

**Minutes of the Planning Board of the
Township Of Hanover
February 16, 2021**

THE FOLLOWING IS AN AGENDA FOR SAID MEETINGS AND FORMAL ACTION MAY OR MAY NOT BE TAKEN ON A PORTION OF THIS AGENDA. THE PUBLIC IS INVITED AND MAY ATTEND SAID MEETINGS SUBJECT TO THOSE AREAS OF CONSIDERATION DESIGNATED, IF ANY, FROM WHICH THE PUBLIC MAY BE EXCLUDED PURSUANT TO SECTION 7B & 8 OF THE LAWS OF 1975.

PUBLIC MEETING 7:00 P.M. VIA ZOOM WEBINAR ONLY

PUBLIC BUSINESS

I. STATEMENT BY PRESIDING OFFICER

Chairman Peter De Nigris called the Public Meeting to order on Tuesday February 16, 2021 at 7:01 PM by Way of Zoom Webinar Only and read the Open Public Meetings Act into the record.

II. ROLL CALL

The Board Secretary, Kimberly Bongiorno, called the roll.

In attendance were Members: Byrne, Critchley, Deehan, Chairman De Nigris, Dobson, Mayor Ferramosca, Gallagher, Glawe, Monzo and Olsen.

Absent were Members: Mian

Members of the Public were: John Kovaian, Anthony Sigalas, Terri Baird, Steven Smith

Also present were: Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan
Board Secretary Kimberly A. Bongiorno, LUA
Township Engineer Gerardo Maceira, P.E.
Township Planner Blais Brancheau

III. RESOLUTIONS NONE

**IV. MINUTES – JANUARY 26, 2021 and
FEBRUARY 9, 2021**

There were no questions, comments or corrections offered by Board Members.

A motion to approve the Minutes of January 19, 2021 and February 9, 2021 was moved by Member Critchley and seconded by Member Dobson.

In voice all present voted in favor of approving the Minutes of January 19, 2021 and February 9, 2021.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1)	CASE NO.	19-10-15-R1
	APPLICANT/OWNER	RIVER PARK BUSINESS CENTER, LLC
	LOCATION:	34 EDEN LANE, WHIPPANY
	BLOCK: 3801	LOTS: 2 ZONE: RIVER PARK REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan, Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision approval to construct a four-story 81-unit apartment building, including temporary office space, parking garage and related improvements and to subdivide the existing 73-acre tract into four lots. PARTIALLY HEARD AND CARRIED FROM JANUARY 19, 2021.

Copies of the filed Application forms and supporting documents submitted by the applicant can be reviewed at the following link <https://tinyurl.com/yxuy15s3>

Board Action Date – FEBRUARY 28, 2021

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Stated the names of the professionals who will be testifying in tonight’s case.
- Explained this is a continuation testimony of the previous meeting.
- Gave an overview of the proposed project.
- Gave a summary of what took place in the previous meeting and what his client is proposing.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Still under oath from the previous meeting.
- Went over the charging provisions, the placement of the outlets and further explained.
- Each unit will get ‘1’ parking space, the remaining ‘78’ parking spaces will be available on a first come first serve basis.
- A letter was submitted dated it February 9, 2021 that contained 2 site plan sheets and 8 sheets of architectural plans.

- Referenced the ‘DMR – ARCHITECTURAL PLANS’ sheet ‘A1 –3’ and further explained the parking requirements.
- When the temporary office space is vacated, we are required to provide ‘154 parking spaces’ and we have ‘159 parking spaces’ so we would have an excess of ‘5’ parking spaces.
- Mr. Brancheau indicates in next to last paragraph; right above item # 2 on page 3 of today’s memo, ‘RSIS’ does not explicitly or implicitly talk about parking for accessory support uses related to residential operations and further explained.
- In my professional experience we have never accounted for a parking requirement associated with this, I do not think is appropriate, and further explained.
- I do not believe that there should be a parking requirement of ‘6’ parking spaces for the ground level accessory office/ support space for this building.
- Agreed with Mr. Inglesino that a variance is not required for this based on his professional opinion.
- Addressed Chairman De Nigris questions regarding the charging stations and the possibility of underground parking.
- Elaborated on his statement that they are currently over parked under ‘RSIS’ requirements.
- Addressed Mayor Ferramosca’s question regarding the temporary use of the office space.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Addressed Mayor Ferramosca’s question.
- The point I want to make is that the office at a temporary basis is established in the “Redevelopment Plan’ and the time frame will be established in the ‘negotiated Redevelopment Agreement between the Township Committee and the applicant’

Mayor Ferramosca

- I think is admirable that the developer is providing individual parking spaces with electrical connections.
- I think that the issue that this Board is thinking of right now is ‘in the event during this temporary period of time which we do not know and we are not going to decide what it is tonight; in the event that temporary period of time results on a traffic parking issue, meaning parking spaces were missing as parking spaces, do you have any other place where you can put your five temporary parking individuals; the individuals working in your office’ Can they park somewhere else if we run into a situation where demand is greater than supply?
- Would you accept the condition that says, ‘if demand is greater than supply the office workers would park their cars in some other place during the temporary period’?

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- I do not have a problem with that, but I must consult with my client on that one.
- I would like to get back to you on that.

Chairman De Nigris

- Those people that would have to move out is that space to be designated somewhere other than what it has been identified? As an addition to it, Am I correct?

Mayor Ferramosca

- It would be separate apart from the 159.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Yes, Mr. Chairman I do have authority from my client to agree to that condition and further explained.
- The answer to that is yes, we would agree to that condition.

Open to the Public for questions

After hearing none

After seeing none

Closed to the Public

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Brancheau’s question.

Re-opened to the Public

John Kovaian

- 2604 Courtland Lane, Whippany
- Sometime in the future as we have more and more people coming in and the spaces are filled; Will people be able to park on Eden Lane, outside of the parking lot? Say like curb side parking, is that something that would be allowed?

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Kovaian question.

John Kovaian

- I just want to make sure that there are adequate plans for the future.

Closed to the Public

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- We prepared a traffic study dated June 30, 2020 and further explained.
- Explained the levels of service.
- Gave the number of trips calculated during the morning peak hours and evening peak hours and further explained.

Mayor Ferramosca

- I would appreciate if Mr. Keller would show the exhibit that he just described and show the members of the Public through and further elaborated.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Sheet '8/20' titled 'Lay out and Dimension Plan' last revised 'February 8, 2021'
- Went over the presentation.
- Elaborated on the pedestrian crossing from 'Boxwood Court' onto 'Road A'

Township Engineer Gerardo Maceira, P.E.

- Addressed Mayor Ferramosca's question.
- There are enhancements that can be added and further explained.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Member Monzo's question.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Mr. Monzo the answer is, it is to be determined, it is an issue that will be addressed in the broader redevelopment agreement and further explained.
- Addressed Mr. Monzo's question regarding ownership of the site.

Member Monzo

- Elaborated on the reasoning for his question and stated 'I think the traffic pattern is underestimating the exact kinds of loads we see during those periods and as more development is put into the Township, that puts the burden into the intersections of 'Route 10' and 'Jefferson', '287' and route 10 and Ridgedale Eden lane is going to take more and amore and a bypass of a demeanor and I am very concern about the increase in the traffic that is not being picked up by the traffic report.
- I said it at the prior meeting, and I am suggesting again at this meeting that we have bicycle traffic, we have running traffic, walking traffic....
- When you stated that there is not enough good reason to cross 'Eden Lane' come around the summertime and see the people jugging and running... they will have a reason now because there will be other things that they can go to.
- I would feel more comfortable as a member of the community knowing so that this intersection will be controlled by traffic lights not just by white markers on the road.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Explained what is required to put a traffic light.
- At this point this intersection will operate safely with a 'Stop' controlled and further explained.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Further explained the reasons why a traffic light has not been able to be installed.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Member Gallagher question.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- We would agree as a condition to modify the signage per the direction of Mr. Maceira, with the understanding that every attempt would be made to obtain the signage that Mr. Gallagher is describing.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Mayor Ferramosca's question.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- To be cleared for the Board there will be '2 Redevelopment Agreements' and further explained.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Brancheau's question.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Mr. Brancheau that would be problematic for the applicant because it would be putting the applicant's approval in the hands of ...

Township Planner Blais Brancheau

- No, I am just saying only if the party is willing to allow you to do that to paint those arrows if they are not willing to allow you then obviously you cannot do that.
- But if they are willing to are you willing to?

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Yes, of course

Township Planner Blais Brancheau

- Going back to the Township Engineer's earlier comment there would need to be in his mind any way a study to determine what those arrows should be.

Township Engineer Gerardo Maceira, P.E.

- I guess the concern was without having a traffic count done at the Boxwood Court approach, I do not know what the utilization is between the number of left turns and the number of right turns and whether that number of that new through movement is best associated with the left turn or the right turn.
- Without knowing the volume, it kind of leaves a question in my mind as to which the best approach to provide that through movement with.
- Making that modification to Boxwood Court, I understand that it is a private road, and I will let the attorney address that, but our concern is that because it affects the operations of a public intersection, I think the Township has jurisdiction to make modifications to that intersection.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Clarified what the condition is Eric correct me if I am wrong, we will differ and do what Mr. Maceira recommends regarding striping and if the Board over Eden lane is agreeable to stripping there as recommended then we will do it, if they are not then we will not.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Continued reviewing Sheet ‘8/20’ titled ‘Lay out and Dimension Plan’ last revised ‘February 8, 2021’
- Addressed Member Deehan’s question.

Open to the Public

John Kovaian

- 2604 Courtland Lane, Whippany
- The designs look pretty good but I am sensing a problem, for example when I am driving on Eden Lane and I am going West, to turn left on Boxwood that seems fine however you have also the same lane heading in the same direction able to go straight through the intersection but there is somewhat of a ramp at that intersection so what happens is that is better to really separate the lanes because you can easily wind up having car accidents , people bumping into each other at the end of that ramp and also there is a curb above that , so you cannot see cars coming around that curb and further explained how dangerous it is.
- Expressed his concern with the visibility lines in that area, after the intersection about 100 feet away.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Kovaian’s question and or concern.

John Kovaian

- Questioned the number of ingress and egress areas.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Kovaian’s question.

Anthony Sigalas

- 11 Eden Lane in Whippany
- Mr. Keller at the very beginning of your testimony you had mention using traffic numbers from across the street. Can you clarify what you meant by across the street exactly?
- It was like the second statement that you made.
- The study that you did only looked at this 81unit appartement building, it does not include any future traffic, is that correct?

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Sigalas questions.

Closed to the Public

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- Mr. Keller just for the record again, you are a registered, Licensed Planner for the state of New Jersey.

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- I am and my license is in good standing and I have appeared this board before.
- Referred to Mr. Brancheau’s memo, page 3 went over the number of parking spaces that are being provided and further explained.
- Discussed the positive criteria with Mr. Inglesino and went over the negative criteria.
- Addressed Mr. Critchley’s question.

Open to the Public

Terri Baird

- 180 Parsippany Road, Whippany
- During this testimony you have been referring to a letter made by Blais Brancheau and I cannot seem to find it on the planning documents that are put up in the cloud.
- Is there a way that we would be able to see what is on Blais’ document for today?

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Mr. Brancheau’s commentary on the parking in today’s memo is the same as what was in the prior memo and further explained.

Terri Baird

- The November’s memo was not up in the cloud either, so I just want you to be aware of that.
- I have a question for Mr. Sullivan if that is possible?

- I know the planner just had a certain section of testimony right now but as a planner the person also be responsible for any projections of school children for this particular development.

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- I guess you are asking me whether you can ask that question of Mr. Keller.
- I think we touched upon this question last time and Mr. Keller indicated that they had not done any projections, is that correct Mr. Keller?

Terri Baird

- Correct.
- Okay I guess I misinterpreted my notes.
- Will this project be in pilot?

Eric Keller – Civil Engineer, Planner and Traffic Expert for the Applicant

- Correct.
- That is not part of my testimony.

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- The planning Board does not get to decide.
- That is not before us.

Terri Baird

- The reason why I was asking is because on the documents posted online there is a first amended and restated settlement agreement and in there it has ‘PILOT’, and something called ‘RAB’, and I wanted to know who I could ask questions about that too.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Addressed Mrs. Baird’s questions.

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- It would be an issue with the township committee not the Planning Board.
- It is legitimate to ask the question and you are not going to know necessarily that who’s jurisdiction this falls within but on occasion just as you asked, the question is outside the scope of this Board’s jurisdiction.

Closed to the Public

Kurt Vierheilig – Architect for the Applicant

- 777 Terrace Avenue Hasbrouck Heights, New Jersey.
- I am employed by DMR Architects.
- Gave his professional and educational background.
- Licenses are in good standing.
- Accepted by the Board.
- Exhibit A-8 will be the set of documents that was recently submitted with revision '2' dated '1/19/21'
- I just want to clarify that there were sheets in that set that were resubmitted that where the new revision dates were left off, sheets 'A1-1, A1-2, A1-5 and A1-7' when we prepare our conforming drawings as a result following the application, we will make sure to clean that up and amend that.

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- Clarified and further explained.
- If this application was approved those sheets revision dates will be corrected.

Kurt Vierheilig – Architect for the Applicant

- Went over sheet 'A1.0'
- Sheet 'A1-1' – 'Ground floor Plan', gave the number of parking spaces and described what the plan depicts.
- Sheet 'A1-2' – 'Second floor Plan' it is a colorized plan, went over all the amenities that are in this floor, the circulation, the location of the units including the 'COAH' units.
- Sheet 'A1-3' – 'Upper Third and Fourth floor Plan', specified the location of the development office depicted in the plan, explained the lay out of the same.
- Sheet 'A1-4' – 'The Roof Plan' it illustrates the location and configuration of the Solar Panel array lay out.
- Went over the mechanical units and explained how these are screened.
- The solar panel configuration was updated based on new information and as a request from your professionals.
- Sheet 'A1-6' – 'Unit Layout Configurations', went over the square footages of the ,1,2 &3' bedroom units, explained the layout, every units has been designed to be adaptable and further explained.
- Exhibit 'A – 9' – 'PR – 1', Colorized Rendering, dated 11/12/2020. It depicts the exterior view of the proposed building looking from Eden lane and gave details of materials, features and colors that will be used.
- Sheet 'A1 – 5', Went over the West side of the building elevation and gave the building heights.
- Sheet 'A1 – 7' 'Photometric of the Parking Garage', explained the light and that there will be not light spillage.
- Exhibit 'A – 10' – 'P – 2' dated 9/29/20, it illustrates that there will be no head light glare and further explained.
- Exhibit 'A – 11' – 'PR – 4' dated 11/24/2020, explained the garage openings and how the lighting will not have any spillage and or glare.
- Exhibit 'A – 12' – 'PR – 2' dated 11/16/2020, this exhibit provides a perspective of the location of the proposed building and what surrounds it.
- Exhibit 'A – 3' – 'PR – 3' dated it 11/26/202, this is another site section that cuts through Eden lane, the vegetation and further explained.
- Highlighted details regarding how this proposed building is highly efficient and further explained.

- Addressed the signage that is being proposed for this development, where it will be located, illumination and materials used for it.
- Addressed Member Glawe's question regarding the roofing material.
- Addressed Mayor Ferramosca's question.

Open to the Public

Steven Smith

- 5 Pleasant Valley, Whippany.
- What are the set back to the river, both in distance and in elevation?
- Within the building themselves are there any precautions or provisions for high water and drainage?

Kurt Vierheilig – Architect for the Applicant

- Deferred question to Mr. Keller, explained that he deals with the building footprint.
- The building and the siting of it, it is such that it is not in an area that is prone to flooding, agreed that this is more appropriate for the site Engineer to address.

John Kovaian

- I just want to let the Public know that I am deaf and that I utilize special equipment, when you enter the lobby, is there a way to access that?
- Is there a door person, a doorman, or doorbell if it is locked and they cannot... I cannot hear someone or the doorbell ringing, if there is a delivery or a visitor? How is that managed? Is there special equipment that accommodates people like myself that are deaf?
- If there is a deaf mail delivery person, a deaf pizza deliveryman, there are a lot of deaf people and they should have equal access.

Kurt Vierheilig – Architect for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Kovaian's question and further explained.
- An exchange of questions and answers between Mr. Kovaian and Mr. Vierheilig took place.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Kovaian's question and clarified that the area of expertise for Mr. Vierheilig is architecture and that he has not been qualified or certified as a 'Code specialist' in that regard.
- Mr. Sullivan will add a condition of approval that will require the applicant to comply with any and all laws, it is a very broad type of condition which the applicant will comply with in all regard.
- We are sensitive and understand that there will be possibly any other needs that will not be covered by code.
- We cannot possibly anticipate all of what they are but they applicant will agree to comply with all laws, rules, regulations, and codes that are required to comply with.
- Addressed Chairman De Nigris question.

Open to the Public

Terri Baird

- 180 Parsippany Road, Whippany.
- I have a question about the amenity deck, I believe that is the one with the pool, and the height of the building.
- The pool or the amenity deck or the opening part is on the North and the building height is on the South. How much shade coverage does that get in the summertime?

Kurt Vierheilig – Architect for the Applicant

- There will be shadow in the morning on one side and there will be shadow in the other side in the evening and further explained.

Terri Baird

- Just to let you know a ‘Chevy Tahoe’ the headlight is above 3ft. 2 inches on a stock Chevy Tahoe, I went out and measure it just so you know.
- Thank you.

Township Planner Blais Brancheau

- Followed up on Mrs. Baird question or comment, in relation to the testimony about shielding of the headlights at 3 ft. 2-inch wall height.
- In my understanding is the regulations are that headlights can be no higher than 4 ft. above ground.
- I wanted the architect to address the situation that the Mayor had asked about, what effect the new wall would have if you had a pickup truck with a 4 ½ ft. high head light.

Kurt Vierheilig – Architect for the Applicant

- Addressed Mr. Brancheau’s question and further explained.

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Clarified and further explained.

Closed to the Public

Open to the Public for comments

Anthony Sigalas was sworn in by the Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- Any member of the Public who wants to testify should put themselves on video if they are able to do so.

Anthony Sigalas

- Is this a time where I can address the Board as a whole?

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- Yes, it is.

Anthony Sigalas

- Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the moment, back when we were talking about the traffic situation Mr. Monzo had brought up good points and he was my hero for a moment until he brought up the fact that he wants the traffic light.
- As someone that lives on Eden Lane, Eden Lane is a lot more than just a pass-through street for me, is my address, is where I live, it is my front yard.
- Mr. Monzo was right people do cut through often Eden Lane. I see all the time sometime 5 o'clock you know sometimes I cannot even get into my driveway as it is.
- I am just thinking of if a traffic light is added what it does to my commute, it gives me another stop that I cannot get right home it is significantly impacting my quality of living and one thing that I do want to ask to consider and I do understand and this may be slightly outside of the scope of this meeting and if it is I apologize, but please let me know what is the correct scope; this driveway 'A' or roadway 'A' if this links to the rest of the property then the issue that Mr. Monzo had raised which he was 100 percent accurate it is only going to get exacerbated.
- People circumventing Route 10 traffic, Parsippany Road traffic, they are going to use a facility as a cut through and that is going to add even more traffic to Eden Lane, and it is going to significantly impact a current kind of residential street to have a huge traffic burden.
- Again, I do not know that this is the scope of this conversation, but I know that the decision has been made on the apartment building, but my request is for roadway 'A' to end and to not extend to the rest of the back half of the property.
- Allow there to be a walking path but no a driving path because then we are going to get even more traffic on Eden Lane.
- That is my comment, thank you everyone.

Terri Baird was sworn in by the Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

Terri Baird

- 180 Parsippany Road, Whippany.
- I think that the building is a very pretty building and it looks like it will be really nice, I am concern with the exterior parking spaces, the ability to get to them, and the height to go through the parking garage to get to the outside parking spaces because some people drive vehicles that are a little bit on the high side then they cannot get in to those parking garages so my suggestion would be to make sure that there is a loop around the building; that would help with the fire truck also.
- The paperwork that is on the cloud I feel could be improved by being updated and, also including Blais' and Gerry's reports so that everything is in one spot and that is updated with the most current information because it did not seem to be done this me.

- I would hope that in the future those types of things would be taken care of.
- Thank you very much.

Closed to the Public

John Inglesino – Attorney for the Applicant

- Summarized and made his closing statement.
- On behalf of the applicant, I would like to thank the Members of the Board, its professionals, and members of the Public for your participation and attention to this matter and further elaborated.
- We are looking to develop the best project possible for my client and for Hanover Township, we feel we are in the same team in that regard.
- This application in our opinion is fully compliant and further elaborated.
- The only potential deviation that is being requested is regarding parking and further explained.
- On behalf of my client, we thank you and we respectfully ask that the Board look favorably upon this application with the conditions that have been stipulated it.

Attorney for the Board Michael Sullivan

- Summarized.
- This is an application for River Park for Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision, Preliminary and Final site Plan approval Building 1 on proposed lot 2.03.
- To permit the construction of a 4 story, 81-Unit, Multifamily Residential Apartment Building with their associated amenities.
- The only question regarding the division from our ordinances is about to the Parking.
- The applicant has provided 159 parking spaces and argued both under the temporary condition with the 4th floor office in place and when that disappears, that they are compliant with the parking.
- In the first instance it will be 159 exactly compliant and then after that office space disappears, they would have a parking requirement of 154.
- Mr. Brancheau has indicated that perhaps the ground office/ reception area should also contain a 6.1 parking space requirement.
- In that instance when the 4th floor office space is in use, applicant has a deficiency of 6 parking spaces, and then when the 4th floor office space dissipates the applicant would have a 1 parking space deficiency.
- The other thing to keep in mind is the Board can find that there is shared parking approach, and that relief is not required.
- I think as a threshold requirement the Board has to say I believe relief is required or not required and if it is required; whether relief is appropriate, now if the motion is to approve, I think it should contain the following:
 - The applicant shall comply with and satisfy paragraphs ‘1’ through ‘23’ contained in the Township’s Engineer Memorandum dated 11/20/2020.
 - The applicant shall comply with and satisfy paragraphs ‘B1’ through ‘B24’ contained in the Township’s Planner review memorandum dated 02/16/2021.
 - The Plan shall be revised to add an addition street tree on the east side of road ‘A’ and two additional street trees on the west side of road ‘A’ in compliance with section ‘3.21C1’.

- In addition, the applicant has stipulated that they will provide charging outlets for every parking space in the garage.
- During the 4th floor office use, if there is a parking deficiency noted, the applicant stipulated that they would provide an additional 5 offsite parking spaces.
- The applicant also agreed to modify the signage on crosswalks to rectangular rapid flashing beacon design or as directed by the Township Engineer.
- The applicant shall install the Boxwood Court parking striping or other striping as directed by Township Engineer if permitted by the party having jurisdiction to grant such authorization and standard conditions the applicant is bound by all its representations made during the course of the hearing.
- The applicant shall comply with all applicable laws.
- The applicant shall correct the revision dates with respect to the architectural plans specifically sheets 'A1-2', 'A1-5' and 'A1-7'.

A motion to approve this application with conditions and no parking variance required was moved by Member Gallagher and it was seconded by Member Critchley.

Members Deehan, Dobson, Glawe, Olsen, Byrne, Critchley, Gallagher Mayor Ferramosca and Chairman De Nigris voted in favor of approving the application with conditions and no parking variance required.

Board Secretary Kimberly A. Bongiorno, LUA

- Requested of Mr. Vierheilg submission of all the 'Exhibits' presented.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to Adjourn was moved by Member Byrne and seconded by Member Olsen.

In voice all preset voted in favor to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:52 PM

KIMBERLY A. BONGIORNO, LUA.
BOARD SECRETARY
PLANNING BOARD
TOWNSHIP OF HANOVER
COUNTY OF MORRIS
STATE OF NEW JERSEY