board something else to think about, we added a second set of elevations on Harrison Street providing a three story elevation facing 8th and 9th Streets, creating a gateway into the gateway. Also, we did some other things with architecture such as wrap around porches. Architect Pickell and he

met and went through a variety of ideas and we can discuss the alternative ideas. He would like to discuss the alternative if the Board would like.

Architect Lucas noted that we talked about articulation of the streets as part of creating variety in architectural elements along Harrison Street and elsewhere in the project. We talked about the idea of a wrap around porch so the porch sticks out beyond the façade and wraps around the side of the building. That helps create interest as well as additional framing of the intersections. These wrap arounds will occur at 8th Street and as part of the gateway into 9th Street. Marked as Exhibit A-26 is the Three /Two and One Half Story Corner Building on Harrison Street, dated 12/23/15. Architect Lucas noted that they added the white railing. At this scale, they cannot represent spindles. A wooden look of the railings at the porches was the change.

Architect Lucas also noted that one of the other things they changed on all the elevations was providing for windows in the doors consistent with the old style detail of divided glass in half the height of the door. We can possibly have a French balcony detail on the elevation of the façade. We showed that previously on the three story building. This is an element that can be mixed into a couple of the units along Harrison Street to create variety. Marked as Exhibit A-27 is the Two and a half story Harrison Street elevation with balconies, dated 12/30/15.

Marked as Exhibit A-28 is Alternative A – Two and One half story Harrison Street elevation with shutters, white railings and doors with windows, dated 12/23/15. Architect Lucas stated that he thought it was important to add wooden railings on the porches. This has the same style dormers as before. Responding to Chairman Eckel as to the porch roofs, Architect Lucas stated that it is a design detail. We do not need the porch roof over the doorway because the doorway is recessed 4 feet. We wanted to break up the porches more.

Marked as Exhibit A-29 is Alternative B – Two and One half story Harrison Street elevation with shutters, white railings and doors with windows, dated 12/23/15. Architect Lucas stated that this one has the shed dormer at the roof instead of the gable dormers which created more variety. Chairman Eckel commented that we do not normally recommend shed dormers. Architect Pickell noted that we normally do not recommend shed dormers but it creates variety. Architect Lucas stated that we are trying to show some of the bigger element that we can randomly move around to create interest that we hope the town is looking for. Planner McKenzie asked why the dormers are all the same on the units in the same building. Architect Lucas noted that they could easily mix things up. We can perfect the design and will work with Chris Pickell through the whole process. Responding to Jack Weeks, Architect Lucas noted that each building will be either brick or siding and will not be mixed. Chris Pickell noted that that is how it was done.

Marked as Exhibit A-30 is Three/two and one half story corner building on Harrison Street, dated 12 /23/15. Architect Lucas stated that this is where we started with the idea of taller corner buildings although he understands that the Board wants to keep the scale down on Harrison street. In traditional old corner building, typically there were business in those buildings and they needed to have 2 living floors above so the corner buildings were taller at the corner with the other units still 2 ½ story. The scale would be anywhere from 38 to 41 feet. It is a small perceptual difference. This is a response to variety. This is an idea to put forward. In the three story building, the third floor is not large enough for living space.

Marked as Exhibit A-31 is Alternative Bay window treatment, dated 12/23/15. Architect Lucas noted that they used the same elevation but with different types of bay windows that we could introduce along various facades. They can be placed intermittently. The one next to it does not have to look the same. The bay and box windows are mixed. Gordon Dragt asked if it is wood or something else under the bay windows? Architect Pickell stated that you would not have wood. It is sitting on the porch roof. Traditionally, there is wood out of the roof. Architect Lucas added that it could also be metal/copper. They can also introduce this into the two and one half story buildings. There are a number of alternatives for variety. Responding to Chairman Eckel as to the heights of the two and one half story buildings with the taller corners, Architect Lucas noted that the 3 story portion is 45 feet and the two and one half story portion is 38 feet with the alternative bay window treatments. The other one is 41 feet. There is a full street elevation to look at the differences. It depends how you want to mix the variety.

Marked as Exhibit A-32 is two and one half story side elevation with side port and entry. Architect Lucas stated that the doorway has been pushed around to the side of the building to give it a little more of a front door look for those units facing 8th and 9th Streets. Planner McKenzie asked if it is possible to run the wrap around more so there is more of a presence? of the corner of the building? Architect Lucas noted that we have a window about 6 feet away from the door. They normally would not have. Planner McKenzie noted that in Frenchtown, several buildings have corner houses that have porches that wrap all the way around. Architect Pickell noted that he likes that idea but it would be taking away green space. Jack Weeks stated that there are stairways there. Chairman Eckel stated that if you look at views of the fronts of the buildings, there is a lot of interest, dormers, shutters, divided light windows and divided light windows in the doors and then you get to the side of the building and it looks like you are staring at the side of a building. Architect Lucas stated that the stairway window is on the landing. Architect Pickell stated that it could use a little work. Cathy Suttle stated that the side has a modern look and ornate on the front. Planner McKenzie stated that the stairwell window could be raised. Chairman Eckel commented that the side looks like the side of a house that could be butting up against the side of another house and not like the side of the house facing the street. There are no houses in Frenchtown that have a side facing the street that looks like that. Architect Lucas stated that in the development there might be a couple other corner opportunities, there might be some other opportunities for wrap around porches. It would take up green space. Architect Pickell noted that if you turn the roof with another hip, it would look more finished. There are things we can do with more details. Planner McKenzie recommended extending one more column toward the window. It would make it look different. Chairman Eckel noted that most of the homes in Frenchtown are of the style we are trying to mimic, the street fronts have two fronts on the houses. We need to celebrate. Architect Lucas stated that they will continue to work through that in the process of the architecture.

Marked as Exhibit A-33 is Elevation A on Harrison Street between 8th and 9th Street, dated 12/28/15. Architect Lucas noted that this is the street elevation. The varieties is the difference between the center building and the siding materials and the wrap around porches at 8th and 9th Street. The height of the siding buildings is 41 feet. We respect the idea of the 38 foot elevation that Board would like.

Marked as Exhibit A-34 is Elevation A on Harrison Street between 9th Street and ballfields, dated 12/30/15. Architect Lucas noted that he used this elevation with the balconies to show variety. Responding to Chairman Eckel, Architect Lucas stated that each section of the building is 24 feet so the length of the entire building is 72 feet.

Marked as Exhibit A-35 is Elevation B on Harrison Street between 8th and 9th Streets, dated 12/28/15. Architect Lucas noted that these elevations are of the same stretch between 8th and 9th. It is a mixture of the three story buildings at the corner to articulate the intersections.

Marked as Exhibit A-36 is Elevation B on Harrison Street between 9th and ballfields. Architect Lucas stated that they kept the corner building in the ballfield to create the same kind of balance and to designate the end or beginning of the project.

Referring to Exhibits A-24 & A -25, Architect Lucas noted that in the Exhibit A-24 you can see more of what is happening beyond Harrison Street. The interesting thing is when you look at the ground level, Exhibit A-25, the buildings on the Harrison Street block the view of what is happening beyond Harrison Street.

Chairman Eckel stated that this piece of property that slopes down or drops off toward the river. The way you are proposing to move forward on this would involve raising the land toward the river so it would be nearly flat with Harrison street. Architect Lucas stated that once it is filled, it probably only dropt about 6 feet from Harrison to the last part of the property. We need to keep the buildings out of the floodway. We are not filling any more than we have to. We have a limitation of the amount of fill. Referring to the cross section, the finish grade along Harrison Street is 139 feet and the finished grade at the river side is 132 feet. He is going by where the unit is. Chairman Eckel stated that the Board does not have that document. She added that we really need documents to be distributed to the Board well ahead of time so that the Board can review them ahead of time. Architect Lucas noted they distributed a document and got additional information at the last minute that he put on the document. Entered as Exhibit A-37 is a cross section from Harrison Street toward the river. The outside grade goes from 139 feet to 133 feet and the finished floor is 1 foot above that. Chairman Eckel asked what the current level of the ground is at the river side? And, how much will you fill there? Architect Lucas noted that the walls will be about five feet. The existing grade is about 128 feet. Chairman Eckel asked that at the bottom of Eighth Street where the front setbacks are fairly narrow, what will the front yard look like? Architect Lucas stated that Eighth Street in front of the units will be raised up and the parking lot may start to grade back down on that side. We do not want ten steps to the front porch.

Cathy Suttle stated that there is a mention of accessory buildings or maintenance building in the Redevelopment Plan. Where would that be? Architect Lucas noted that there may be provisions that we do not anticipate using. It is not in the vicinity of the existing homes. Chairman Eckel stated that there are homes on Eighth Street and you are proposing to raise Eighth Street. Architect Lucas noted that they will not raise the street where the existing homes are. Planner McKenzie requested that they show that graphically what that will be like. Architect Lucas stated that those units along Eighth Street will have to step. We have not prepared grading plans yet in order to document all of those conditions. The buildings do not have to run flat. Sarah Scott expressed concern that the new buildings will be out of the flood plain but you would be exacerbating the flooding conditions to the existing homes on Eighth Street. Architect Lucas stated that the engineer will not be allowed to exacerbate any flooding. Once you stop the flood from going over the wall, it will not flood. Sarah Scott commented that she is referring to Harrison Street. Mr. Meiskin stated that you are going into details for a civil engineer. He cannot do engineering until he has a plan. They cannot change a road that creates a negative impact to existing homes. You are focusing on details that is part of a preliminary site plan approval. Planner McKenzie stated that the concern is that we are looking at a package and are we putting ourselves in a box where there may be implications for adjacent properties so if we

write a redevelopment plan and be stuck with that. For example, to achieve whatever grading you need, we may not have enough setback from Eighth Street to allow more room to work within that area. Are we putting ourselves in a situation where extraordinary engineering measures have to be taken and, where there are could be potential impacts to adjacent property owners? The Board has to look at some of these questions because they effect things like how many dwelling units are going to be on the property. These are the impacts in order to make a decision on what should be in the Redevelopment Plan. That is why we are asking the questions. Mr. Meiskin responded that we asked that this property be put into a Redevelopment zone and in doing so, we gave up certain rights. You can at preliminary site plan approval, deny it. Attorney Hirsch stated that a Redevelopment Plan Ordinance is like any other Zoning Ordinance. You comply with the standards in the ordinance. That is pretty much the end of the Board's discretion. Do not tell them they have the right to turn it down if they see something they do not like when the preliminary site plan comes before them. Those standards protect you and the town. You know what you have to design and the Board and its consultants knows what they are reviewing it against. Mr. Meiskin stated that he cannot lift the property out of the ground while having drainage go some place it normally doesn't go. Our engineers look at this and he is comfortable that it can be done without creating a large impact. Attorney Hirsch stated that when we look at a site plan, our concern is do we have enough standards in the plan and in the stormwater management plan that addresses that. Engineer Clerico stated that the elevation is 133 feet to have the buildings above that and the street is at 125 feet, you will have a major differential from the building to the street and you will have to raise the street and parking lot. About one third of the way down the street, you have existing dwellings. The concept is that he has to get the building out of the flood plain and he has to get the site to drain internally so he has to grading internally to the collection system that is developed as part of the site. That all has to be done without adversely effecting anything onsite or off site. The Borough's Stormwater Ordinance will deal with managing the storm water on the site and probably conveying off the site. Chairman Eckel noted that the concern is how changing the grading on this site will effect stormwater drainage on other neighboring properties. Engineer Clerico noted that it is something that you would look at as part of a review on any application. He does not know if there is specific verbage that speaks to the criteria. Cathy Suttle stated that she remembers another application where the stormwater ordinance limited us on how much we could ask the applicant to do to protect adjacent properties and it became the town's property for an existing situation. She also noted that these buildings will appear 5 feet or taller than the existing houses on the street. Engineer Clerico noted that in the lower part of the project, there is a parking lot and they will not be able to modify the street as you get closer to Harrison Street. Cathy Suttle stated that the buildings on the other side of the street are close to the street. Planner McKenzie stated that when we look at setbacks, we may want to make sure there is enough room. Engineer Clerico responded that you could propose a design criteria in your ordinance that would establish what you feel is the maximum curblin and the grade line of the building or first floor of the building. The heights are measure off the grade around the building so you would measure from the grade around the building. Architect Pickell noted that it will set the setback. It could be set as a slope. Chairman Eckel commented that if the differential takes place within one foot, it will be pretty steep.

Attorney DeSapio commented that it sounds like there is a difference of opinion of what can be worked out and what has to be done now. The concern is that we will put something in the Redevelopment Ordinance that will negatively affect the community that you cannot deal with later. Planner McKenzie asked, are we going to fail to put something in the ordinance? Attorney DeSapio stated that the way to deal with the approach is to take the topic and look at the ordinance and determine if there is anything in the ordinance that bars you from dealing with it

later such as drainage. He does not see anything in the plan that alters the drainage standards in the stormwater management ordinance. He respectfully asked that the Board work on the language in the plan for discretion. If we talk about all these details, we will be here forever. Chairman Eckel noted that it is important to get all the details right and consider the implications on the community so we get it right before we recommend the redevelopment plan to the Council. Attorney Hirsch stated that this is what the Planning Board is suppose to do and that is what the Governing Body expects the Planning Board to do and not to provide a skeleton of the ordinance to the Governing Body and say you might want to consider this or that, they want to know what the Planning Board recommends. Out of courtesy to your client, they have done a good job of bring forth a lot of details tonight then they did at the last meeting but the Board has not had a lot of time to look at this. Whatever amount of time it takes the Board to discuss it and come up with recommendations is the time it will take. Planner McKenzie noted that out of the discussion the Board is having, we have arrived at the fact that we may need to add design criteria regarding the differential between the grade of the curblineline and the grade of the street which is something we had not thought of until it came out of the discussion tonight. We may need to add expectations from the setback from Eighth Street. This Redevelopment Plan will have its own design criteria. We have to get it right. Attorney DeSapio stated that the development cannot go through every design item because he has not given you enough details to make a decision. You have to talk about concepts and standards. He understands the approach but we are reaching a loggerhead that is going to affect his ability and your ability to accomplish what your objective is. Your objective is get to the point where you have enough in front of you to make specific decisions. You will not get enough in front of you until we go forward. Attorney Hirsch stated that we spent more time talking about what we should be talking about then if we ask Mr. Clerico to consider an appropriate design standard would be along the nature of what he suggested. We will rely on our Board engineer for those standards which has not been included in the Redevelopment Plan up to this point because we have not discussed this before. Chairman Eckel added that it is because we have not had the appropriate documents before us to consider. Chairman Eckel asked Engineer Clerico to come up with some design standards and get them to Planner McKenzie.

Chairman Eckel stated that the Board is trying to discuss the Redevelopment Plan and we cannot do that until we get through the documentation from the proposed developer but there is an Exhibit over there that we do not have a copy of to consider so we are trying to do our due diligence and we will take the time we need to consider the proposed Redevelopment Plan and the impact it will have on the town and in what form before we recommend it to Council.

Sarah Scott commented that she does not like the shed dormers and especially the triple shed dormer. She thinks they are bulky. She prefers the single dormers. They help to minimize the massiveness of the building and the steepness of the roof line. She does not mind if there are two but she prefers that they are separate. Chairman Eckel noted that there is a dormer with two windows (gable dormer) that was okay too. The triples shed looks industrial. Cathy Suttle commented that she likes the singles best. Sarah Scott commented that there is some incongruity because her understanding is that rowhouses are being built to look like townhouses and they are two different things. It will not look right. Chairman Eckel asked what the depth of that building is. Architect Lucas responded that it is 50 feet. Chairman Eckel commented that on the roof top school view, it makes the side of the building look enormously long. Architect Pickell commented that it is distorted and unrealistic. Gordon Dragt commented that he appreciates the variety that was presented and there is a lot more diversity in possibilities. Planner McKenzie agreed that it gives the Board the ability to say they like this and not that. Jack Weeks commented that he likes the bay windows because it does not make the building

look as much like a townhome. Chairman Eckel stated that she does not like exceeding the original height.

Sarah Scott referring to the layout, asked if there is a way instead of there being a parking lot next to the residential lots, that there could be buildings there and the parking lot could be moved to somewhere within the bulk of the site? Architect Lucas stated that it is his understanding that area starts to get too low and the amount of fill it would take to bring it up to the grade required would not be allowed by the NJDEP. Planner McKenzie asked if there was a possibility of doing a buffer treatment along the parking lot. Architect Lucas responded in the affirmative and recommended ornamentals and evergreens. Gordon Dragt stated that he would like to see the tower excluded from this development and encourage the town Council to put one on town property. Chairman Eckel tabled that discussion for when the Board discusses the Redevelopment Plan.

Chairman Eckel requested that the Board review the traffic Study. Engineer Joseph Staiger is the traffic study expert and affirmed that he is still under oath. Marked as Exhibit A-38 is the traffic study. He noted that he was here at one of the other meetings and presented an overview of the traffic report. He had taken traffic counts of the roadway and keyed in on peak hours cognizance of the fact that the school is across the street. During the residential peak hours, 7 – 9 am and 4-6 pm, when the residential development will give peak traffic, the levels of service are very good. You have 143 students enrolled and he took counts of the drop offs and pick ups in early June of last year when the school was open. He coordinated the timing with the school to insure it was a typical day. Harrison Street has light volume during peak hours of 250 vehicles per hour in each direction. It is less than the capacity of the roadway. When we project the amount of traffic generated from this development, based on standard trip generation rates, a publication from the Institute of Transportation Engineers that provide the rates which the State DOT uses, town engineers use it, etc., the 130 townhouse units will generate 57 trips in morning and 68 trip in evening in peak hours. Some residents will leave at 6 am and some will leave at 9 am and vice versa on the return. These are hourly volumes which may extend over 2 or 3 hours. When we superimpose this on existing volumes, based on DOT growth rate, we are within the realm of levels A and B, particularly at Eighth and Harrison Streets. You have good levels of service. Levels of service which are representative of classifications of delays we can expect which range from A to F. In terms of capacity, this development would not have negative impact on traffic. Traffic will flow relatively easy as it does today. The key issue is the use of this property and traffic generation relative to the school and the safety of the children. We meet with the Principal of the school and representative of the Board of Education to come up with ideas on how to improve the safety of the children. We felt the crossing of the street is paramount to improve the safety. We came up with a crosswalk plan that he presented to the school for input. He has copies of that layout.

Marked as Exhibit A-39 is the overlayout. Along with blow ups of the intersections. Engineer Staiger noted that you have three intersections and we were concerned with the existing intersection at Tenth Street and Eighth Street which are 4 legged intersections with existing crosswalks. We will enhance them by putting up signage at those crosswalks. We are proposing at those location to identify pedestrians by putting in pedestrian walking symbols, diamond shaped, and arrows pointing down at the crosswalk. In the center of the yellow line of both crosswalk at Eighth and Tenth Streets, we will have the R1-6A detail, stop for pedestrians in crosswalk, with flexible posts. It will have a traffic calming effect. At the key intersection of Ninth Street, at the front of the school, you will have a new crosswalk. This is important because you do have a lot of drop offs and pick ups that happen on the west side of Harrison Street. Right

now the children get out of the cars and walk across the street. You will have a sidewalk connection as part of the Redevelopment Plan. The sidewalk will lead to this crosswalk so children can get out, walk up the sidewalk to the crosswalk. We will have a special traffic light button they can push at the crosswalk. We will have pedestrian signs which will have a beacon. The blinker will start to blink when the button is pushed. There will be a warning sign 125 feet before the crosswalk on both sides, with pedestrian crosswalk ahead and at the crosswalk you will have the pedestrian symbols as well as the arrow pointing down and it will be energized when the button is pushed so motorist will be very well aware of the pedestrians. He met with the school and that this was the most important aspect that needed to be addressed to improve the safety of the three intersections.

Responding to Sarah Scott as to the R1-6A, Engineer Staiger noted that there are temporary signs and will be flexible on the double solid line. It can be replaced if it is destroyed. Sarah Scott noted that there are lot of those signs in Lambertville, and it is very difficult to turn without either swerving into the opposing lane of traffic or hitting one of those signs. Is there a best practice in terms of placement so that people coming down Eighth Street and trying to make a right onto Harrison Street will not have that issue? Engineer Staiger noted that they will put turn templates in advance of the crosswalk particularly so someone making a left turn at the intersection are not impeded by that. It does not have to be a permanent sign. It can be a placard. Chairman Eckel asked Mr. Meiskin if he was presenting this to the school Board? David Meiskin noted that the school board has a meeting on the 26th and he asked them if they wanted him to be there. They have had the documentation. Chairman Eckel noted that she believes that they are expecting you at their January meeting.

Chairman Eckel stated that she is curious about a couple of items in the traffic report. When we met in the Technical Review Committee and members of the school board, we were adamant and it was repeated over and over again that it was important to have a traffic study that started before the pick up time in the afternoon. Parents show up at 2:45 pm. The traffic study started at 4:00 pm. What was the reason that was not done? Engineer Staiger noted that he can provide that. Afternoon dismissal time is not at peak hour. There will be movement because people are picking up their kids but it is not an active time for a residential development. If this board feels it would be a proper analysis, we can do that. It will not have the same impact as the morning peak hours. It is coincidental. Chairman Eckel stated that there was quite a discussion of the afternoon pick up because there is more chaos. There are a lot more people walking home so there is a different pedestrian pattern and there are extended after school activities which involves parents coming back to the school. The point we made was that by June, after school activities are over. This report excluded all that. We did ask for that repeatedly. Engineer Staiger stated that they can do that time period. We did not think it was critical to study that time period so we will study that time period. Chairman Eckel commented that she is surprised that the timing for the study was coordinated with the day of the 8th grade field trip, missing 10% of the traffic that you would normally see. Engineer Staiger noted that it was a typical study. He had talked to the principle and asked if that would be a typical day. We will make sure we get the right day. Planner McKenzie asked if it would be possible to have that before you met with the Board of Education at their next meeting. Engineer Staiger responded "Yes". Planner McKenzie stated that she thinks they would be interested in having that information as well as this Board. The fact that this site is directly across from the school will interact with what it going on at the school. It will be critical to the Board of Education and to this Board. Chairman Eckel added that it is about the impact to the community.

Traffic Engineer, John Jahr, representing the Board was sworn in by Attorney Hirsch. John Jahr asked if the school board has an engineer that represents the school board? School Board President Kate Nugent responded "No". John Jahr stated that he is West Newark's school board's traffic engineer. They have a huge school district. The reason he brings it up is that it might be a good idea for William Burr or him to join the team at the school board meeting because it will bring everything together and we can give some advice to the school board. The school board should have representation. He services that role in other towns. It would be a very good idea. Chairman Eckel agreed that it is a good idea and stated that the school board is primarily concerned with pedestrian traffic and safety. Engineer Jahr stated that he would be happy to service the school board. It would help guide the school board. Planner McKenzie commented that ultimately, whatever solution is devised for traffic and pedestrian safety is something that will be worked out between the school, the Borough and the developer and would be helpful to all parties. Engineer Jahr noted that since you are doing a Redevelopment plan, what is worked out can be written into the plan. He would like to work with the Planner because he has done other redevelopment plans where he has written in traffic regulations or traffic safety issues that need to be accommodated as part of the development. Planner McKenzie stated that she would welcome that. Chairman Eckel apologized that Engineer Jahr and Engineer Burr received the traffic report at the last minute as was unable to provide a written report. She asked if Engineer Jahr has any comments at this point. Engineer Jahr stated that he will defer his comments until Engineer Staiger does a new analysis. We do have a summer time traffic count but he would like to request that Engineer Staiger do another traffic study. This way we can have a summer time traffic count which will have some value. But the more valuable count would be in January and February because we know school is in session and after school activities are going on. We need the count at 2:45 to 4:00 pm so he can observe the cues and see what is going on and then 4 to 6 pm for the commuter peak to get the whole picture. The commuter peaks are not as important to us as the school peak. Getting a solid traffic observation of how the children are crossing, what the count is, and what things we can do. He has already provided great ideas keeping a safe situation for crossing. He would like to see that count. Chairman Eckel stated that a winter count would maximize the traffic count for the school. By June, the kids are walking home from school but in inclement weather the kids are being picked up and dropped off. Engineer Jahr commented that you can be sure that if it is colder, more children are being picked up and dropped off. He stated that he thinks the order of magnitude is important to this application. He is only speaking to traffic. He would like Engineer Staiger to add to his report the percentage change of what is happening on the road today and what will happen later. He added that Engineer Staiger is saying the trip generation is small and the level of service is very good. Although he is saying small, everything is relative. For a town with 1,300 people compared to a larger town, small and large are very different. Engineer Jahr stated that he would like a comparison table or figures looking at volumes. The traffic increase will probably be 3 or 4 percent. If the town has 1,300 people and you are adding 130 residents, that is a 10% increase. Maybe the traffic increase is not that much but that gives us a feel of the magnitude. If you say there is 57 trips, it is hard to say what the 57 trips is. If he gives you a figure of 3% increase, you will feel better about it. Engineer Jahr noted that the last comment is regarding the school. His biggest concern is circulation. He is looking at the site plan and what he saw, right now the way the road is used on the opposite side of the road. There is a paved area where parents let kids out of the car and those will now become parking spaces for the residents. He has a problem with that. There are other solutions. The other solutions will present themselves after getting more from the school board. There could be other things done to take it further. It would be good to not have the parents drop off on the other side of the school. If we could find a way for people to drop off on the side of the school, that would be a huge safety improvement for the children. He will work with Planner McKenzie to put something in the

Redevelopment Plan to improve that condition. There are many things that can be done. Chairman Eckel stated that you could discuss that with the school board.

Marked as Exhibit A-39 is the crosswalk plan. Marked as Exhibit A-40 is the letter with exhibits.

Chairman Eckel stated that the Board will address the Financial Impact Study. Planner McKenzie asked if the developer's expert is here. Mr. Meiskin noted that his expert was unable to attend but if you want to have a conversation, he will be happy to address what he can. Planner McKenzie noted that she has a lot of concerns. It is not just the issue of PILOT versus Non-PILOT. The numbers do not seem to work. She is concerned about what it implies in terms of the long term cost to the Borough in terms of the revenues generated regardless of whether they come through taxes or a PILOT. A lot of the purpose of having a Redevelopment Plan and encouraging the redevelopment of the site is to do something positive. She has no quarrel as to what comes out of the affordable units. She is concerned about the sizes of the market units and the fact that you have so many 3 or 4 bedrooms units which is bumping up the number of school kids. She is also concerned that you dealt with public school children and she knows that the literature contains a component of school age children but in Frenchtown, all school age children will go to the public school. We do not have people here sending their children to private school. She can talk to Mr. Reading about it and modifying that in his report. She is more concerned about the global issues which has to do with the plan and its implication for Frenchtown long term. We need to have a serious talk about what this means in terms of types of units and size of units. Chairman Eckel asked if Mr. Reading could be here for the January 27th meeting. We need someone to answer these questions. Planner McKenzie noted that she will reach out to Mr. Reading and try to have that conversation ahead of the meeting. The whole project will be a negative fiscal impact for the Borough over time because of the size of the market units and it will generate a lot of school age children and a lot of costs and there is no way to recover that. Planner McKenzie added that it has to be sustainable for the Borough.

Sarah Scott asked about the calculation of sewer capacity. Mayor Myhre noted that we received a document late from former Mayor Sworen about sewer capacity and he would like it to be reviewed by the sewer operator and the consultant for the sewer plant. He is not sure about the numbers and thinks it should be vetted. Attorney DeSapio requested a copy of the document. Chairman Eckel asked if it could be vetted by the January 27th meeting. Mayor Myhre also stated that the financial impact study should also be reviewed by our professionals. Chairman Eckel noted that the study touches on the size of the different units, etc. She asked if they have the approximate square footage of the different units? Architect Lucas stated that he will prepare something and send it to the Board. Chairman Eckel stated that it would be helpful to have ranges such as the two bedrooms are here to here and the three and four bedrooms are from here to here. She also has questions on the demographics. There is a question about quoting the 2010 Census report in the 2nd to last paragraph at the bottom of page 14 where it says "the Borough of Frenchtown contained a total population of 1,373 persons of which 1,355 persons occupied 596 of the Town's 656 total housing units. She does not understand why that sentence is in there and she does not know why you would parse out what part of the population was living in what subset of the housing units without further defining them. If you do talk to Mr. Reading, we would like that to be addressed. She is also concerned that he was unable to find any comparable housing units anywhere in this geographic area to come up with an estimate of the number of students. From the beginning of this project, we have been adamant that what goes in there has to look like Frenchtown and look like western Hunterdon County. The fact that your expert can not find anything that vaguely resembles what you are proposing to put in anywhere near by and

had to rely on State figures has her concerned. Perhaps the expert can speak to that at the meeting on January 27th. Planner McKenzie stated that she has the figures of the number of students in her office. They did break out the number of school age children and high school students. The report was perfectly responsively done and the problem is that it perfectly pointed out that there will be problems down the road. Also, although it is customary in areas of the State where there are private schools that provide alternatives to use the public school portion of the school age children, in Frenchtown that does not work. Sarah Scott commented that there are students that attend Frenchtown by using the school choice program. So, they live outside of the Borough but attend Frenchtown school. She does not know if there are students that live in Frenchtown and go to school elsewhere. Planner McKenzie stated that we could find that out from the Board of Education. But, it is better to assume the students will attend Frenchtown School. It is more likely.

Jack Weeks asked how did you base your pricing of the units and rentals? Mr. Meiskin responded that the rentals are the affordable units. The limit is set by the County as to what you can charge. As for the sale price, it is looking at the market units and what it would bear based on the product. Jack Weeks commented that first time home buyers are children oriented. Chairman Eckel stated that they will need an extra bedroom. Planner McKenzie stated that is why they have the larger units. Referring to the pricing, Chairman Eckel commented that you can buy a house in Frenchtown with a yard and a place to put a grill and an alleyway that goes to your own private garage for less than you can buy a four bedroom piggy back unit. Mr. Meiskin responded that construction today costs more than houses back then. Cathy Suttle asked the developer how he thinks he will be able to sell these units? Mr. Meiskin responded that the numbers we put forth are reasonable. These are new homes and typically, buyers get what they want in new construction. People buying old homes may be putting money into it to fix it up and make it what they want.

Having no other comments or questions from the Board, Chairman Eckel stated that she hoped to get to the Board to discuss the bones of the basis for the Redevelopment plan relative to the memo our Attorney put together. Because of the hour and the number of people that came this evening, she thinks that the Board discussion will continue to the January 27th meeting. She will open the floor to the public and asked that they only comment on things that they have not commented on.

Planner McKenzie noted that she is looking for language from Engineer Clerico, Engineer Jahr and the consultant's report on the sewer capacity. It would be helpful before the Board goes through the issues of the Redevelopment Plan to know what the choices are for such things as setbacks, grading, pedestrian and traffic issues. It would also be useful to talk with the Mayor and Mr. Reading to find out how this will work for the Borough. We want to make sure we have all the information, before the Board discusses it.

Responding to Sarah Scott as to having a conversation on density, Planner McKenzie stated that she would like to have the context in types of units, setbacks, etc. which will effect everything you are talking about. Density matters but it is the issue of what is the number of units on this site and does it work or will it work if the units are smaller. It is an important issue. Planner McKenzie added that right now, she cannot make a recommendation. We are in the process of quantifying what kind of an impact this will have. When all the other impacts are factored in, it will help. Jack Weeks stated that we need clarification on some of the terminology such as the condos within a structure is not 130 townhouse units. It is 130 housing units with 62 buildings and some of the units are flats. Cathy Suttle expressed concern about other items on the agenda

for January 27th. She would like to have time to have discussions on the Redevelopment Plan. Secretary Shepherd noted that the Cretella application is the only other item. Attorney Hirsch stated that since Cretella was not deemed complete, the Board does not have to hold the public hearing on this application at the same meeting that completion is being determined.

Chairman Eckel opened the floor for public comments. She asked that we hear about things the Board has not heard before or from people the Board has not heard from before.

Liz Johnson of 19 Second Street commented that the traffic study did not address cues during rain and bad weather which changes the traffic pattern.

Brian Fleming of Twelfth Street commented that the fill of that property will create problems. In 1955, a third of that property flooded. By building up that site 5 feet, it is creating a dam and will push that water and spread it out further upstream. Chairman Eckel stated that the NJDEP would have to give them permission for the fill plan. Engineer Clerico noted that they have indicated that they have been to the DEP to establish the flood plain and limited fill on the property. It is under the jurisdiction of the DEP. Brian Fleming noted that you brought up about the stormwater management. The study you will get will be perfect but it will not show the scenario of leaves on the basin, snow, etc. If that road is 5 feet higher, the water will not go into the basins, it will run across the road into other people's driveways.

Glen Horvath of Cedar Street asked what happens to the traffic going into town that wants to go to Route 513, Route 29 or Route 12? We get a bottleneck there now. He would like to know the effects of the increase in traffic to the middle of town. Secondly, you are putting railings around these buildings. He hopes there will be a homeowner's association because if you look at some of the buildings on Milford Road, you see bicycles on the porch, rugs hanging over the porch and all kinds of litter that distracts from the building. Thirdly, what do we do with the school buses that are picking up the kids going to high school from those homes. Where will that happen? He asked the Board to consider the fact that there could be four kids in a three bedroom unit. Chairman Eckel noted that the school bus stops at every other street now.

Adam Blackburn of Third Street stated that this discussion is not about density and proving that it should be this many units. It is all about proving why it should match the rest of the town at 10 units per acres. Planner McKenzie noted that it will be part of the discussion and what this will look like. We want to understand all the impacts and address that in the discussion. Adam Blackburn asked how did we get to 111 units originally for this site. He understands that the Board never reach a consensus on that. Planner McKenzie affirmed that the Board did not reach a consensus on that. Adam Blackburn stated that he thinks that the Board should go back to the drawing board. Attorney Hirsch stated that the only guidance she would like to give on that point, is should the Board consider recommending 130 units for this Redevelopment Plan or some other number or density. Also, the comment implicates that the overlay zoning that has been in place for a few years should be reconsidered and that the Board should make a recommendation. The only point she wants to make to the Board on that is that what is in front of them right now is the Redevelopment Plan or some form of the Redevelopment Plan. If they want to include in their recommendations regarding the existing zoning. There is a whole process that the town would have to go through if there is a consensus that the overlay zoning is not appropriate for some reason. All the Board is doing on the Redevelopment Plan is making a recommendation, doing a preliminary review and passing on a recommendation with a record to the Council. At the Council level, if there is a Redevelopment Plan passed through, the Council will look at it, see if it is acceptable, introduce it and there will be a full ordinance process with a

public hearing. That is an official process. What we are doing now is not the official process. The public is getting two shots at it. If the Board wants to consider the overlay zoning, she would suggest you do that as a second part of this process because the Master Plan would have to be changed and then, you would have to decide about the existing ordinance and if you will leave the underlying zoning in place and the overlay zoning. It is complicated enough with the task that faces this Board in dealing with the Redevelopment Plan. Making a serious attempt to come up with standards that will be workable and represent the interest of the town is tough enough but if you reconsider the existing zoning, it will become even more difficult. She recommended separating the two out and if the Board feels that they need to make a recommendation on the existing zoning, do so but deal with this first.

Gideon Lenkey of Harrison Street commented that speaking of the Master Plan, he saw an aerial of what was proposed which got his ire up. He went to the Master Plan to see what was guiding this and he read in the front of the Master Plan the goals and objectives. Section 2 says to retain the attractive small town character of Frenchtown. This was done in 1994. They actually surveyed the town's people about what was important to them and at the top, above everything else, was to preserve the Borough's small town character and number 3 was preserve historic features and buildings. Later on, in 2005, the Board created the Village Center Plan and did a good job of defining that character of what that center should look like and then you filed it with the County and included a cover letter that says the purpose of this rehabilitation plan was to set forth standards that would support and maintain the historic nature of the Borough's Center Business District and serve as the basis for new zoning in the Borough. The new development in the downtown does not look alien or out of place. This new development is alien and out of place. It does not look like a place in the town. You talk about back yard and alleys. This does not look like Frenchtown. We do not have condos or stacked flat. There are ways to do it and maintain Frenchtown's character. We do not have rules like the Village Center Plan and we are counting on you to watch our backs.

Caroline Scutt of Ridge Road noted that she sat through many similar meeting when the development on Bridge Street was being discussed and what people were saying about that development is exactly what people are saying about this one. As far as a small town feel, if you look at our Census, there are about 150 people less than 20 years ago. Adding 200 people will not hurt the small town feel. That is a different thing then density in one area. Her comment is that we spent several hours talking about spindles and awnings, etc., and we should be talking about density and where that discussion should take place. Everyone here should be a part of that conversation. None of us agree 100% on what would be appropriate for that site but we are spending a lot of time and money, when we do not even have a context of what we would accept, what we may be legally forced to accept and what the community would like. It would be beneficial to all of us to understand what it is that we are talking about in density before we talk about spindles, colors, wrap around porches, water, etc. which are all important but if we do not know where we are starting from then are we wasting everyone's time here and will they get up and walk away and we will have all those plans sitting here with the other plans. That will not do this community any good.

Jim Meade of Harrison Street commented that his main concern is density, about the look and feels. When he looked at the aerial, it looks like barracks. That does not fit the character of the town. He agrees that density should be the top concern.

William Sullivan of Harrison Street and a member of the Council and Planning Board stated that he agrees that density is an issue but we need to consider what happens if we do not develop that

property. If you look at Milford and the paper mill and what it is now, we do not need this property to turn into a brownfield. We need to balance the character of Frenchtown. Mr. Lenkey noted that the State considers the western part of the property to be a brownfield.

Adam Blackburn added that it is vital that this property be redevelopment and that there be housing and affordable housing. He agrees with William Sullivan that it be developed the right way to make it part of Frenchtown.

Don Seigle of Everittstown Road noted that this property is in the National Historic District and asked if anyone on the Board got a hold of the Department about this property. When his wife and Ellen Russell got this district in the registry, the purpose was to keep the historic character. This is a mechanism not to stop development but to make it look like the rest of the district. Sarah Scott noted that she works for the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office which is the State's equivalent of the National Historic Preservation Office. The Frenchtown historic district is the majority of the town and is listed on the same National Register. However, being listed on the Register only protects historic districts from a public undertaking so whether property is municipally owned or work is being done with Federal, State, County or Local money, it is the only way you can regulate development in those districts unless you have a Local Historical Preservation Commission which Frenchtown does not have. If you or anyone else is interested in putting one of those together, she would be happy to be part of that conversation. The Municipal Land Use Law allows municipalities to regulate private property regarding historical structures. The State and Federal Government cannot regulate private property. The municipality can. Planner McKenzie stated that the last time this came up which was several years ago, the determination of the power to be in Frenchtown at that time, did not want to go that route because they did not want to control what people did with their properties. It is always a question to ask and to see if it is a good idea. The town felt that there was so much regulation coming from outside, they did not want to regulate more. Don Seigle stated that it was one of their concerns. They did not want to control the colors of people's houses such as paint colors. Sarah Scott noted that you can regulate certain things so if you want to regulate paint colors you can and if you do not, you do not. Planner McKenzie stated that it is a good question to keep looking at from a planning perspective. Don Seigle commented that he is more impressed with this meeting than previous ones. Planner McKenzie noted that the Board had more to work with this time.

Eric Ferrara of Sixth Street noted that he is concerned with the density and balance. Everyone wants to see this property developed. If it is done in balance, it is a good thing. An environmental impact should be addressed to make sure it does not adversely affect the environment of Frenchtown being that this development is right on the river and towpath. Chairman Eckel noted that when an applicant comes to the Board for a site plan approval, an environmental impact study is required.

Sky Van Saun of Eighth Street stated that she is where everyone else is. She thinks we need to do this but she is concerned with density. She is also concerned and wants to be assured that the committee is looking out for things such as the traffic light crossing and if there are repercussions from that. Can it become a regular traffic light? It did not come up about the bottom of Eighth Street and she was looking at one of the pictures and there was not a way to get to the end of Eighth Street to get on the towpath because it is all parking spaces. She does not know how the bottom of a public street can become a parking lot. Also, she is concerned with the elevations with the other houses on Eighth Street. She asked that the Board keep an open mind about the flavor of this town and what is positive to us. Planner McKenzie responded that

the pedestrian connection to the towpath is written in the draft and we expect that it will be a requirement. It is critical to the Board and has been from the beginning. As to the other points and balancing, we are here to try to achieve that but none of us know what the magic formula is. Chairman Eckel noted that one of the things we have talked about all along and even when another developer was here, was making sure that the entire property was porous. The development will be owned by a condo association but Ninth Street would have public access and will be porous. It will not be a gated community. The developer knows it will be a porous development and that access be maintained to the river. It will be written into the plan.

Charlie Lowe of Eighth Street stated that one of the justification for the high density was the cost of the clean up. Has the Board considered ways to lower the cost of the clean up with grants or other options? Planner McKenzie noted that she is not aware of it but she thinks we have to have that discussion with the developer to see if there are opportunities.

Glen Horvath asked what are the tax obligations and ramification with the taxes in this town? The taxes in this town are extremely high. The developer on Bridge Street is having problems selling the \$600,000.00 homes. Based on his home assessed at \$500,000.00, he is paying \$18,000.00 for taxes and sewer per year. We are retired and our income does not go up. Are their taxes going to be \$20,000.00 per year? Planner McKenzie responded that we have a lot of questions on the fiscal impact. Glen Horvath commented that he is being forced out of town because of the taxes and sewer and poor management of the town.

Having no other public comments, Chairman Eckel closed the public portion of the meeting.

Chairman Eckel noted that the Board will continue this to the January 27th meeting. She asked that the developer try to have someone here from Mr. Reading's office. The Board is hoping to get to the discussion on the Redevelopment Plan. Attorney DeSapio requested a copy of the memo from Attorney Hirsch for point of discussion for the Board. Attorney Hirsch stated that she will provide Attorney DeSapio with a copy.

William Sullivan, John DenBleyker and Rocco Musolino returned to the meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE, COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE REPORT AND OTHER RELATED ITEMS

Mayor Myhre noted that the Borough submitted a letter to the County of Hunterdon requesting that the passing lane on Route 513 be removed.

Chairman Eckel stated that she would like to propose that we start a small kitty fund so anyone who does not bring their Zoning book to the meeting will pay \$1.00 starting January 27th.

Chairman Eckel noted that the Board received correspondence from former Mayor Ron Sworen. Mayor Myhre recommended that this correspondence be verified.

Chairman Eckel noted that there is correspondence from the County that the County is waiving fees for County development applications to spur economic activity. It does not have implications for municipalities.

Chairman Eckel asked Planner McKenzie to provide the Board with an update on affordable housing situation. Planner McKenzie report that the Econsult report came out which said you do not have to do anything over what you have done. However, this is one report and there is a

report that scares us and another one that is in the middle. Judge Miller made it clear to the court appointed Master that he is concerned with the lower numbers from the Econsult report. The Judge is hiring his own Master on the numbers. The Master will likely be Rich Reading. She does not know what it means for Frenchtown. It is not as dire as she thought but she wants the Borough to be protected.

Jack Weeks asked if there is a time period on the Shale Cliff development. Planner McKenzie stated that she will reach out to Jonathon Perlstein. The approval may be extended by the Permit Extension Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Gerry Case moved adjournment at 10:59 PM, and Jack Weeks seconded. The motion passed on favorable voice vote.

Brenda S. Shepherd
Planning Board Secretary