

Frenchtown Planning Board
Regular Meeting
September 28, 2016
7:30 P.M.

Chairman Randi Eckel called the Regular 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.

ROLL CALL

Present:	Absent:
Case	Myhre
DenBleyker	Scott
Dougherty (Arrived at 8:10 pm)	
Dragt	
Eckel	
Musolino	
Sullivan	
Suttle	
Weeks	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting – July 27, 2016

Gerry Case moved to accept the minutes of the July 27, 2016 Regular meeting. Jack Weeks seconded the motion. The minutes of the July 27, 2016 Regular meeting were approved by favorable roll call vote with Rocco Musolino abstaining.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Eckel announced that before we start the public comment section, comments are welcomed on matters not listed on the agenda. Comments related to agenda items should be held until that specific item comes up on the agenda. Chairman Eckel opened the public comment session. Having No comments, Chairman Eckel closed the public comment session.

TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO THE 2012 LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT – BLOCK 59 LOT 7 & 7.01, 68 & 68A TRENTON AVENUE – HANLEY/CIPOLETTI

Attorney Hirsch noted that a minor subdivision was approved by the Board with two existing lots. The surveyor did not draw the line where they wanted it. They want a minor adjustment. Both property owners agreed to about a 700 square foot adjustment. Applicants Julie and Michael Hanley were sworn in by Guliet Hirsch. Julie Hanley testified that 4 years ago they bought the property behind their house with a lot line adjustment. The surveyor never put markers in. They had the closing and then the surveyor put a marker in. It was not where we wanted it. The property owner is selling the property and hired a new surveyor and the marker is not where it should have been. We are requesting a minor adjustment to the original lot line adjustment so that the line is where it should have been originally. Attorney Hirsch noted that

the Board received a letter from Valerie Cipoletti approving this change. The adjustment is less than 700 square feet to be included in Lot 7.01. This is a minor change. The Board will pass a resolution acknowledging the minor change. The applicant will need to file maps or deeds confirming the new boundaries of the lots. Engineer Clerico noted that the resolution should acknowledge the original lot line adjustment and the applicant will need to file a new deed of the 700 square feet from one party to the other and the new deeds should be filed for both lots. The surveyor can do the descriptions for the two separate triangular areas. Then deeds should be recorded to correct the original deeds to reflect what you now own. Attorney Hirsch noted that this should be done. Also, this will require a resolution and vote from the Board. Any Board approval will be subject to all conditions from the previous subdivision approval and conditions discussed tonight. The Board will memorialize the decision at the next Board meeting. On motion by William Sullivan, seconded by Cathy Suttle and carried by unanimous favorable roll call vote, the Planning Board approved the technical correction to the original lot line adjustment (subdivision) submitted by Julie and Michael Hanley with the consent of Valerie Cipolitti to change the division between Block 59 lot 7 & 7.01 as shown on the amended Minor Subdivision map for Block 59 lot 7 & 7.01 dated 8/1/16 prepared by RBZ Enterprises, Inc. subject to all previous terms and conditions and conditions discussed this evening.

INFORMAL CONCEPT REVIEW FOR “THE BARN” - PROPOSED WEDDING VENUE – BLOCK 15 LOT 1, 1210 MILFORD ROAD – BRENDAN STOKES

Chairman Eckel stepped down on this informal concept plan due to proximity. Vice Chairman DenBleyker took over chair of the meeting.

Attorney Hirsch gave legal direction to the Board on what the Board is dealing with here. She noted that anything the Board does is subject to State Law, the Municipal Land Use Law in place since 1976. When the Board reviews a Use Variance application which this might become, there are definitive procedural requirements and the Board acts in a quasi-judicial capacity. What that means is that the Board is effectively a judge and jury. There is a court and there is careful consideration of evidence and there is application law to that evidence. You hear from witnesses and decide their credibility. That is the role the Board plays. It is a serious and formal law particularly when you are dealing with a use variance. Under the Municipal Land Use Law, when a use variance is considered, the process that must be followed starts with public notice being given to all property owners within 200 feet at least 10 days prior to the public hearing. All people have the right to speak, they can produce witnesses, they can speak to an attorney. There is a whole process. The purpose of the process is to protect the property owners who are effected by the decision of the Board, particularly with a use variance when you are considering an application to do something that zoning does not permit. Also, under that process, the hearing process protects the applicant as well. The applicant wants all the procedures followed exactly the way they are required to be followed because there are cases which involve inadequate, improper notices, etc. of failure of the Board to do thing in open and at a public hearing and failure to follow procedure. Applicants have spent time and money in front of a Board, gotten an approval and someone challenges it and the court over rules the Board’s decision because of failure to follow procedures. It protects everyone involved in the process.

Attorney Hirsch added that there is not any short cut to the hearing process required by State statute that is permitted by Section 10.1 of the Municipal Land Use Law. The language states that at the request of the developer, the Planning Board, which you are a joint Board and Planning Board acting with the authority of a Zoning Board as well, shall grant an informal review of concept plan for a development for which a developer tends to prepare an application for development. Concept plan is the key language. You have the right to review the concept

which will evolve into a site plan or subdivision. You can do this for this applicant and any other applicant. When you review a site plan, you will see from the engineer and planner's that they are urging you to look at site plan aspects such as access, parking, sewage, hours of operation, noise, etc. all the things you consider when reviewing a site plan. That you can do. What you cannot do is give them any direction. You can get a preliminary discussion from them on what they intend to do by way of a use variance when they submit that application. That is not for discussion at this point. It would not be appropriate for the Board to consider that or give them a nod of the head. Applicants come to the Board with an informal to see if the Board is likely to say yes or no. Unfortunately, there is no short cut for that. They have to submit an application for use variance, there are statutory criteria that they have to prove, they have to produce witnesses and exhibits so that you can make an informed decision. That does not happen with an informal review.

Architect and Planner Michael Burns noted that he is here with the applicant Brendan Stokes who is also the chef and owner of Cooked to Order. He thanked the Board for allowing them to talk informally. He understands what the Board Attorney has pointed out.

Mr. Burns noted that the property is unusual and it has interesting environmentally sensitive issues. We would like to get any feedback we can on the general approach to the site plan. We did receive Engineer Clerico's memo. We understand that we have to deal with the engineering aspects of the site plan. Hopefully, we will get some direction on where to focus the application.

Mr. Burns added that we did submit along with the request for informal hearing, 2 sheets of drawings. Sheet 1 of 2 shows the zoning information. The property is 18 acres plus or minus up on the hill from Milford Road. The property is located in the R1 residential zone. On Sheet 2, there is a site plan showing the required setbacks for the R1 zone. There is an areal photograph of the site. The site is heavily wooded and has a significant slope from east to west most significantly on the western edge looking over Milford Road and particularly where the access come to the property. There is an existing residence on the site that is approximately 3,700 square feet. It is a raised ranch with one floor of living level and a garage and basement underneath. There are a few garage/sheds on the property. The house is located in the clearing on the site. Property is serviced by public water and there is a private well that serves the house presently. Our hope is to improve the access drive from Milford Road to the property and Mr. Stokes and his family would like to live on the site. Mr. Stokes would like to construct a new building on the southern end of the site, a 7,200 square foot barn type structure, to serve as a wedding venue and to the west a patio overlooking the field and a small free standing structure on the west for photos or exterior wedding venue. He will plant wild flowers on the open portion of the property. There will be parking along the extension of the entrance drive to accommodate 75 cars. We showed a conceptual plan of the building showing a lobby, bathrooms, a utility space and a catering kitchen with the idea not to have a full working kitchen. We also show an access road to that portion of the building to accommodate deliveries and removal of trash. Mr. Brendan Stokes can speak to the anticipated number of times the building will be used, number of people, etc.

Responding to Vice-Chairman John DenBleyker, Mr. Burns noted that they received a copy of Planner McKenzie's memo dated 9/19/16. Vice-Chairman John DenBleyker noted that Planner McKenzie encouraged the applicant to present the concept plan which you just did and to talk about specific issues such as ingress and egress with the steep driveway, service vehicles, emergency vehicle,, noise control measures, frequency and duration, etc. He asked that they go through the list and address some of the issues.

Mr. Burns stated that the plan is to use the current access road, which needs improvements. It is hard to determine how much improvement will be required because we will need to do a topographic survey with the idea to improve that in order to get emergency vehicles and guest to the facility. The parking area is in front of the building with a road extended to the back of the building and there will be a place in the front of the building for drop off and pick up which will be adjacent to the building and will be screened with landscaping. There is a service drive that will run to the back of the building for catering, deliveries, recycling, trash, etc. We are contemplating minimal improvements as we can to accomplish this. One of the reasons the building and parking is located where it is is so that we do not have to disturb any substantial trees that exist. As he indicated previously, we would also like to introduce a wild flower meadow in the open area. In terms of noise control measures, wedding venues tend to produce music. During the design of the building, we will accommodate that. It is early to demonstrate that. In terms of frequency and duration, Mr. Stokes will speak to that.

Mr. Stokes stated that he intends to have music inside the venue. We may use the outside patio with a tent and may have music playing across there. The music will end by 9:30 pm. There will be an inside pub. He intends to have a fully air conditioned unit for inside weddings. He would like to see one wedding per week on Saturdays preferably. There will be one set of traffic coming in and one set of traffic leaving at night. It will not be all day long. He anticipates approximately 250 people. He caters to many venues in this area and generally people will be shuttled in from hotels and these venues do not have more than 50 or 60 parking spots. Staffing is only one day a week with 20 or 25 staffers for one day and minimal the rest of the week. Mr. Burns noted that we have not considered lighting yet. The property offers an unique opportunity to accomplish what we would like in a way that has minimal impact. We will prove necessary lighting levels and with all lighting footprints on the property. In terms of potential impact on the neighbors, Mr. Stokes noted that traffic will be one time in and one time on the way out. There are no provisions for housing people on the site. These guests may stay overnight in the Borough so it could have a positive impact on the Borough.

Attorney Hirsch asked if weddings would be the only type of special event or would other be considered? Mr. Stokes noted that the predominant use would be weddings but he may also consider other special events such as Barmitzfas, etc. He may consider meetings during the day but it is a large facility. Jack Weeks asked where 25 staff members would park? Mr. Burns responded that the parking requirements will be based on the ordinance requirements. Those requirements usually anticipate staff parking. Attorney Hirsch asked Mr. Burns if he knew which type of use this would be considered? Mr. Burns noted that he did not find it in the ordinance but the parking standards to include assembly halls, dance halls and community halls. Mr. Stokes added that generally, wherever the food is coming from, we car pull and will have a truck. We may have 5 vehicles. We would gather at the place where food is prepared. Mr. Burns noted that we suggested 75 parking spaces but we are not limited to that. We could extend or expand.

Mr. Burns noted that there is sewer to the property but no public water. Mr. Stokes added that he would look to extend public water and natural gas to the property. Both are available from Milford Road.

Attorney Hirsch asked what the environmental constraints are on the property? Mr. Burns noted that forest is one but there is also a reasonable slope from east to west. It is hard to determine how it fits in with the steep slope ordinance without a topographical survey. He does not think it will be an issue where the construction is proposed. We will address it once we get to that point.

There is an issue with the access because it is an extreme slope. This property is an ideal location because it is a wonderful piece of property from an environmental point of view and does have farmland assessment. We would like to keep the disturbance to a minimum. The neighbors are far away. Mr. Burns asked Engineer Clerico to review his comments.

Engineer Clerico noted that irrespective of what gets built on this property, he outlined a number of things that came to mind. There is no formal plan to review. They will exceed the threshold for a major project and will need to deal with stormwater management. They will need to watch because of the slope conditions and cliff conditions to Milford Road that they are not concentrating water because there could be erosive and they have to look at the amount of water on the property and how the water is leaving the property, preferably not leaving the property concentrated. Looking at the topographics, is there viable access to accommodate whatever is being proposed as well as access for emergency services? There are also normal site plan standards including landscaping and lighting that they will need to address. We will need a detailed survey of the tract and topographical features. He attached a google map of the property with the boundaries. Site disturbance and grading will need to be addressed. It appears that this venue would be in the woods although Mr. Burns indicated that they want to keep everything in the open field. Sewer service may not be adequate. Water pressure may be an issue as well as the utilities. He added that he did not mention it in his comments but the driveway comes down onto a paper street. William Sullivan noted that there was discussion at one of the Council meetings in reference to the right of way with the owner at the bottom of the road. Engineer Clerico stated that he does not know what that means for an application. The curb is the limit of the Borough road. A survey will reveal the right of way. There is a lot of erosion on the existing ditches. A lot of water comes down that hill and stormwater will be an issue.

Attorney Hirsch recommended that an Attorney look at this access issue because if you do not have definitive access or cannot define the nature of the access, it will be a severe problem with a use variance application.

Architect Burns stated that the Borough's Master Plan talks about this property as a property that you would prefer to not be developed in a significant way. This proposal would not over use the property. He asked the Board for any opinion on the nature of the use. Attorney Hirsch asked the Board members not to respond.

Responding to Jack Weeks, Mr. Burns stated that they would prefer not to pave the parking in an effort to minimize the impact. The entrance would be paved but the parking would be crushed stone.

Having no other questions from the Board, Vice-Chairman DenBleyker thanked the applicant and noted that the Board has given the applicant as much as it can.

Chairman Eckel returned to the meeting.

PROVISIONAL USE REQUEST – BLOCK 59 LOT 4, 62A TRENTON AVENUE – ART YARD, INC.

Attorney Mongelli noted that he is here this evening on behalf of ArtYard and added that Jill McDonald, Geraldine Dougherty and Architect Michael Burns are present this evening. Attorney Mongelli thanked the Board for getting us on the agenda quickly. He will let the Board know what we have done, where we are at and where we are going. We came to the Board for Preliminary Site Plan approval and a Use Variance approval. We had a tight time line to close

on this and obtain the Preliminary Site Plan approval and Use Variance approval to make sure we could do what we wanted to do in order to close on the property and then, we would come back with the valet parking plan which would be infrequently used, the architectural design and landscaping. We closed at the end of June after the time period expired for an appeal. Since that time, we began the process of thinking about the final site plan and all the things that ArtYard wants to accomplish with the project. When you deal with the NJDEP, it is complicated and lengthy. That is what we are dealing with now. It will probably be 18 to 24 months until we come back for Final Site Plan approval. We have been confronted with the question of do we want this property to sit for 18 to 24 months getting to the final vision. That is what brings us here tonight. The idea is what can we do in the interim period to introduce ArtYard and what are our options. Attorney Mongelli noted that in reviewing the resolution of approval, it is clear that we are not permitted to do construction. Short of that, the Board has approved our uses of gallery, art gallery, studio space, etc. Attorney Hirsch discussed this with him. What are our rights in occupying the space between now and final Site Plan approval? His view is with the appropriate Certificate of Occupancy, we could do some functions and have occupancy of the space consistent with the resolution. We can do some uses approved in the resolution, if a Certificate of Occupancy is issued for compliance with the fire code and all the other regulations. In getting a Certificate of Occupancy, the Zoning officer is concerned that we do not have Final Site Plan approval. If we are entitled to the Certificate of Occupancy, the building inspector can do the inspections. We think the Board can recommend that it would be an appropriate interim step. Our plans are not grandiose in the interim. There will be no construction. It is a small step to roll out the concept of ArtYard. The concern that Attorney Hirsch had was that we did not notice the public. We only called eight days ago to be placed on the agenda so there was not enough time to notice. Attorney Hirsch raised a concern that an amendment or modification would require a public notice. We are not asking for the Board to change anything. The Board approved the uses. We just need a Certificate of Occupancy. The architectural details, the landscape design and valet parking plan for Final Site Plan are still needed. There is no impact on what we are suggesting. He wanted to present the concept. He knows that Attorney Hirsch has different provisions. We need to use the space.

Attorney Hirsch stated that she does not think there is any problem with presenting to the Board your concept of staging in the use. It is not something you originally anticipated when you were in front of the Board for your Preliminary Site Plan and Use Variance. You can come back to the Board for the reasons you are telling us about with the NJDEP. The problem she has is that Section 12 of the Municipal Land Use Law tells you when you have to give public notice. One of the times you have to absolutely give public notice is for modification or elimination of a significant condition or conditions memorialized in the resolution and where notice was required in the original application. The original application did require notice the first time. In looking at the conditions in the approval, she does agree that one of the conditions does preclude construction until Final Site Plan. There are also other conditions that are required to be done at the time of Final Site Plan. Condition 7 states that the Applicant shall provide at the time of submission of the final site plan application, sufficient details concerning the valet parking operation to allow confirmation by the Board that adequate parking will be provided for all proposed uses, subject to the conditions imposed herein. Additionally, the Applicant shall provide sufficient detail to assure the Board Engineer that the parking arrangement on site will allow safe maneuvering within aisles on the site and that emergency vehicles can access the building and maneuver within the site. Item 8 requires that the applicant provide any missing fencing or landscaping required pursuant to the Two Buttons approval. Item 9 requires the Applicant to show on the Final Site Plans, installation at its own cost of a sidewalk on the adjacent property, known as Block 59, Lot 3, within the road right of way or within a private

easement area if an easement can be worked out with this property owner. Item 10 requires the Applicant to provide additional details concerning traffic and noise impacts, if any, at the time of submission of final site plan application. Items 11 requires the Applicant to provide confirmation of the flood hazard elevation on the Subject Property at the time of submission of final site plan application. Items 12 requires the Applicant to provide a review letter from the Fire Department at the time of submission of the final site plan application.

Attorney Hirsch noted that there are a series of conditions generated by the understanding reached between the Board and Applicant at the time of Preliminary that certain things would be delayed until Final Site Plan approval. Depending on what you are proposing to do in the interim, maybe things are not need right now. To change those conditions requires public notice. If it was a minor change, the Board could consider it. Her advise to the Applicant is that the Board could hear the concept once you provide public notice. She does not recommend that this go forward without public notice. It is the applicant's responsibility and it is their jeopardy if they do not provide public notice but it is the Board's obligation to make sure that we have jurisdiction over an application. The Municipal Land Use Ordinance says if you are going to modify a substantial condition that you need to provide public notice. You can provide an informal concept plan. If you are in a hurry, the Board could hold a special meeting. She asked if the Applicant would like to talk about the interim use.

Engineer Clerico asked what DEP permits does the applicant need for the project? Attorney Mongelli stated that there are additional properties that the applicant has purchased. Jill McDonald noted that they have also purchased the hatchery property and the Herb property on Trenton Avenue. The big plan is that 62A Trenton Avenue will be for performance and films. The hatchery will be the art installation space. Attorney Hirsch noted that those additional properties were not part of the original application. Therefore, you will need to submit a Use Variance and Site Plan Application for those purposes. Engineer Clerico noted that there is nothing on your approved plan that requires DEP approval. Jill McDonald responded that we are not asking for anything else until we figure out the grand plan and get DEP approval for the hatchery, what it will cost, how much we will be required to lift the building and how that impacts the design of the theatre and whether it requires us to lift up any part of the theatre at 62A Trenton Avenue. We have a preliminary meeting with the DEP on October 18th. It will be a good 2 years before we have a finished theatre at 62A Trenton Avenue. We would love to use the building to screen documentaries, have poetry readings and bring in filmmakers. We currently have an art installation. We were hoping to screen a documentary on October 22nd. It would be such a shame for the town and us to wait two years to get started. We wanted clarification that it is okay to do what we are planning and to have time to plan properly. We are trying to keep ArtYard alive. It will take a lot of time and a lot of money. Attorney Mongelli noted that the issue is the other properties and the ability to use them which delays the theatre. Engineer Clerico noted that there is nothing on the plan that requires DEP approval for 62A Trenton Avenue. If there is something in your use of the theatre based on DEP flood regulations, you cannot do that until you address those particular issues. There was very little you were proposing as far as improvements. There was no lighting and landscaping plan, etc. which are not DEP issues. Architect Burns noted that depending on how the issues are resolved on the other properties, it may have an impact on how we use this property. Chairman Eckel noted that they are trying to use both this property and the hatchery and depending on what they can do with the hatchery may affect the interior design of 62A Trenton Avenue. Cathy Suttle noted that it is creating a delay of the final site plan for 62A Trenton Avenue. Jill McDonald noted that in the back of the theatre, there are bad site lines because the central beam cuts through the center of the building in such a way that we would have to have a small screen and small rise. We do

not have clarity yet if we need to move that area into another portion of the building. There are a lot of things that we would like to do without making alterations to the building. We are looking at other scenarios. We are not doing anything that Two Buttons was not doing. Attorney Hirsch stated that under the resolution, the Two Buttons use variance was terminated.

Engineer Clerico asked if the interim use of the building is different from what was approved? Attorney Mongelli responded in the negative. Engineer Clerico recommended that the applicant come in with a Phase I Final Site Plan application proposing those elements of the building based on the use you have approval for and whatever site improvements you are proposing. They originally did not phase the project. There is nothing that precludes you from changing a Phase I approval in the future. You could address the landscaping and lighting as part of Phase I.

Attorney Hirsch responded that Engineer Clerico's suggestion is the simplest way to proceed. And, if you cannot do the landscaping, etc. now, let us know that. Tell us what part of the building you will be using and the parking needs for those uses. It should not be a major redo of the current plans. Engineer Clerico added that there are provisions to allow you to bond certain aspects in order to obtain a temporary occupancy permit.

Responding to William Sullivan in reference to the October 22nd proposal, Chairman Eckel noted that various business groups in town have asked Council for permission to hold special events. Perhaps you can request a special events permit from Council for the October 22nd event. William Sullivan stated that there is a Council meeting on October 5th. Brenda Shepherd stated that if the applicant could get the request to the Borough by Friday, it can appear on the Council agenda for October 5th. William Sullivan recommended that the applicant contact the Mayor and Council about the request.

Chairman Eckel commented that in the near future, we will see the applicant for staging of the project. Attorney Hirsch noted that the application would be a Final Site Plan application for Phase I along with requests for revision or abandonment of preliminary conditions until Final Site Plan. Responding to Engineer Clerico, Attorney Mongelli noted that there are no construction code issues involved for the proposed interim uses.

Jack Weeks asked if the current bathroom situation would be able to accommodate what you are proposing? Architect Burns responded that the number of bathrooms in the building is adequate to accommodate what we are proposing in the plan. It is sufficient to accommodate what we proposed in the original plan. We are proposing new bathrooms because they would be more adjacent to the theatre space. The level of occupancy was 110 based on the code allowable for the size of the space and based on the exits and plumbing fixtures, etc.

Responding to John Dougherty as to fire safety issues for the event on October 22nd, Architect Michael Burns stated that the fire department's review letter focused on the valet parking. Most of their concerns do not apply to what we are proposing in the interim. The fire safety in the building is adequate for what we are proposing.

Chairman Eckel noted that she believes the Board has given the applicant guidance to move forward. Attorney Mongelli agreed and thanked the Board.

VOUCHERS

Brenda Shepherd, Board Secretary, presented the following vouchers for approval:

VOUCHER LIST 9/28/16

Archer & Greiner	Professional Services for General Representation through 7/31/16	\$ 400.00
Elizabeth McKenzie	Professional Services for General Representation through 7/31/16	\$ 218.75
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for General Representation through 06/30/16	\$ 255.00
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Declaratory Judgement through 7/31/16	\$ 555.00
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Declaratory Judgment through 8/31/16	\$ 555.44
Elizabeth McKenzie	Professional Services for Affordable Housing Representation through 8/31/16	\$ 87.50

ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 34 LOT 1 – Michael Inspection Escrow

Van Cleef Engineering	Professional Services for Michael through 5/31/16	\$ 120.00
-----------------------	---	-----------

ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 34 LOT 1 – Michael Escrow

Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael through 5/31/16	\$ 2,080.42
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael through 04/30/16	\$ 705.00
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael through 06/30/16	\$ 32.86
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael through 7/31/16	\$ 30.00
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael through 8/31/16	\$210.00
Van Cleef Engineering	Professional Services for Michael through 8/31/16	\$903.75

ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 59 LOT 4 – ArtYard

Elizabeth McKenzie	Professional Services for Art Yard through 7/31/16	\$ 131.25
--------------------	--	-----------

ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 34 LOT 1 – Michael Pilot Escrow

Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael Pilot through 7/31/16	\$ 45.00
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael Pilot through 8/31/16	\$905.00

On motion by Jack Weeks, seconded by Gerry Caset, and carried by unanimous favorable roll call vote, the Planning Board approved payment of the above bills list.

CORRESPONDENCE, COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE REPORT AND OTHER RELATED ITEMS

Chairman Eckel noted that the Sign Advisory Committee that involves Council, Planning Board and the Frenchtown Business and Professional Association still has not met. We are waiting on the appointment from the Business and Professional Association. There will be an extension of the 60 days report requirement at the next Council meeting since the committee has not been complete created yet. Cathy Suttle stated that she understands that the Frenchtown Business Association has joined to become part of the Lambertville Rivertown Committee. She asked if we should get some input from that committee. Jack Weeks stated that the Business Association partnered with the Lambertville group to encompass the river towns and how they could promote everyone as opposed to singularly but every town still has their own Business Association. Chairman Eckel noted that Sarah Scott participated in a workshop about sign ordinances and has provided her with a smart drive full of sign documents. Once all the members are named, the Committee will move forward.

Chairman Eckel noted that in reference to an Affordable housing update, she had a conversation with Planner McKenzie and we still do not know what Frenchtown’s numbers will be. William Sullivan noted that the Council did decide to put up additional money to join the second round of litigation.

Rocco Musolino noted that the Environmental Commission is doing an ERI Inventory. He asked when the Master Plan was last updated because it has to be included. Chairman Eckel stated that the Master Plan was last updated in 2009 and is updated every ten years. Rocco Musolino noted that the town received a grant and funding to do the ERI Inventory.

ADJOURNMENT

Gerry Case moved adjournment at 9:04 pm, and William Sullivan seconded. The motion passed on favorable voice vote.

Brenda S. Shepherd
Planning Board Secretary