

Frenchtown Planning Board  
Regular Meeting  
October 26, 2016  
7:30 P.M.

Vice-Chairman John DenBleyker 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	Dougherty
DenBleyker	Eckel
Dragt	Scott
Myhre	Weeks
Musolino	
Sullivan	
Suttle	

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Regular Meeting – September 28, 2016**

Gerry Case moved to accept the minutes of the September 28, 2016 Regular meeting. Gordon Dragt seconded the motion. The minutes of the September 28, 2016 Regular meeting were approved by favorable roll call vote with Brad Myhre abstaining.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Vice-Chairman DenBleyker 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. Vice-Chairman DenBleyker opened the public comment session. Having no comments, Vice-Chairman DenBleyker closed the public comment session.

**MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTION - CORRECTION OF MINOR SUBDIVISION/LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT APPROVAL – BLOCK 59 LOT 7 & 7.01, 68 & 68A TRENTON AVENUE – HANLEY/CIPOLETTI**

On motion by Gordon Dragt, seconded by William Sullivan and carried by unanimous favorable roll call vote, the Planning Board approved Memorializing Resolution #2016-15 as follows:

**FRENCHTOWN BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD**  
**RESOLUTION NO. 2016-15**  
**VALERIE D. CIPOLETTI, MICHAEL T. HANLEY**  
**AND JULIE K. HANLEY**  
**BLOCK 59, LOTS 7 AND 7.01**  
**CORRECTION OF MINOR SUBDIVISION/LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT APPROVAL**

**WHEREAS**, Valerie D. Cipoletti is the owner of certain property known as Block 59, Lot 7 and Michael T. Hanley and Julie K. Hanley are the owners of adjacent property known as Block 59, Lot 7.01, both lots located in the Borough of Frenchtown (the “Subject Property”); and

**WHEREAS**, in May, 2012, Valerie D. Cipoletti and Michael T. and Julie K. Hanley submitted an application to the Frenchtown Borough Planning Board (the “Board”) proposing a minor subdivision/lot line adjustment of Lots 7 and 7.01, which subdivision did not require any variances; and

**WHEREAS**, by Resolution No. 2012-12, the Board memorialized its decision to approve the application for minor subdivision/lot line adjustment submitted by Valerie Cipoletti and Michael and Julie Hanley; and

**WHEREAS**, by letter dated September 6, 2016, Julie and Michael Hanley requested that the Board approve a minor correction of the lot line adjustment approved by Resolution 2012-12, said correction involving the transfer of approximately .016 of an acre, or about 700 sq. feet, from Lot 7 owned by Valerie Cipoletti to Lot 7.01 owned by Julie and Michael Hanley; and

**WHEREAS**, the application documents in support of the request for minor correction included a plan entitled “Amended Minor Subdivision for Block 59, Lot 7 and 7.01,” prepared By Nicholas Lebo, N.J.P.L.S., of RBZ Enterprises, Inc., and dated August 1, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, Valerie Cipoletti, the owner of Lot 7, submitted a letter dated September 11, 2016 consenting to the requested correction of the minor subdivision; and

**WHEREAS**, Julie Hanley appeared at the Board meeting held on September 28, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board, after considering the application, documents, testimony and exhibits referenced above and giving appropriate weight to them, makes the following factual findings and conclusions of law:

A. **Factual Findings**

1. The application requests the correction of the minor subdivision/lot line adjustment approved via Resolution 2012-12, said correction proposing a transfer of .016 acres from Lot 7 to Lot 7.01.

2. No variances or subdivision exceptions were required in connection with this minor correction to lot line adjustment.

3. Both properties are located in the R-2 Zone, and after the lot line adjustment, each lot will contain more than the 15,000 square foot minimum lot required in the R-2 Zone.

4. Lot 7 has two existing legal nonconforming conditions, that is, lot frontage of 98.61 feet where a minimum 100 foot frontage is required and an accessory building closer to the lot line than the 10 foot side yard setback requirement. Neither non-conformity would be exacerbated by the proposed correction of minor subdivision.

**B. Conclusions of Law**

The Board concludes that the proposed correction of the lot line adjustment memorialized in Resolution 2012-12 will result in a de minimus change in the distribution of lot area between Lot 7 and Lot 7.01 and a lot area distribution which will be consistent with the rest of the properties which exist in this tax block. The Board also finds that the legal nonconforming and pre-existing conditions affecting lot 7 will not be exacerbated by the proposed lot line adjustment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Frenchtown Borough Planning Board by motion duly made and seconded on September 28, 2016, that the application for minor correction of the minor subdivision/lot line adjustment submitted by Julie K. Hanley and Michael T. Hanley, is hereby approved subject to compliance with the following conditions:

1. The boundaries of Lots 7 and 7.01 shall be as shown on the Amended Minor Subdivision plan prepared by Nicholas Lebo and dated 8/1/16.

2. The Applicant shall supply proof that the additional five foot wide right-of-way dedication along Trenton Avenue to Hunterdon County has been recorded.

3. The subdivision deeds shall be reviewed and approved by the Board Attorney and Board Engineer prior to recording.

4. The subdivision deed for Lot 7 shall reference the existing public drainage rights along the northerly property line consistent with the subdivision merger plan by Stanley Norkevich for the application approved under Resolution No. 2012-12.

5. The Applicant should obtain written confirmation from the Tax Assessor of the lot number designation prior to recording the subdivision deeds.

6. The Applicant shall replenish the Planning Board escrow account upon request, if necessary, as required by the executed Escrow Agreement.

C. **Voting Record**

On September 28, 2016, a motion to grant the requested correction of minor subdivision/lot line adjustment received the following vote:

Those in favor: Case, DenBleyker, Dragt, Eckel, Mussolino, Sullivan, Suttle and Weeks

Those opposed: None

Recused:

The above memorializing resolution was adopted on October 26, 2016 by the following Board Members eligible to vote:

MEMBER	YES	NO
Case	X	
DenBleyker	X	
Dragt	X	
Musloino	X	
Sullivan	X	
Suttle	X	

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brenda S. Shepherd, Board Secretary

**FINAL SITE PLAN APPLICATION, STAGE I - BLOCK 59 LOT 4, 62A TRENTON AVENUE – ART YARD, INC. (COMPLETENESS REVIEW)**

Attorney Mongelli representing the applicant noted that present this evening is Architect and Planner Michael Burns, Jill McDonald and Geraldine Dougherty.

Vice-Chairman John DenBleyker noted that the Board has a review letter from Board Engineer Robert Clerico wherein there are a lot of items that are deemed “not complete”. He asked Engineer Clerico to review the items.

Board Engineer Clerico noted that the Board acted on a Preliminary Site Plan in February. There were a number of conditions proposed. There were a lot of open items the applicant needed to resolve before they came back for Final Site Plan. The applicant came last month with the a request to utilize the back portion of the building for a use somewhat consistent with the preliminary approval but they had not yet met the conditions of the preliminary approval. As a direction to the applicant, the applicant was told to come back sectionalizing the project. He asked the applicant last month if what they were doing was consistent with the preliminary plan. They responded that it was. They were going to come back with an amended Preliminary Site Plan application and a Final Site Plan, Phase 1, addressing the components of the building they were looking to utilize and addressing conditions that they could from the preliminary approval. They filed a Final Site Plan application for Phase 1 which is a new set of drawings, three sheets detailing how they want to use the building which is slightly different from what was approved in February. In the applicant's opinion, one of the uses rose to the level of requiring a use variance. They are holding off on Phase 2 which is the theatre as they explained last month. They do not have to do anything with the building to accommodate this new proposal. The Board cannot act on a Final Site Plan that is not consistent with the Preliminary approval and the Board cannot act on a Final where an applicant cannot address the conditions of the Preliminary unless the Board acts to amend the conditions.

Engineer Clerico noted that the Board has an application for Final Site Plan with different uses in the remaining element of the building different from the approvals from February. Some of the uses have different parking requirements. The applicant will have to explain that but we are not discussing the merits of the application tonight. We can see if we can give the applicant direction to go forward.

Attorney Mongelli stated that they would like the Board to determine completeness so that they can come back to the next meeting for a public hearing on the Final Site Plan, Phase 1. They are prepared to walk through Engineer Clerico's memo and are asking for waivers on applicable conditions but they have a different take on some of the things mentioned earlier.

In discussing the proposed uses, Attorney Mongelli noted that he and Architect Michael Burns believed they may need a second use variance for the screening which is out of an abundance of caution. We do not think there is a change in use for the screening. The screening facility is part of the larger theater use which was already approved in the Preliminary Site Plan. We do not think we are changing any use. We laid out the proposed interim uses on the Final Site Plan, page 2, so that we can begin use of some of the facility while we make our final plans. There is a lot of work going on behind the scene with lots of experts and the NJDEP to get to the final plan. He would like to slowly introduce the community to the bigger picture. We came to the Council to get a special permit for a one time event. This proposal will allow us to do some things until we get to the big picture, the final site plan. We will walk you through all of Engineer's comments but a lot of them will be implemented down the road such as the valet parking for the theater. We will have to have a master plan for the parking for the theater as the Board wants more details. We are not contemplating that now and Architect Burns will walk you through the plan for adequate parking for the uses proposed in this Final Site Plan.

Attorney Mongelli asked to go through Planner McKenzie's memo first. Engineer Clerico stated that we are not talking about the merits of the application. It is the procedure we are addressing this evening. We can give the applicant direction to go forward. Currently, we have a preliminary approval with conditions. The applicant needs to put the Final Site Plan proposal on

an amended Preliminary Site Plan and show the phases of the project. It is simple. The theater would be Phase 2 and everything else would be Phase I. As part of the amended Preliminary Site Plan approval, the applicant can ask the Board to defer the sidewalk and lighting, etc. to Phase 2. Put on paper as part of your amended Preliminary Site Plan what you want to do. The Final Site Plan is further details of your preliminary. When we deal with this in a hearing, we would be considering your request to amend the preliminary and the Final Site Plan, Phase 1. In your previous application, the theater is what triggered the valet parking. The Board has to consider if anything in Phase I would trigger valet parking. That is what you would be presenting and the Board would have to take into consideration your requests and could amend prior requirements or not. The Board could require details on conditions or require additional conditions for the Final. There were recommendations from the Fire Company in reference to water and fire protection improvements. Fire Captain Michael Atheras indicated that they may not necessarily be required. You can get input from the Fire Company so that the Board can determine if anything in the Fire Company's recommendation has to be part of Phase 2 or if it can be part of Phase 2. The Board has to sort through the merits of what you are proposing. If you do not think you need a variance, let us know because a lot of the items in the completion review are from the checklist for a variance. We can only review what is before us. It is not that complicated. Sometime in the future when you come back for the theater, you may want to change around what you are now showing as Phase II. At that point, you may again have to amend your preliminary so the Board can consider it at that time. We cannot have multiple approvals approved under different plans. .

Attorney Mongelli noted that he does not think that they need the variance application because the screening fits in the approval that does not go outside the scope of what was approved. We can withdraw that application. We are asking the Board to look at the approval and give us a Final Site Plan approval for Phase 1. The building is not changing. He believes that we satisfied some of the conditions and are asking for waiver on others.

Vice-Chairman DenBleyker noted that this has to be handled as an amended Preliminary Site Plan and Phase I, Final site Plan. Engineer Clerico noted that he spoke at length with Attorney Hirsch and Planner McKenzie and we are all in agreement that this has to be an amended Preliminary Site Plan and Final Site Plan, Phase 1. You go back to the original set of plans and amend them with what you are proposing now. The only thing he sees on the plans with details is the number of signs and you are asking for variances for the signs. There are details on this new set of drawings that were not part of the preliminary plan. You can leave it as part of the final or incorporate them back into the preliminary. When this gets approved, this is your Final approval for Phase 1 and the amended preliminary plans. At the hearing, you can go through the conditions.

Responding to Cathy Suttle, Engineer Clerico noted that a lot of the items in his memo are from the Use Variance checklist. You cannot determine if the use variance is required this evening. In Planner McKenzie's memo, she indicates that the use variance has to be presented and the Board will consider if it is a use variance or not. We are not in a position to hear testimony tonight.

Responding to Engineer Clerico, Attorney Mongelli stated that if the Board approves the Final, Phase 1, the Board can require as a condition of approval that an amended Preliminary Site Plan be submitted. All we did was take what you approved and showed within the building what we are proposing. We have provided the parking calculations on what we are proposing. He had a chance to speak with Attorney Hirsch and she was not aware that we had all the parking

calculations on this proposal. Engineer Clerico responded that the applicant does not have all the parking calculations on the plan because the theater is not on the plans. We are dealing with procedural issues. You had all the uses on the preliminary site plan and you are mixing up uses which is different. If you were dealing with this as an amended preliminary, you would be looking at the big picture with all the uses. The Board could decide that you are ending up at the same place and the only thing that drives valet parking is the theater. At the hearing, you can go through the conditions and as part of the amended request, it may be decided that a particular condition such as water and fire suppression is not needed. The fire company letter which is not dated and the only one we have, says additional water service into the building and a fire hydrants on the site is needed as well as other things. The Board needs to consider all the uses as an amended application. Vice-Chairman DenBleyker recommended that the Board consider completeness at the next meeting and also hold the public hearing the same night. Engineer Clerico noted that the amended plan has to be submitted by next Friday for the November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting..

Mayor Myhre asked the applicant if there are additional events the applicant wants to run prior to a Final approval? Jill McDonald stated that there is a screening that she would like to schedule and a gallery opening. Mayor Myhre stated that the Council can work with the applicant on additional events until a final approval is given. There is a Council meeting next Wednesday and the Council is willing to work with you on that until the planning board process is complete. Vice-Chairman DenBleyker added that there is also a willingness from this Board to work with you to do completeness and a public hearing at the same meeting so you do not lose a month but you need to amend the preliminary site plan application showing the phasing and take away the use variance if you do not need it. Engineer Clerico also noted that the applicant cannot have overlays where the preliminary says you are doing this and the final says you are doing that in the same part of the building. If it will change in the final phase and it effects parking, you can seek further amendments to the preliminary approval. This plan is different from what was approved in the preliminary. If you are not ready for such things as lighting, make the request as part of the preliminary that it will be addressed in the final phase. What deferrals you are asking for have to be clear. You can make that clear in the presentation and your justification. Attorney Mongelli stated that the conditions were addressed on the final site plan. Engineer Clerico noted that if you are requesting to defer conditions, list them as part of your phasing. You do not have to put it on the plan, you can ask for an amendment to the resolution and you have to make it clear in the presentation. Engineer Clerico added that in his memo, he provided his opinion as to whether the conditions were addressed or not. Vice-Chairman DenBleyker stated that what we do not have is your request to phase the project as part of the preliminary site plan. Architect Burns ask if you can cross reference the two sets of drawings in a way so it is essentially one set of plans. Engineer Clerico stated that what you have on your final has to be incorporated on your preliminary and look at parking, etc. and when you come back, conditions can be addressed. The conditions on the sewer were addressed but you did not address the fire company issues. Architect Burns stated that the only thing not address for the fire company is the fire hydrants. His reading of the fire codes is that as long as there is a fire hydrant within 400 feet of the site, that is an acceptable condition. There is one across the street. Engineer Clerico responded that you have to address that with the fire company. Responding to GordonDragt, Engineer Clerico noted that he film screening and the theater are different spaces. It gets confusing if you try to compare what is proposed in the final and the preliminary. The final site plan is a confirmation of the preliminary if nothing has changed. Since there are changes to the preliminary plan, an amendment to the preliminary has to be provided. If your uses in Phase 1 require the use of the back parking lot, you will have to show lighting for that area. If the Board decides that the sidewalks are required as part of Phase I, Final, it will be a

condition of approval. There has to be an amended preliminary that goes along with Phase 1 Final. There is only one approved plan for the site and you can amend it at any time.

Vice-Chairman DenBleyker requested that the applicant address Engineer Clerico's memo dated October 20, 2016 for completeness.

As to Page 2, item (i), zoning permit denial, Attorney Mongelli noted that this was addressed during the Preliminary Site Plan Application. The Borough did not have a zoning officer at the time and the Board Attorney said it was an unnecessary step. Attorney Hirsch inform him that it is not required.

As to Page 3, Attorney Mongelli addressed the following items from Engineer Clerico's review memo as follows:

**Item A, Checklist Items C1 & 2/D1 & 2**, Administrative items were done.

**Item B, Checklist item D-3**, zoning denial is unnecessary.

**Item C, Checklist items C5 & 6**, no details as required by conditions of the Preliminary Site Plan approval and no amended preliminary site plan application were submitted. Attorney Mongelli noted that as referenced on page 1 of the application, we will address it in the final site plan, Phase 2. This will be a board decision. Engineer Clerico noted that the Board will not consider any waiver until the Final Site Plan is part of the amended preliminary site plan application.

**Item D, Checklist item C8**, Detailed engineering data not provided. Attorney Mongelli noted that this will be provided in the Final Site Plan, Phase 2. Engineer Clerico noted that you will be submitting an amended preliminary site plan application. In conjunction with that, you will ask to amend conditions imposed in the preliminary approved based on whatever justification is put forth at the public hearing. Whatever waivers were previously given in the preliminary still stand.

**Item E, Checklist item D16**, Approval Signature lines not included. Attorney Mongelli noted that these items have been provided on both the preliminary and the final site plan.

**Item F, Checklist item D21**, buffering and landscaping, a temporary waiver was granted and made a condition of the preliminary approval. Attorney Mongelli noted that we will ask to defer that to the Final Site Plan, Phase 2. Engineer Clerico noted that as part of your amended preliminary, you will show that as a deferral until Phase 2. It is a condition of the preliminary and you will have to consider that request.

**Item G, Checklist B22**, Flood Plain Certification provided. However, a condition of the prior approval was to obtain clarification from the surveyor why his certification differs from the Base Flood Elevation established as part of the 2009 Site Plan. Attorney Mongelli noted that the Flood Plain Certification was provided and they have that clarification. Engineer Clerico noted that it must be submitted.

**Item H, Checklist item D23**, contour and spot elevations, is shown on the survey. A waiver was requested but is not required. Item is complete.

**Item I, Checklist item D24**, documenting existing wetlands and transition areas. The Board previously granted a waiver since the applicant is not proposing any site disturbance except for the installation of sidewalk extension along Trenton Avenue.

**Item J, Checklist Item D25**, certified list of property owners, dated January 18, 2016. The Board Attorney should determine if a current list is required. Attorney Mongelli noted that a new certified property owners list was obtained from the Tax Assessor, dated October 18<sup>th</sup> and has been provided.

**Item K, Checklist Item D31**, Deed of record was submitted but does not refer to the Sight Easement shown on the plan. The Board previously granted a temporary waiver and made it a

condition of the preliminary approval that the documentation of dedication be provided. This item must be addressed as part of any consideration for a Final Site Plan. Attorney Mongelli noted that since we are requesting to defer the landscaping plan, we will provide the documentation as part of the final. Engineer Clericco noted that you will have to make that request as part of the hearing.

**Item L, Checklist item D-33**, environmental impact statement. The Board previously granted a waiver as part of the preliminary approval. The Board should again grant a waiver.

Attorney Mongelli stated that he thinks that we have everything we need to hold a public hearing. If the Board grants a Phase I final approval, it could be subject to an amended site plan application being submitted. Responding to Engineer Clerico, Attorney Mongelli noted that they do not want to delay the application another month. Engineer Clerico noted that you just have to amend the preliminary to reflect what you are doing for the final. The Board needs to evaluate what you are doing on the site. Architect Burns noted that there is a parking area on the site and we are not proposing to modify the parking area in anyway. We will not exceed what is there. Engineer Clerico stated that Phase 2 Final must be shown. The Board has to act on an amended preliminary site plan. You have to consider what is being proposed and if parking, landscaping, etc. has to be provided. Conditions will be imposed on the Final Site Plan, Phase 1. The applicant would have to meet those conditions to implement the final plan. Responding to Vice-Chairman DenBleyker, Engineer Clerico noted that this could be submitted by Friday for the November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. The applicant is withdrawing the use variance application.

Vice-Chairman DenBleyker commented that documentation must be submitted by Friday or Monday for the November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. We will do a completion review then and if the application is deemed complete, a public hearing will commence.

On motion by Brad Myhre, seconded by William Sullivan and carried by unanimous favorable roll call vote, the Planning Board deemed the Site Plan Application for Block 59 Lot 4 incomplete pursuant to the above review and approved to allow the submission of additional documentation by Monday for a review at the November 9<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting waiving the ten day submission requirement.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

### **A. REVIEW OF ORDINANCE #775 FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE MASTER PLAN**

Councilman Sullivan noted that currently any building permis requires a zoning permit. He worked with the Zoning Officer and the Zoning Officer approved this ordinance. This ordinance specifies when a zoning permit is required for such things as change in footprint or height. Vice-Chairman DenBleyker stated that the Planning Board must determine if the ordinance is consistent with the Master Plan. On motion by Cathy Suttle, seconded by Gordon Dragt and carried by unanimous favorable roll call vote, the Planning Board determined that Ordinance #775 is consistent with the Master Plan.

**B. REVIEW OF ORDINANCE #782 FOR COMMENTS**

Mayor Myhre noted that this Ordinance is banning establishments of puppy mills in the Borough. Borough Council suggested that the ordinance come before the Planning Board for comments. Rocco Musolino commented that it limits what dogs could be sold and does not allow puppies from reputable breeders. William Sullivan stated that he does not know the authority that distinguishes a breeder and a puppy mill. Mayor Myhre noted that the ordinance can be changed and he will take the comments back to Council.

**VOUCHERS**

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

**VOUCHER LIST 10/26/16**

Archer & Greiner	Professional Services for General Representation through 9/30/16	\$ 327.00
Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Declaratory Judgement through 9/30/16	\$ 285.00
Elizabeth McKenzie	Professional Services for Affordable Housing Representation through 9/30/16	\$ 218.75

**ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 34 LOT 1 – Michael Inspection Escrow**

Van Cleef Engineering	Professional Services for Michael through 9/30/16	\$ 264.90
-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-----------

**ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 34 LOT 1 – Michael Escrow**

Albert Cruz	Professional Services for Michael through 9/30/16	\$ 15.00
NJ Advance Media	Publication Services for Michael on 10/13/16	\$ 15.88

**ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 59 LOT 4 – ArtYard**

Archer & Greiner	Professional Services for Art Yard through 9/30/16	\$ 200.00
Van Cleef Engineering	Professional Services for Art Yard through 9/30/16	\$ 202.50

**ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 59 LOT 7 – Hanley/Cipoletti**

Archer & Greiner	Professional Services for Hanley/Cipoletti through 9/30/16	\$ 200.00
------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

Van Cleef Engineering	Professional Services for Hanley/Cipoletti through 10/26/16	\$ 33.75
-----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	----------

**ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 15 LOT 1 – Stokes**

Archer & Greiner	Professional Services for Stokes through 10/4/16	\$ 340.00
------------------	--------------------------------------------------	-----------

Elizabeth McKenzie	Professional Services for Stokes through 9/30/16	\$ 306.25
--------------------	--------------------------------------------------	-----------

**ESCROW ACCOUNT- BLOCK 3 LOT 1 – Redevelopment Study**

Elizabeth McKenzie	Professional Services for Redevelopment through 9/30/16	\$ 262.50
--------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	-----------

On motion by Gerry Case, seconded by Gordon Dragt, 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**

Councilman William Sullivan report that the Ridge Road project started today. There will be a total repaving of the road, all new drainage, new driveway aprons and sidewalks on the west side of Ridge Road and onto Kingwood Avenue. We are also putting in sewer stubs for the other roads. Mayor Myhre noted that when the County redid Kingwood Avenue, they did not replace the drainage and one resident noticed his backyard bubbling when it rains hard.

William Sullivan also reported that lower Third Street will be rebuilt and repaved. Construction will begin after Trick or Treat. There will be a new sidewalk connection on the north side and the road will be newly paved by George Michael. Some existing street spots will be preserved and the road will be widened to current standards. William Sullivan added that Eleventh Street will be paved and part of Seventh Street will be paved.

William Sullivan noted that work on the front porch and fire escape at the Police Department will begin and a new drainage pipe will be installed at the park bathroom.

William Sullivan added that Public Works will be getting a new dump truck.

Responding to the Board as to the River Mills project, Mayor Myhre noted that George Michael is getting his Building permit for Building G and has received a foundation permit. He is also getting his permit for Building A. They have two commercial tenants competing for the space on the first floor. They will construct Building A and Building G simultaneously. They will construct Building A in house. One resident has moved in already and the one next door is sold. They are having difficulty selling the units because the taxes are \$16,000.00 to \$20,000.00 per year. The good news is that the project is moving forward.

Mayor Myhre also reported that the Borough is putting in a grant for the Downtown Revitalization in the amount of one million dollars which will include street lamps, additional benches, repairing of the pavers and drainage. The Downtown Revitalization Committee met and Dorsey Reading and Michael Padovan picked out the street lamps which will be consistent with the ArtYards design. Responding to the Board as to addressing signage, Mayor Myhre stated that the street lamps have a place for banners and announcements to go in there.

Mayor Myhre reported that we have not heard from Mr. Meiskin. The property is now vacant except for the garages that are being rented. The owner is not doing well.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Gerry Case moved adjournment at 8:53 pm, and William Sullivan seconded. The motion passed on favorable voice vote.

---

Brenda S. Shepherd  
Planning Board Secretary