

Frenchtown Planning Board
Regular Meeting
October 27, 2021
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 on the website and copies distributed to the designated newspapers with the teleconferencing information to join the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Present:	Absent:
Cooke	Dougherty
Dragt	Reino
DenBleyker	
Eckel	
Ferree	
Herb	
Myhre	
Tomko	

Chairman Eckel noted that John Dougherty is away on business and unable to attend this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting – September 22, 2021

Gordon Dragt moved to accept the minutes of the September 22, 2021 Regular meeting and Brad Myhre seconded the motion. The minutes of the September 22, 2021 Regular meeting were approved by favorable roll call vote with Jeanne Herb abstaining.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Randi 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 floor for public comments. Chairman Eckel stated that if you wish to make a comment, raise your hand and she will call on you. Having no comments, Chairman Eckel closed the public comment session.

MINOR SUBDIVISION - LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT – BLOCK 43 LOTS 3.01, 4 & 6 – MAPLE AVENUE – MEGAN BYRNE (COMPLETENESS REVIEW)

Chairman Eckel asked if the applicant or the applicant’s representative was present for the completeness review. Having no response, Chairman Eckel recommended tabling this agenda item. Attorney Gulie Hirsch noted that there is a time frame for making a completeness determination. She asked that the Board go forward and make that determination this evening. Chairman Eckel stated that this item will be moved below the Site Plan item on the agenda. Attorney Hirsch responded that moving it below the next applicant would be fine. She added that she did get a call on this application about public notice. The applicant is getting ready for a public hearing on November 10, 2021.

Chairman Eckel stated that the Board will move onto the Site Plan application and come back to this subdivision application to see if the applicant or its representatives join the meeting.

SITE PLAN APPLICATION– BLOCK 56 LOT 3, 48 BRIDGE STREET – 48 BRIDGE STREET, LLC. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Chairman Eckel noted that Gordon Dragt stepped down on this application due to proximity and his relationship with the applicant and attorney.

Chairman Eckel reported that the public hearing on this application will start this evening. The applicant and the applicants professionals will have to be sworn in. Attorney Hirsch wanted to clarify that this application was rendered a conditional completes. Engineer Clerico noted that he took his 9/15/21 letter and updated it with a date of 10/25/21 noting the additional information that came in, which items ar now complete and summarized what actions were granted or reconfirm the waivers on page 4. The application can now be deemed complete. Attorney Hirsch noted that the application had already been deemed complete subject to submission of certain document. This recognized that those documents have been submitted and the applicant is ready to move forward.

Jeanne Herb asked that clarification be given on who is Guy and who is Guy D on the screen. Chairman Eckel stated that the first thing to identify is the notice for the public hearing and then Attorney DeSapio can clarify the two screens. Attorney Hirsch stated that Attorney DeSapio provided the affidavit of service and the notice is in order and the Board has jurisdiction to go forward tonight.

Attorney DeSapio, from the law office at 1110 Harrison Street, Frenchtown, noted that there are four people in his conference room with two laptops. Guy DeSapio in capital letters is Rosella and himself. The screen with Guy D has Dorsey Reading and Architect Michael Marguiles. The applicant and the applicants representative were sworn in by Attorney Hirsch.

Attorney DeSapio stated that the applicant will make a presentation about the building for 48 Bridge Street, who owns the property to reconstruction on the former Galasso site. We will make a presentation about building and answer any questions the Board may have and proceed with the two variances that the Board Planner has identified. Attorney DeSapio noted that we will go through the Planner’s letter, dated 10/20/21, in conjunction with the planner.

Reviewing Planner Green’s letter, dated 10/20/21, Attorney DeSapio noted that he wants to get the technical items out of the way. As to Item 3, on page 5, the issue of additional charges has to be determined regarding the affordable housing fees. The affordable housing fee does not apply because of the change in COAH and the second provision of 1.5% fee does not apply pursuant to Section 4b1 of the Borough ordinance which exempts replacements as a cause of natural disaster, flood or fire.

Attorney Hirsch stated that she agrees. There are questions raised at page 5 involving affordable housing or development fees that could be applicable. It is clear to her that the section of the Borough’s development fee ordinance at Section 4B4 requires a residential fee. The prior apartment unit was destroyed by fire. The Frenchtown Village Center fee cannot be applied due to the lack of current COAH rules. The restaurant use is subject to the State Non-Residential Development Fee, per N.J.S.A. 40:55D-8.4, which statutory fee applies in place of the fee contained in the Frenchtown Borough ordinance. The provision of the State Non-Residential

Development Fee contained in N.J.S.A. 40:55D-8.6c applies due to the previous development of the site, and the formula for assessment of the fee contained in that section of the statute shall be calculated by the Borough Tax Assessor.

Responding to Jeanne Herb, Attorney Hirsch stated that it is a requirement and will be a condition that would have to be imposed as well as how the fee is calculated. Like other conditions, it is enforced by the tax assessor.

Mr. DeSapio suggested that the three fees in the Development Fee ordinance not Frenchtown borough development fee ordinance does not apply and is superseded by the State non-residential fee which is part of the municipal land use law and that is the only fee that applies. Attorney Hirsch noted that this will be discussed as a condition of any approval.

As to Item 5 on page 5, Attorney DeSapio stated that Architect Michael Margulies will testify on the present condition of the sidewalk. Architect Margulies noted that the sidewalk is in good condition around the perimeter and we will repair any damage to the sidewalk created by the construction.

As to Item 6, on page 5, regarding trash and recycling receptacles, Attorney Hirsch stated that this item has been addressed and no testimony is needed. Planner Green confirmed it was addressed.

As to item 7, on page 5, access easement, Attorney DeSapio noted that this was submitted as part of the supplemental documents provided. The deed contained the reference to the access easement so this item has been addressed. Planner Green confirmed it was addressed.

As to Item 8, gross and net areas to determine FAR, Attorney DeSapio noted that this item deals with the variance and will be provided in the presentation.

As to Item 9, lot width appears to be incorrect. Attorney DeSapio noted that the lot width on the site plan shows it as 24 feet at its narrowest point. The lot width of 41 feet can be put on the plan. Planner Green noted that the correct numbers should be corrected on the plan and made a condition of approval.

As to Item 10, lot depth appears to be incorrect. Attorney DeSapio stated that the lot depth will be corrected on the plan. Testimony will be provided.

As to Item 11, setbacks, Attorney DeSapio stated that this has been addressed in the new submission.

As to Item 12, corner lot and front yard setbacks, Attorney DeSapio stated that if the application is approved, the will be changed on the plan. Planner Green stated that it would be a condition of approval.

As to Item 13, the new sidewalk, Attorney DeSapio noted that there is an existing space between the building and the existing sidewalk. Architect Margulies stated that the a new sidewalk can be put in to extend to the existing sidewalk.

As to item 14, awnings not shown on the site plan, Attorney DeSapio stated that this was addressed in the supplemental submission.

As to Item 15 & 16, lighting and gooseneck lighting details, Architect Michael Margulies noted that he submitted a lighting package. Where the sconces will go, can be submitted as part of construction phase. The plan does show the outdoor lighting. Chairman Eckel noted that lighting involves wattage and the Board will need to know if it is sufficient and make sure it will not spill off the property. We have to make sure it is appropriate for the site. This will be a condition of approval.

As to Item 17, no foundation on the cellar plan, Attorney DeSapio noted that this was addressed. Planner Green confirmed that the item was addressed.

As to Item 18, plan of basement, Architect Margulies noted that when the fire was cleaned up, pieces of the foundation were knocked in. We are showing an approximate location with dotted lines. We will not know the exact location until we excavate. This will be a condition of approval. Responded to Jeanne Herb, Mr. Margulies noted that we have to determine if it is 6 inches or 18 inches but it is still in the same location. If any of the foundation needs to be repaired or replaced, the applicant will do that.

As to Item 19, façade requirements of the VCP, Attorney DeSapio noted that this will be provided in testimony. Mr. Margulies stated that we indicated that this is a reconstruction of the pre-existing building with photographic evidence and the aesthetics in trying to keep in the context of the project. A drawing had been submitted.

As to Item 20, number of seats in the restaurant, Micheal Margulies noted that there will be 48 sears. 46 is showing on the drawing because of the doorway. The applicant would like to have 48 seats as in the previous restaurant.

As to Item 21, outdoor mechanical, Mr. Margulies noted that the outdoor mechanicals will be mounted on the façade wall. He did not show that on the drawing but it will be on the south elevation. This would be a condition of approval. Attorney Hirsch noted that it will have to be reviewed by Engineer Clerico.

As to Item 22, signage, Mr. Margulies noted that nothing has been submitted. A desgn will come back during the construction phase. He did not want to hold up the application. Chairman Eckel noted that the sign will be approved by the Zoning Officer.

Planner Darlene Green noted that everything was addressed in her letter except for Item #8. Only the gross area was provided and not the net area. Attorney DeSapio noted that testimony will be provided. If the Board is set, they will provide a presentation on the variances. He asked Architect Margulies to provide his credentials as a professional witness.

Architect Michael Margulies noted that he has an architect business, Acclectic, and has practiced in the architectural field for 20 years. The Board accepted Architect Margulies as a expert witness.

Mr. Margulies noted that we are requesting a variance, a D4 variance, for the Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Th FAR limit is 1.00. It is difficult to make the exact square footage for the building. The proposed FAR is 1.03, a deminimis amount. It is so close to the require amount and if we round down, it would be 1.0. The previous FAR was at 1.23 so we are reducing the previous FAR by .20 making the building more conforming. We are talking about 3 hundreds. Chairman Eckel referred to the Planner and Attorney about the deminimis notation.

As to the location of the building on the lot, Mr. Margulies noted that it is consistent with the previous FAR and what existed in the downtown. We are making it as consistent with the zoning and existing conditions that were there and consistent with the aesthetics of the 19th century building. We brought it down in scale and the one story will not make it massive at the corner of Bridge Street and Trenton Avenue. It complies with the intent and purpose of the adjoining buildings in the area and it is consistent with the zoning and complies with the intent and purpose of the zone.

Another variance, a C1 variance, is required for a rear yard setback. The zone requires a 20 foot setback and the rear setback is 4.5 feet. Architect Margulies noted that a 20 foot rear yard setback is difficult to meet. You would not have any building. We are minimizing what went to the property line previously, the entire building envelope. We are giving back 4.5 feet, an alley like, for the rear for the garbage and HVAC, etc. to get it off the street which was previously a problem on Trenton Avenue and hold the building back as far as we can and still make the project feasible. We are trying to meet the intent of the zoning ordinance.

Attorney DeSapio asked Mr. Margulies how the size of lot and boundaries of the building impact the 20 foot setback requirement. Mr. Margulies noted that we are dealing with what was there, the existing conditions, and trying to balance it to comply with the intent of the zoning. It is difficult to make a feasible project with a 20 foot setback. You would only have a building on half the lot.

Attorney DeSapio suggested to the Board that because of the lot size and nature of the conditions, the applicant made efforts to provide a setback but the project would not be feasible to meet the current setback requirements.

Attorney DeSapio also stated that as to the FAR, he believes that we have complied, reducing the FAR substantially from 1.34 to 1.03 and the building is consistent with the streetscape and the intent of the zoning. The Board should grant the variances.

Jeanne Herb asked that regardless of Mr. DeSapio's legal interpretation of the issues, she wants to hear from Mr. Margulies as to aesthetically, what is being proposed and how does it compare to what we would have experienced at the time of the original construction of the building. Mr. Margulies stated that they are trying to match the historic sensitivity, aesthetics, and the aesthetics familiar to the Borough and match very closely the details and configuration of the 19th century building originally but in a historical character conforming to the local zoning. Jeanne Herb asked where this design falls in terms of what are the current aesthetics to what it was at that period of time. Clarifying herself, Ms. Herb noted that she wants to make sure that that in 20 years from now that Frenchtown is not a Disneyland version of Frenchtown versus a true version of Frenchtown in its true spirit at the time it was developed. Mr. Margulies stated that we are applying modern zoning. For example, a 20 foot setback would be hard to conform as half the lot would be the building. Jeanne Herb stated that we need to look at some of our zoning from a historical end and look at our future to respect our past more systematically. Chairman Eckel suggested that Mr. Margulies reiterate the point of the old building photos and how you have taken the photo and added what you have. Mr. Margulies responded that as to the oldest photo, we recreated the Bridge Street façade and held it back beyond the dining pavilion. We did it as close to the details with the windows using the photograph area. The rest of the building is 19th century aesthetics of Frenchtown in general. We provided a picture from the 1950's. Dorsey Reading added that the original building in 1925 was like that. We took what

was there and shrunk it to 50 feet from 92 feet to duplicate what was there originally and are use the existing foundation because the foundation is already there. We are following the photoprint and keeping Frenchtown's look. We spent a great deal of time researching to keep the period there so 20 years from now, we do not have a wild Avenue. Jeanne Herb asked what the period is that you are focusing on. She knows history changes and commented that the building did not have outdoor dining. Mr. Margulies stated that it is not an outdoor eating space. The zoning does not allow more than 1.0 FAR. It is not possible by local zoning to completely comply but we can as close as possible. A lot of the Trenton Avenue aesthetics had no windows and then haphazardly windows were put in and certain access points were not allowed. To avoid steps and overhangs into the right of way which would not be allowed by current zoning. Responding to Jeanne Herb as to barriers, Mr. Margulies noted that he would be happy to meet with Ms. Herb.

Chairman Eckel noted that the question of the FAR over .03 which equals 91 square feet over the required 1.00 and anything over and requires a variance although it may be de minimus. Attorney Hirsch noted that the applicant has made a reasonable case to grant the variance. De minimus is in the eye of the beholder. She feels that it is de minimus but there is a need for the D4 variance.

Responding to Kandy Ferree, Attorney Hirsch noted that we look at the zoning and how it allows a project to go forward without a variance. This lot is in the Frenchtown village center which does not have similar provision so variances are required. If you have substantial destruction, you are required to comply with existing zoning. If you have less destruction, you can rebuild that project. Because of the complete destruction, the applicant was required to comply with the existing zoning. Mr. Margulies added that Rosella is losing 800 square feet. Rosella commented that everything we created in the structure was created with the opportunity to revisit our past. Responding to Chairman Eckel, Rosella confirmed that the comments made during the concept review, it is her desire to have the building reconstructed so that it does not put her current outdoor dining next door in a dark alley. Mayor Myhre stated that she appreciates the effort of the applicant to put a tasteful design together and take into account the historical photos, keeping in character of Frenchtown. If it is a de minimus variance, then a variance should be approved. Chairman Eckel stated that the applicant is trying to get as close to the FAR as required and it has been beneficial to the applicant so that the outdoor dining is not obscured.

Chairman Eckel asked if there were any further comments or questions from the Board. Having no further questions or comments from the Board, Chairman Eckel asked Attorney Hirsch to list conditions of any approval of this application.

Attorney Hirsch noted that the Board can accept the application and put in the following conditions:

1. The restaurant and apartment will be constructed in conformance with the plan.
2. Specific development fees required pursuant to page 5 of Planner Green's letter apply.
3. Any damage to the sidewalks or municipal improvements during construction. Damage to sidewalks during construction would be repaired to the satisfaction of the Borough Engineer.
4. Revisions to the plans will show the lot width of 41 feet and a lot depth of 120 feet and that the front lot line for the property is at Trenton Avenue.
5. The zoning notes shall include the FAR of 1.03.

6. The lighting plan package submitted by the Applicant shall be subject to the review and approval of Board Engineer to make sure the lighting is adequate for pedestrian safety as well as showing the location of the proposed gooseneck lights on the subject plan or by way of note on the plan
7. The Applicant shall be permitted to have 48 seats within the restaurant area of the building.
8. Outdoor mechanical equipment shall be wall- mounted on the south elevation of the building along the alleyway, and subject to review and approval of Board Engineer
9. Any signage required by the Applicant shall be subject to review and approval of the Zoning Officer.
10. Any temporary checklist waivers shall be satisfied by a revised plan or other documents subject to review and approval by the Board Engineer.
11. Proof of payment of taxes to date of adoption of the resolution must be provided.
12. Any outstanding escrow fees must be replenished within 30 days of receipt of a deficiency notice.
13. The applicant is subject to any governmental approval that may be required.

Engineer Clerico noted that the temporary waivers must be incorporated into the plan or other documents. He will work with the applicant as these have to be met before a Certificate of Occupancy can be issued.

Chairman Eckel asked the Board for a decision on the application. A motion was made by John DenBleyker to approve the variance and site plan applications for Block 56 Lot 3, 48 Bridge Street, with the conditions listed above. The motion was seconded by Paul Tomko. The motion was tabled in order to hold the public hearing on the application.

Chairman Eckel open the public hearing on the Variance and Site Plan applications for Block 56 lot 3.

Having no public comments for the public hearing, Chairman Eckel closed the public hearing on the variance and site plan application.

The motion was brought back to the table. Chairman Eckel called a vote on the motion. The Planning Board approved the variance and site plan application for Block 56 blot 3, 48 Bridge Street, by unanimous favorable roll call vote.

Gordon Dragt returned to meeting.

Minor Subdivision - Lot line Adjustment – Block 43 Lots 3.01, 4 & 6 – Maple Avenue – Megan Byrne (Completeness review)

Chairman Eckel noted that the Board will have to take actions on completeness this evening. There have been a number of waivers requested and outlined.

Attorney Hirsch noted that there are a number of items missing. The applicant is planning to amend the plan and address the missing items. They want to have a hearing at the November meeting. The application is a minor subdivision/boundary line adjustment. There is a variance with one of the lots which is a pre-existing condition. In her opinion, she does not see any variance that would require a public notice. The applicant will need to provide those items not provided and will have to provide them quickly in order to meet the deadline for the November 10, 2021 meeting.

Engineer Clerico noted that he received a text from the applicant's attorney. The applicant's attorney was unable to attend this evening and is prepared to move forward at the November 10, 2021 meeting. Kandy Ferree ask what is the protocol for text messages. Jeanne Herb added that she is worried about what record it sets. Attorney Hirsch stated that it is not setting a record. The Board has a deadline for making a completeness determination of 45 days. The consequence of not meeting the deadline, the application is automatically considered complete. If Engineer Clerico identified 4 items that are incomplete and if we fail to communicate that the application is deemed incomplete, it would be automatically complete without submitting the items the Board may want to see. She urges the Board to go through the letter and make a determination and have that communicated to the applicant. Chairman Eckel recommended that the Board review the completeness this evening and make a determination. She asked Engineer Clerico to go through his review letter to the Board.

Engineer Clerico stated that he did a completeness review letter, dated 10/22/21. He will go through the letter. There are three existing lots and the applicant is adjusting the internal boundary lines bring the lots more in compliance. The lot depth is a preexisting condition and is not changed. The letter describes the application. It is his understanding that the Borough has recently adopted an ordinance to accept the street. The application does not grant a right to build on the vacant properties. It just grants approval to adjust the lot line. Hear tape:

As to the ownership of the lots, recent deeds were recorded. Megan Byrnes is the owner. In order to meet the subdivision standards, additional road Right of way are required which need to be dedicated to the town as well as a site easement at the intersection.

The existing power line easement needs to be tied down by the survey and the existing well and septic is not shown on the plans and need to be shown.

The planting of Street trees is a subdivision design requirement.

The applicant is asking for a number of waivers from a number of the checklist items that are not required for a minor subdivision application.

Engineer Clerico stated that he grouped the recommended waivers with a summary for action. He recommended granting waivers requested for items I, J, K, P3, R, T, W, X, 11a-11c, 18, 19, 25, 26 and 33, granting temporary waivers for items S and 27c, having the applicant request a waiver for 31 and granting that waiver, denying a waiver for item 17, and deem the application incomplete for checklist items L, N, O, 5, 13, 15, 16, 32, and 42 and item 17. These items needs to be submitted for review. The applicant has a limited period of time to submit these documents. The applicant indicated that they will submit the items by the end of the week.

Attorney Hirsch stated that the Board should deem the application incomplete for the items listed, grant the temporary waivers and grant the other waiver requested except for item 17 and give the applicant a deadline of no later than November 1st to submit the incomplete items if they want to be on the agenda for completeness at the November 10, 2021 meeting. Engineer Clerico stated that they have already been working on these items for the last 5 days.

On motion by Jeanne Herb, seconded by Gordon Dragt and carried by unanimous favorable roll call vote, the Planning Board deemed the subdivision/lot line adjustment application for Block 43 lots 3.01, 4 & 6 – Maple Avenue for Megan Byrnes incomplete for the items listed above and granting waivers and temporary waivers as listed above and in Engineer Clerico's review letter.

The required documents must be submitted by November 1, 2021 in order to be placed on the Planning Board agenda for November 10, 2021 for a completeness review and possible public hearing.

Engineer Clerico noted that he cannot be at the Planning Board meeting on November 10, 2021.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. ESCROW FEE DISCUSSION

Chairman Eckel noted that Secretary Brenda Shepherd has gotten her the numbers from different municipalities and she will have something for the November meeting. This item will be carried to the November agenda.

APPROVAL OF VOUCHERS

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

VOUCHER LIST 10/27/21

GENERAL REPRESENTATION

Archer & Greiner, PC.	General Representation through 9/30/21	\$40.00
-----------------------	---	---------

ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 56 LOT 3 Bridge Street

Archer & Greiner, PC.	Professional Services for 48 Bridge Street 9/30/21	\$520.00
-----------------------	---	----------

Van Cleef Engineering	Professional Services for 48 Bridge Street 9/30/21	\$1,237.50
-----------------------	---	------------

ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 28 LOT 1 – Knight and Brown

Gannett	Advertisement for 3 rd Fourth Street	\$47.90
---------	---	---------

Van Cleef Engineering	Professional Services for 3 rd Fourth Street Through 8/31/2021	\$75.00
-----------------------	--	---------

ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 3 LOT 1 , Country Classics Redevelopment

Phoenix Advisors LLC	Professional services for Country Classics through 6/30/21	\$2,291.25
----------------------	---	------------

Albert Cruz	Professional services for Country Classics through 9/30/21	\$32.00
-------------	---	---------

**ESCROW ACCOUNT – BLOCK 3 LOT 1 , Country Classics Redevelopment
On Site Off Site Inspection**

Colliers Engineering	Professional services for Country Classics through 9/14/21	\$6,793.72
----------------------	---	------------

Colliers Engineering Professional services for Country Classics \$467.50
through 10/14/21

ESCROW ACCOUNT - BLOCK 12, LOT 5 – Milford Investments LLC

Colliers Engineering Professional services for Milford \$310.00
Investments through 10/14/21

On motion by Jeanne Herb, seconded by Kandy Ferree 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

Jeanne Herb reported that the Environmental Commission held its monthly meeting and wanted her to express the concept to the Governing Body and Planning board that if we proceed to purchase the property or a part of the property of Kathee’s, it would be great to look at natural based infrastructure and eager to provide support. Also, members of the Environmental Commission are working with one of the members of the Borough Council to convene a community meeting on Climate Change solutions. The meeting is on November 13th at Borough hall.

Kandy Ferree stated that the Cannabis Committee had made a lot of progress early and split the committee into 2 parts to look at cultivation and growin and the second phase is distribution and sales. It has been stalled because John Dougherty and herself are swamped at work although we have been in touch with each other.. We need to get a schedule together to move forward. Our original thought was by the end of December or early January.

Kandy Ferree added that she has been in connection as the Economic Development Committee Chairman with Denice DeCuna as liason for the TAP grant. Ms. Decuna represents NV5, the engineering firm, to complete site survey work and is putting etogether for a presentation on that to the Borough. Then, the kick off meeting with the NJDOT can commence. ring firm. Complete site survey work on tap grant,m will provide presentation to borough and then we willhave kick off meeting.

Ms. Ferree also wanted to echo Jeanne Herb’s comment around climate change and climate activity group that Stacy Becker is putting together. She is particularly excited about her desire to engage young people and looking forward to seeing how that plays out.

Mayor Myhre noted that the Borough has been awarded a NJDOT grant in an amount just over \$203,000.00 to resurface Bridge Street and Race Street with enhanced crosswalks. For purposes of background, he had looked at Nassau Street in Princeton where there is lit crosswalks with brick that draws people’s attention. We put that in the grant application We put something similar to that in a grant application. The NJDOT looked favorable on that.

Mayor Myhre also reported that there is an option agreements and a conceptual offer for the acreage of the Thompson property. Conceptual plan for Thompson.

Mayor Myhre noted that he met with NCRS which did an assessment of the Nishisacawick Creek and we are looking to do a grant application for a stream bank restoration of the entire area to repair the damage by Ida with plantings and other things. T. It would be a 75%/25% split. The Borough would have to put out the money and get reimbursed.

Mayor Myhre also held a meeting with County Representative, Zach Rich, the Public Safety Director, Mark Gantner, Council President Michele Liebtag and the engineer concerning County Routes #610 and #513. There has been a lot of conversation concerning traffic calming. The County is proposing to put up a steep slope sign on Route #513 and pavement markings with the speed limit on Kingwood Avenue. Lower the speed limit is something that needs to be reviewed by the County Engineer. What they do not want is the speed going from 45 mph to 25 mph. You are suppose to have a phasing of that per the Uniform Traffic Safety Code. The Borough will follow with a formal request to the County.

Mayor Myhre noted that Trick or Treat and the parade are this weekend. Trick or Treat is 6-8 pm. If the weather is bad, the parade will be Sunday. The street closures will be Harrison Street from Second Street to Sixth Street and lower Second Street for both events.

Chairman Eckel noted that she had a discussion with Secretary Brenda Shepherd about future meetings and at least for the next 6 months. It is working well and NJPO is endorsing virtual meetings. Every time she turns around, she hears that someone has COVID. The dais is a small area and it is not possible to keep a distance from each other.

Mayor Myhre stated that the County is having drive-thru clinics for booster shoots. The County has plenty available. The breakthrough cases are real. Gordon Dragt added that the Frenchtown Pharmacy has vaccinations available.

Chairman Eckel stated that she would like to start the review of the Reexamination report and the priorities next month. With all the applications, vacations, etc. it was difficult. It will be on the November meeting agenda. We will need to consider a discussion on climate change and the requirements. Municipalities need to consider natural disasters as part of their Master Plan review. It was well summarized in the NJPO newsletter.

Jeanne Herb stated that she will not be at the November 10th meeting.

Chairman Eckel noted that we are without a zoning officer. The zoning office took a new job and his last day was to be November 19th. He got COVID and has to quarantine so the Borough currently does not have a functioning zoning officer. She spoke to the Mayor and he said that we are continuing with the shared service agreement with Lambertville so we are waiting for Lambertville to backfill that position.

Chairman Eckel noted that at the request of one of the Board members, when we have long meetings, she will call at break at 9:00 pm.

Kandy Ferree stated that now that we are finalizing the Land Use Ordinance codification, if there is something that comes up in the Master Plan reexamination, we can approach County Economic Development Director Marc Salik for another grant.

ADJOURNMENT

John DenBleyker moved adjournment at 9:19 pm and Jeanne Herb seconded. The motion passed on favorable voice vote.

Brenda S. Shepherd
Planning Board Secretary