

**Minutes of the Planning Board of the
Township Of Hanover
April 23, 2019**

Chairman Eugene Pinadella called the Work Session Meeting to order at 7:00 PM in Conference Room "A" and The Open Public Meetings Act Statement was read into the record.

Board Secretary, Kimberly Bongiorno took the Roll Call.

In attendance were Members: Byrne, Critchley, De Nigris, Dobson, Ferramosca, Mayor Francioli, Nardone and Chairman Pinadella.

Absent were Members: Deehan, Glawe and Olsen.

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

Chairman Pinadella

- Reviewed the agenda.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Reviewed the Ordinance for the O.S zone with the Board and allowable uses and prohibited uses.
- Ok to introduce Thursday.

Member Ferramosca

- Down the road member Ferramosca wants a front foyer to make sure we get a high quality hotel.

Chairman Pinadella

- Reminded the Board to not have side conversations as they are being captured by the recorder.
- Members are to be recognized before speaking.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Chairman Pinadella called the Public Meeting to order at 7:31 PM and read the Open Public Meetings Act into the record.

The Board Secretary, Kimberly Bongiorno, called the roll.

In attendance were Members: Byrne, Critchley, De Nigris, Dobson, Ferramosca, Mayor Francioli, Nardone and Chairman Pinadella.

Absent were Members: Deehan, Glawe and Olsen.

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

RESOLUTIONS NONE

MINUTES – NONE

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1) **CASE NO.** 17-2-4-R1
APPLICANT/OWNER 28 SJR, LLC
LOCATION: 30 SOUTH JEFFERSON ROAD
CEDAR KNOLLS
BLOCK: 2904 **LOT(S):** 6.01 **ZONE:** I

Applicant is seeking amended preliminary and final site plan and “C” variance relief .
The applicant proposed to modify the terms of the prior approval by increasing the approved principal structure from 27’ to 33’

Board Action Date – JULY 18, 2019

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Gave an overview of the previous approvals and uses on the site.
- It is very limited this proposal, most of this board members where here for the prior application for the applicant on south Jefferson.
- It was an improvement on an existing office, they did house years ago and we converted it into an office to Star-Lo communications, to Star Lo electrics.

- We were back here in the summer of 2017 to expand the structure, go up and back with the warehouse use and expand the office use.
- We went through DEP approvals in the process.
- There was a recycling component as well.
- The garage door entrance is not tall enough as it is approved so we need the top height of the building to go up.
- Still conforms to the code, there is not variance relieve needed at all still complies.
- However the code has a requirement which links the height of the building to the side yard setback.
- We always had a side yard setback variance during the prior application.
- We were proposing 10 ft. and 10 ft. was approved.
- That is not changing tonight 10 ft. remains proposed as approved, the box of the building doesn't change.
- But the setback requirement is not larger because the building is taller, it still conforms to the height of the building but the setback is greater so there is technically a variance to relive for that which brings us here as well as the amended site plan component.
- It's relatively limited but it is essential for Star-Lo communications purposes to have the garage door higher from a practical stand point to have trucks come in and out of there so it is a necessity for us.
- We need to come to this board to accomplish that.
- Tonight we have one witness to show you and exhibit, explain to you what we're doing and where in the limited nature of the proposal.

Chairman Pinadella

- Have you received the report from our planner Mr. Brancheau?
- He has a number of items in there, but there are two key items that we would like to have addressed.
- One is the roof equipment if any, what happened to it, where is it going?
- The other is how the handling of water off the roof through the gutters and leaders, before it used to be internal to the building into the drainage system and we would like to make sure that we clearly understand what is happening now.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Fred Stewart is the engineer in record for the prior application he remains that today.

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart Sworn by the board's Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Fred Stewart, Professional Engineer and Land surveyor.
- 148 East Main Street, Rockaway NJ.

Township Planner Blais Brancheau and Township Engineer Gerardo Maceira P.E., Sworn by the Board's Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- He's been offered as a professional Engineer.
- License still in full force and effect
- Will describe to the board by way of description what these elevations show.
- As far as the roof run off that was previously directed towards drainage swale that is located between the boundaries of the property.
- If you're looking at the building from the road way it's in the left hand side, and that is what we intend to do with this proposal as well.
- It was from what I understand a flatter roof previously and previously the drainage actually went through the building; it came out from underneath the building and directed towards the drain swale.
- We intend on doing it the same way as far as doing it towards the drains swale, but now we are going to have roof leaders and gutters on the outside of the roof.
- My exchange it's now a pitch roof and that is how is going to drain gutters and leaders that will be collected and then go underground at the collection point and then exposes them at the drainage swale itself.

Chairman Pinadella

- So what you're saying is that you are going to pipe it under ground in order to get it to the drainage swale?

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- Correct, because on the right hand side and the left hand side of the building leaders go down then go underground and circumvent the building and go out towards the drain swale on the left side of the building.
- On sheet 3 of my drawings which the board has, they're revised 2/14/19, there is a proposed 5 ft. by 16 ft. concrete AC generator pad that is located on the left side of the building right behind the where the existing building is now that is where we are proposing our AC units and a generators.
- Previously they were on the roof top and from what I understand there is an existing one in that location now along with an existing generator too.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- The prior approval had both rooftop and both; AC and generators pads, so the only change on that was you only eliminated it the roof top one, they didn't add any on the ground.
- Is that pad that you are showing large enough to handle all the AC and generator needs for this building?

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- Yes it is.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- I would like Fred Stewart to testify as to what you heard me prophet to as to the change height of the structure, the taller garage door.
- These are the plans prepared by Kent Fox.
- They were amended so we are going to mark these Mike, because these were amended following the issuance of the Board reports, and the TRC meetings.
- These should what would be; I would call post approval ready if this board acted to approve on the application tonight.
- They are slightly modified, Fred would tell you what has changed on this plans.
- The architectural elevations that you had before you, as it describes the new the new height as proposed.

The Board's Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- We're going to mark this as A – 1
- Just give me the new title block and new revision date.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- It's titled "Floor plans elevations and sections" prepared by Fox Architectural design, last revision date 4/22/2019.

The Board's Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Our professionals have not looked at these, correct?

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- I don't believe so.
- It's one sheet, it's A – 1.

Exhibit A -1

- Floor plans elevations and section revision date 4/22/19

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- That same drawing is mounted in this board here.
- To summarized, basically here in this upper right hand corner; you see there is the door that we are speaking about. That originally was at 10 ft. we have now raised it to 14 ft. to accommodate the service vehicles.
- In doing that we had to raise the roof of the building from the last submission it was originally at 29 ft. per the building height calculation
- We had to raise that up to 32.65 ft., which is only 3.65 ft. per building height to accommodate the new doorway.

- In doing that, what happens with that is that for the side yard it is actually increased by 1.5 times the building height; which equates to 49 ft.
- Originally what we had on the plan was 43 ft.
- Because of the 29 ft. height now we went to 32.68 ft. I guess it equates to 49 ft.
- Again the side yard should be at 49 ft. we are at 10 ft., as originally approved and on the last application that is where we remain so that is the variance that we are requesting from 29ft. down to 10 ft. for the side yard.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- In the profit of the board Fred; now the 10ft. previously approved side yard setback is that correct? There is no change in the proposed set side yard, now the requirement has increased?

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- Yes that is correct, the requirement has increased.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Can you explain how is different from the plans that were submitted before?
- The changes between this and the last review.

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- Sure.

The Board's Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- The last revision that we have is 02/11/2019.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- That was the last iteration before this one.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- I see you added the dimension of the height of the wall fixtures, was there anything else?

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- Yes, besides the wall fixtures height, we have the lights we added that.
- We also added the finished notes to the left and side elevations as far as the finish goes for the building itself.
- We added notes clarifying location of HVAC units and condenser pads next to the building that is also showing on my plan as well.

- We added notes regarding connecting the roof leaders to underground pipes through the site as well

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Are there any additional copies or reduce size versions of what was marked as A – 1 so we can follow along with this.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- They are full size unfortunately.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- I want one I don't know that anybody else wants one.

Chairman Pinadella

- You've basically taken care of all the additional comments on t Mr. Blais Brancheau's report for each section on page 2.
- And obviously number 4 just stated that all conditions that were originally approved will remain.
- I think that we all agree

Engineer for the Applicant, Fred Stewart

- Yes, that is correct.
- Certainty

Chairman Pinadella

- Are there any questions from the board?
- After seeing and hearing none, I will open it up to the public.

Open to the Public

After hearing none.

After seeing none.

Closed to the Public.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Provided summary.
- Thanked board members, Kim, Gerardo and Blais for their time and assistance in getting them in a prompt agenda.

Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Mr. Brancheau are you satisfied that Exhibit A – 1 address your comments; B1, B2 and B3?
- Or do we need to carry that forward as part of the motion and give you time to check it.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- B1; was addressed in testimony.
- B2; is addressed by this revised plan.
- B3; I think it's addressed on the architectural but I think the side plans should be revised; to show the rerouting of the roofing to the swale from the other side of the building.
- They already show it on one side.

Chairman Pinadella

- Do you understand that request?

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Yes, we'll take care of it.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- I am sorry and B2 was on the plans, correct?
- I think that you testify that it was.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Yes it is on the architectural.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Summarized conditions.
- The motion would be to approve amended preliminary and final site plan approval subject to those items in subsection B that we just went over with Mr. Brancheau's April 17 report.

A motion to approve with conditions was moved by Member Nardone and seconded by member Ferramosca.

Members Critchley, Dobson, Nardone, Byrne, De Nigris, Mayor Francioli and Chairman Pinadella; all voted in favor of approving the resolution with conditions.

2)	CASE NO.	19-1-2
	APPLICANT	ALGONQUIN REALTY, LLP
	OWNER	THE ALGONQUIN REALTY CO.

LOCATION: 160 ALGONQUIN PARKWAY (24 TROY ROAD)
WHIPPANY
BLOCK: 6902 **LOT(S):** 3&4 **ZONE:** I

Applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan and “C” variance relief to improve and expand the existing parking and loading areas of the property, inclusive of adding parking spaces, restriping parking areas, resurfacing parking areas and adding directional signage both near the Algonquin frontage and along the southern side of the property.

Board Action Date – JULY 18, 2019

Chairman Pinadella

- Have you and your professionals received Mr. Brancheau and our Engineer Mr. Maceira’s report?

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- We have Mr. Chairman, thank you.
- The applicant is Algonquin Realty LLP.
- Gave an overview of the property and the requested additional parking.
- The property is an existing large warehouse.
- Structure and property in an industrial zone, about 4 ½ acres.
- The proposal is limited to improving and expanding the existing parking fields for future tenant needs.
- It’s sort of a value add opportunity for us, we’re respectively looking in the future and what the tenant needs will be, sort of functionality and improve the parking areas.
- The building is not changing.
- The approved uses of the building are not changing to not permitted uses.
- No structural additions.
- It is really just exterior improvements to the parking fields.
- The applicant has endeavor over the years and has own this property for decades through family generations.
- To improve the site, recently there have been reroofing efforts on the site; the exterior has been repainted, there’s more to go, we’re going to do some sidewalk improvements etc.
- I notice that in Mr. Brancheau’s report in particular; he referenced many things observed during a field observation that wanted addressed.
- The prior tenant of us had just thrown stuff outside, pallets of medical equipment that tenant is gone we are cleaning that up.
- Sidewalk repair; we agreed to that.
- Fire planting that were installed, have died since, from storm, salting and plowing, we’ll likely have to address that as well but we’re not here because of that.
- It’s just an instance application for development.
- We’re not here because of any violations.
- The applicant is looking to improve and resurface their parking fields.

Chairman Pinadella

- Can you tell me how many tenants are there in the building now?

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli.

- Sure, we're actually going to take through during our engineer testimony; because that number has to do with our parking that is in the field.
- Which is short of parking, it has been for years. It works.
- We're light on the coat but we're okay as it operates.
- We are increasing parking slightly, but the tenancy and who's there and what they do affects parking as well.

Chairman Pinadella

- You're introduction stated that there's a medical device company that is no longer there?

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- A lot of wheelchairs apparently were observed out there.
- I am not sure of what that tenant does; perhaps a distributor or wholesaler of the equipment, but that tenant is gone from my understanding.

Chairman Pinadella

- That was CMC?

Attorney for the applicant, Larry Calli

- Yes

Chairman Pinadella

- I thought they were still there

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- CMC is still there yes.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen Sworn by the board's Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Peter Korzen
- 26 Orchard St, Whippany, NJ.

Township Planner Blais Brancheau and Township Engineer Gerardo Maceira P.E., Sworn by the Board's Attorney Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- I testify before this court before in September for minor subdivision.
- I'm a licensed as a professional Engineer, Land Surveyor and planner in New Jersey.
- I have been operating in the course for Engineering for 15 years
- All licenses are current.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Pete, I see you have up there a sheet. Is that the same sheet that had been filed with this board?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- It is. It's sheet (SIC), with all the existing conditions, plan is revised March 13.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Ok great.
- If you could orient the board a little bit with the property as it exists today and then we will get to the proposed improvements.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- It is located at the South East corner of Algonquin Parkway and Troy Rd.
- 4 ½ acres roughly.
- It does contain the building in the center of the property.
- There's access to the southerly portion of the Algonquin Parkway that driveway leads to a parking area in front of the building.
- There's a front door located there.
- Continues to wrap around the building for supplemental parking.
- There are also 3 floating doors in that portion of the building.
- The northerly side of the building is accessed form Troy Rd.; there is a driveway that provides access to a small parking area there. Front door is located at that location.
- It also provides parking in the back of the building and your three loading doors in the depressed area and one at grade loading area.
- There is currently a driveway connection with joint lot 2 on East side and the remainder of that is all gone.
- I should also mention that right now the striping on the site; is none existing.
- There is some striping but it doesn't really give an indication of how far to park.
- So this plan is the overall dimension plan, sheet (SIC) last revise of March 13 and this shows primarily what we are doing with the striping.

- In addition it shows a 50 ft. wide pavement expansion area on the East side of the Northerly portion of the building.
- With the striping we have 100 spaces.
- If you look on sheet 2 of the site plan package, you can see a loading and parking requirements table.
- On that table there are 98 spaces listed as existing, again it is not stripe but we did our best to count where cars would be parked.
- With this proposed lay out we have some new parking areas on the South side of the Southerly portion of the building for the fire department access.
- Also, one area for trucks to pull in back into the new loading area
- In addition we are providing 88 new parking spaces. There's currently some on site and we are bringing it up to total striping by 2 spaces at the Northerly entrance and 2 in the Southerly as well.
- Next screen that I'll bring up is an enlargement of the site plan, this is the dimension grading of the drainage sheet (SIC) last was revised March 13.
- This shows the East side of the northerly portion of the building and the pavement entrance shading.
- It also shows the post grading within that extension area and the drainage as well.
- Our drainage is comprised of a single inlet located in the center of that pavement expansion and it connects to a new sewer man hole which is over an existing pipe which then runs off site.
- We kept that area under one quarter of an acre so no storm water management is required per code.
- This plan also shows a proposed paved road located on the east side of that extension and that consists of 55 poly trucks which get to be up 4 ft. to 6 ft. height that are 4ft. to 5 ft. wide.
- Ok this is the lighting plan on your packet, sheets 6, 7 and 8, that is revised March 13.
- Proposed lighting it is showing in the East side Northern portion of the building and it is all illuminated by wall pack fixtures.
- There are a total of 8 wall pack fixtures distributed around the building.
- You can see the symbols; mounting heights are all 15 ft. high, you can see the illumination levels in the parking fields as well.
- They all satisfied the township code.
- They also do not allow any light crossing the property lines.
- As a result of the improvements you can see on sheet 2, sheet 1 in your packet on the top right there's this only data table and they have to do with code requirements.
- You can see that no variances are required there.
- With the extension; the percentage of impervious the surfaces below the 65% we're okay there.
- Moving to the bottom center of the sheet; you can see a building use breaking down area and that is where we get with the tenants.
- Currently on the South side of the building, 2 tenants; Mark Trece which is a graphic design firm.
- And CMC is a mobility company, wheelchairs and so forth. They occupy that portion of that building.
- On the Northern side of the building there is now a new tenant Berlisk which makes a whole variance, so they would be the new exclusive tenant in that side of the building.

- Getting back to the building breakdown table, none of that is going to change even with Berlisk coming in.
- You can see in the North side; there is a 27,000 sq. ft. of warehouse space and 6,000 sq. ft. of office.
- For the South 2 tenants there is 11,000 ft. of warehouse and 15,000 sq. ft. of office.
- So we use those numbers to calculate required parking.
- All of that is showing in the parking and requirements table on sheet 1.
- You can see the tenant and the square footages
- There's a correction made to this, there's actually 64 spaces that's required for that portion of the building not 54.
- On the South side with the tenants there, you can see there's 89 parking spaces required.
- There are a total of 153 spaces required and as I mentioned 100 stripe spaces there; so that is one variance that is required there.
- Moving down with some of the designs standards to comply with the stall size.
- Distance from the building, distance with the side property lines including the re-pavement extension, loading spaces dimension of the loading access isle for the side of the Northerly portion of the building.
- However there is one variance that is required and has to do with that distance from the front property line.
- This lot is a corner lot, so you have to front yards; one on Troy Rd. and Algonquin Parkway.
- Currently the parking area on the East side of the Northerly portion of the building is 38ft. from the Troy Rd. right way line.
- We're planning on extending that out with this new parking area so we ended up with 38 ft. at that corner as well so that is our second variance.
- One of the comments that was in the engineer's review letter has to do with vehicle circulation and truck circulation so we created this exhibit which you don't have yet; I am going to call this A – 1, it's titled truck turning diagram.

Exhibit A – 1

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Titled "Truck turning Diagram" sheet 1 of 1 dated April 22, 2019.
- This is a further enlargement of that other site plan that I brought up before it shows the East side of the Northerly portion of the building specifically the 3 loading doors and the depressed loading area and the at grade loading door as well.
- This 69 ft. semitrailer that's shown, pulls in you can see the turning radius pulls through the existing curve that is no longer there into the expanded parking area.
- You can see that you can easily make these two doors where the Southerly door and loading area; it probably has to make another turn but it is certainly an improvement.
- Right now there is only 74 ft. from the building to the curve and you are dealing with at 69 ft. truck.
- I was out there at the end of November; and I witness a truck that probably took 8 turns to get into those loading doors; so we are definitely improving with this design.

Chairman Pinadella

- You mentioned the engineer's report, put your previous chart up with the 6th base in the front of that area and take a look at his number 2, not the truck there; the one that shows the parking in the front of the building.
- You mentioned the set back of those six spaces in front of the building apparently if anybody were to use them they had to back out of those spaces into the main parking lot, so that has to be revised.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- I was going to go through the review letters.
- They (parking spaces) have been like that since 1970.

Chairman Pinadella

- That doesn't make them right.
- That doesn't mean we are going to approve them that way.
- You're going to have to look, to correct it.
- Because whoever is parking in that parking area has to back out actually into the driveway to turn around and be able to do anything.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Certainly it could be accomplished the only thing it would have another variance by pushing that curve line out towards Troy Rd.

Chairman Pinadella

- You're absolutely right and that is what our Engineer and our Planner pointed out and I think that's preferable to what you have there.
- I don't know how the rest of the board feels; I think that so you are going to have to look at that very carefully.
- We can go over more when we get to the plans but I think that is a specific problem that you need to correct.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- That's item 2 in the engineer's report.

Chairman Pinadella

- Correct and it's also in the planner's report.
- I think that we may be willing to conceive the issue with the front yard parking and how close it is.
- If that gets corrected, the isle way gets improved and we get some landscaping, some bushes to cover up that section, I think we can improve the look of that one parking area

- You'll see that is in both of their comments which I happen to agree with.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- So right now we are at 32 ft. and we're making it 49 ft. so we're probably going to end up with a 20 ft. setback from the right away.

Chairman Pinadella

- Correct.
- Only because you went through all the parking; I wanted to make sure we cover that immediately, we can go through the rest of the reports when you are ready.
- Is everybody in agreeance with that, Jerry (Gerardo), Blais are you ok with the changes?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- If you are going to move that curve closer to the street, I would recommend that you put some sort of shrubbery to help shield it from the street.

Chairman Pinadella

- I ask for that also, that we get shrubbery to cover that and that they improve it according to the notes that you both have provided.
- Is there more you want to cover with us?

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Is that a new variance or is that effecting the parking setup from the front lot land line?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- I am not sure of what you're saying?
- There's a variance to move that isle closer to the street.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Is that a new third variance that we are now talking about?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Yes, I mean it's the same section that is being violated by the proposed extension, but it's adding to that.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- It's acerbating that?

Chairman Pinadella

- Yes, but we're requesting that get done, with the landscaping that will hopefully protect from the street.
- One thing you haven't talked about, I think it's both of the reports also.
- There are dumpsters all over this property.
- Are there any spaces where the dumpsters are going to be located?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Currently there are dumpsters scattered on several locations.
- We feel that; there is a large area that actually serves both buildings located in the South East corner we could put a large enclosure and have multiple dumpsters in it.
- If for some reason that side of the building needed additional refuse and recycling, there's a bump out of the side of the corner we could add something right there as well.

Chairman Pinadella

- That will be added to the plans?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- It will.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Can we go back one moment?
- Pete and Mr. Chairman, I want to be certain that if we are going to know the specific dimension to the variance.
- I'm certain that you are Mike in your new resolution is 20 ft. the number that accomplishes.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Unfortunately I don't have a good setback number, and can't answer that right now.

Chairman Pinadella

- Our Engineer estimated it to be roughly 27 ft. in his notes.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- You said 20 ft. gets you enough for planting is what you are looking at right?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Sure, sure
- I am going to continue

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Yes, just please try to go in order so I can follow, you keep flying all over the place.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Addressed the township engineer's review letter dated April 17, 2019.
- We're going to redesign the parking spaces themselves, side walk curve ramps and so forth.
- Illuminate a threshold riser which is currently located on the North side of the building; we'll take care of that as well.
- Item number 5; has to do with existing lot curve and concrete sidewalk repair.
- I believe the side walk is in the public portion which will be repaired and possible some curve sections. I am not sure where they are but we'll take a look at those and we'll repair those.

Chairman Pinadella

- It's all around the back.
- Not the area that you're changing, but the area where you mentioned about the second dumpster.
- If you look in the area of the second dumpster, there are lot problems.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Okay.
- Item number 7, we just touched upon with the revised parking area of the Northside with all these landscaping along Troy Rd.
- Item number 10 it's a recommendation for a guide rail and a depressed loading area in the back Northerly portion of the building.

Chairman Pinadella

- You mean item number 8

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- I'm sorry yes item number 8.
- There's an existing wall on that location on the South side to the rest of the main.
- The North side has slope asphalt which leads up to parking areas.
- We're proposing lead that doesn't cause any problems.
- I don't see the need of guide any rails right now it's working the way it is.

Chairman Pinadella

- Is that acceptable to the engineer?

Township Engineer, Gerardo Maceira, P.E.

- My recommendation was to add the guide rail I thought there was a need for it for safety purposes.
- But ultimately the board will make a final decision.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Yes it is up to the Board.
- Board you want to insist on that?

Mayor Francioli

- If the engineer is recommending it I support it.

Member Ferramosca

- I support it too; from a safety perspective.

Chairman Pinadella

- We'd like you to add the guard rail.

Township Engineer, Gerardo Maceira, P.E.

- Okay the guard rail would be located on the merge area on the South side by the wall.

Township Engineer, Gerardo Maceira, P.E.

- I don't recall there's a parapet on the wall, unless I'm wrong. If there's a parapet I would say that is probably sufficient.
- I don't recall that there is a parapet on the wall. We can make that determination.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Okay, I will coordinate with Jerry (Gerardo).
- Item number 9 has to do with the transformer that is located at the North East corner of the building.
- Currently there's not protection from that so we are going to add a concrete column or two.
- Item number 10 has to do with fixtures that are currently marked per code.
- They are not shielded.

- I believe that right now the building is undergoing renovations; where there is going to be new LED fixtures throughout.
- We are going to make sure that all those are compliance.

Chairman Pinadella

- Take a look at the one especially by the driveway on Troy Rd.
- On the building there; the first light glares into Troy Rd. in the evening so take a good look at that one and on how you handle it.
- The rest I think are in term.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Item number 11 has to do with the downspouts that are disconnected form the drainage system.
- We'll make sure they are plug back into the drainage receptacles on the pavement there that are located in the back of this building here.

Chairman Pinadella

- Are there receptacles?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes

Chairman Pinadella

- Because every one of the leaders actually float right onto the parking area.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Right, it probably just broke off.
- I'm not sure what the reason is.

Chairman Pinadella

- It looks like somebody just put some loose additions to the leaders to make sure they get into the parking areas.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Right

Chairman Pinadella

- I mean around the whole building that has to get corrected.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Okay, I understand.
- Item number 12 has to do with sidewalk along the road would be repaired where necessary.
- Moving onto Blais' report.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- So just to go over those, I guess you're agreeing to all of them.
- With respect of number 2, that setback is going to be reduced down to 20ft.
- I think that's where we ended up.

Chairman Pinadella

- Well they're going to work together on that to come up with the final; whether it's 27ft. or 20ft.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- We'll say approximately

Chairman Pinadella

- Right.

Township Engineer, Gerardo Maceira, PE.

- I had scaled 27 ft. for the parking isle to the right away of Troy Rd.
- I am not sure how much distance the landscaping is going to take.
- I think the variance is the 27 ft.
- My thought was that it was going to be 90 degree parking with a 24ft. isle.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- The building is 75.68 if you subtract the 42 ft. isle and space combination that leads you to 23.68 ft.
- If you have a 6 ft. side walk that leads to you 17.68 as the setback dimension to the curve.

Chairman Pinadella

- What number did you come up with Blais?

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- What's the variance number?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- I'm saying 17.68 ft. more or less; you have cars hanging over the curve.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes, I agree it's 27 ft. to the curve line and beyond that whatever Blais.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Blais, but the variance is 17 ft. or 27 ft.?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- The building is 75.68 ft.; you need 42 ft. for the parking area.
- Subtract that, which leaves 33.68 ft.
- Then you subtract a 6 ft. sidewalk you it's 27.68 ft.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- So that is the variance 27.68 ft.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- More or less.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- What was the 17 ft. we just said?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- I made a mistake.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- We are 27ft.

Chairman Pinadella

- Yes we are good with that.
- What we are saying I believe is; we are willing to go along with that to get the improvements.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- You rather have the variance than what you consider a poor condition?

Chairman Pinadella

- Exactly.
- Yes for safety reasons.

Member Ferramosca

- You referenced testimony was with 6 that you would include replacing or repair curving or on a dumpster area in the North side of the building.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes, we'll take a look at the entire site and make repairs of what's necessary.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- So that was repair of the curving and dumpster area?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- I would say in the East side of the southerly portion of the building.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- I think I have the same comment on my report, if the board could specify the enclosure?
- When you say dumpster, I would like to clear if it's a pad with an enclosure around the dumpster itself?

Chairman Pinadella

- I believe that's what he testify that's what he would do.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Did he? I missed it.
- Did he talk about the material, not like a chain link?

Chairman Pinadella

- No yet.
- But I think that as far as what we're talking about; is that the enclosure on 3 sides we would prefer that it'd be blocked with whatever kind of gates that you want to put on it.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- I'm not sure if you believe if you blocked the view if it's visually apparent from the road and you wanted to make it for aesthetic reasons but I don't really see the point of that here.
- You have the building in display, South East corner. I mean if you put it here no one is going to see it.
- I can put a block on there.

Chairman Pinadella

- My concern is that; the service that is coming in to get the dumpsters is going to destroy anything that is not solid.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- There's plenty that do ok.

Chairman Pinadella

- There's an awful lot that I've seen that seemed to knock the fences down so as a result I think you need to put something sturdier there.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Typically we request bollards to protect the enclosure from getting damage by trucks that place to take the wheel off to make except a vinyl fence.
- I think a 6 ft. vinyl fence we'd probably go with.

Chairman Pinadella

- I think that you need to come up with a proposal that our engineering and planner would accept.
- I want to make sure that the enclosure is sturdy.
- And when trucks come in to pick up the dumpster isn't going to knock it down.
- Whatever you come up with, you can work with them about the location and what the enclosure is going to look like as long as we get them enclosed.
- You can go ahead to Mr. Brancheau's report.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Reviewed planners report dated April 16, 2019.
- Some of these comments are duplicates.
- The first one is item number 2.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Before you lead, item number 1 here, you've got the exhibit there it only shows the movement to pull into the site into the space.
- How about leaving the site? The truck.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- The trucks
- I don't have that prepared.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Can the board require that as a condition?
- There are two issues.
- 1 is; does the truck leaves the same driveway it came in?
- Because if you have a 60ft. truck traveling through the site I am not convinced that the turning ratios are adequate if you were to leave through the other driveway.
- If you leave out of this driveway, I'd like to make sure that he can make the movement as if you were to go out form the other driveway from below the space.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- It's my understanding that big trucks only have to service the Northern portion.
- Truck will not go out Algonquin side of the property.
- It will only be smaller trucks, freight trucks and stuff like that.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- So they're going out only off the Troy hill's driveway.
- Buy again if I have a large truck, clearly the lot design was not design for large trucks, it was originally design for smaller trucks.
- But the larger truck if I 'm leaving the site out to Troy Road, Can I make that turn without having to jockey out the truck?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- It is possible that they are going to have to make multiple point turns, that's why this area is restricted for parking so that they maneuver and can make multiple turns.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- So you don't see any problems with that turn going?
- It's clearly an improvement of what's there.
- I'd just like to know if there are any problems with that that is why I ask for the template.

- You've addressed part of it. But the template doesn't show me the whole picture.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Blais as I understand you want a truck turning diagram showing trucks leaving the site the larger trucks out to Troy Road, is that correct?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Yes, for truck for example I have to jockey it, I want to make sure the other trucks are at the loading dock there's no risk of him striking other vehicles while he is doing the job the whole maneuver thing.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Okay so you're up to number 2.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes the parking requirements.
- The fact that the parking variance can go away if we provide a reserve parking plan and I'd love to be able to do that here but we need 53 spaces and we just don't have the room.
- We can possibly fit in another 8 spaces at this location, and another 9 over here, that is only 17 spaces and if we stated expanding beyond that then we are creating variance conditions, setbacks, etc.
- So I think that we are going to stick with our variance.
- I've been to this site 4 times and the most that I've seen is 24 vehicles.

Chairman Pinadella

- I've never seen many cars there either.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- In my report I did a fair amount of analysis of this and I suggested that it is impossible that the 2 variances that were requested may not be required depending upon the factual findings.
- That is that sort of critical thing that is going to have to be reflected in the record.
- Does the applicant have a position on that?

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- I appreciate the review and I think that is a very fair interpretation that you've reached, but the applicant position on the record is we are prosecuting a variance for the short fall and that is essentially it.

- I do tend to read the interpretation of the code the way you read it and you directed it on your report.
- I don't think that it would make much of difference tonight for purposes of the record if we are seeking a variance relief; we are improving over what's existing and overall the site improvements are being improved as well.
- As far as I am concern Blais I think we are asking for a variance and we're moving on to site improvements.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- So then in the terms of the variance, so this board is familiar, the town's code allows an applicant to build less parking than it's required by the code:
 - A) If he shows he doesn't really need that much
 - B) He could build it if it turns out he did need it or it turns out he switch the use to another use and he could really do that.
- Are you seeking relief from that bank parking requirement?
- Or are you because then the proofs would be different.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- I think you heard Mr. Korzen testify that his observations are that we are adequately parked or over parked as a site.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- What if the use changes?

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- We can't forecast that.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- I am trying to avoid the applicant having to return to this board.
- Every time the use this changes because we granted a parking variances for specific set of uses that could change and likely will change in the future and they may have different parking requirements.
- The zoning officers who sought as well the variances were only for those uses you'd have to go back to the board.
- I am sure you don't want to have to do that.
- We want to have you to have it there if there a reserve on the parking plan for those future changes of uses can occur and you can build for whatever parking you need within that plan to meet those needs without having to come back to the board and amend it.

Chairman Pinadella

- But I don't see where there could be reserved parking put in at this point.
- They're using every space they can.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- That's point one absolutely.

Chairman Pinadella

- I mean I don't think they're asking to build less than what they are showing.
- I think that is one of the offers you're making they don't have to build it if you don't need it.
- It could be put in as reserve.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- We'll but they have to show that if the use changes or even if the use remains the same but their needs change it could be built.
- With the last future parking plan said was that for example if this went to a use that it required less in a way of loading spaces but more in the way of parking space; the future parking plan could show a reduction in loading but an increase in parking.
- That would be preapproved, makes it administratively easy for the applicant in the future, and makes it administratively easy for the town in the future if the use changes to a more car intensive use but less intensive truck use.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- But with all that assume in place that's sort of an elevation in the sense that seems there's no other site improvements that would happen that wouldn't otherwise trigger true cycling anyway.
- There no assurance that it's an administrative approval
- It would have to be that it is the only change and it would have to fit with the rules of the parking.
- I don't think that there's enough to go on here to respectively to anticipate that here.
- I don't think that there's anywhere to build that reserve area anywhere here on this plan and I can't think of just about everything that would happen that would just trigger and industrial site in the future cycling for future changes.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- If the applicant wants to proceed I don't have any objection in doing that.
- I just want to save everyone a lot of trouble.

Chairman Pinadella

- I understand that what you're saying; but they are showing all the parking that they believe that they need and they are asking for a variance.

- It's going to be a problem for them to try to reserve parking on the space with any of the parking that is here and then turn into green space, which would be beneficial.
- Based on the work that they have to do, I mean this parking lot in a nut itself it's a disaster, it's all falling apart, it crumbling.
- They have to redo the entire parking area.
- If they want to ask for reserve parking; which I didn't hear to reserve some of the spots and not have to put them in and not black top it that's one thing.
- But think they're saying they prefer to go with the variance at this point and time and leave the parking as they are projecting it to be here is that correct?

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- I just want to it to be clear alright; saying you do not need the parking that the code requires it's not a valid basis for me.

Chairman Pinadella

- I understand but if you look at this lot, I don't see where they can put the additional parking unless they want to do it in the front of the building along Troy Rd. and along Algonquin Parkway; which I prefer not to see. They have enough in the front of the buildings there.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- So the already approved reserved parking plan is going to be voided by this case?

Chairman Pinadella

- Where would it go?

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Is the parking layout right consistent with the future parking layout?
- I'm going to guess not.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- That's the question.
- That's the inquiry; wheatear or not it's voided or not.

Chairman Pinadella

- Unless they know the building down I don't know where they are going to put more parking, except in the front of the buildings.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Here's the future parking plans form 1973.
- Again if the applicant wants to proceed on that basis I am not objecting.
- What I am trying to say is you have to have a zoning officer now decide, anytime there's a change of use in this property does he send it back to the board for a variance. What do we do with that?

Chairman Pinadella

- Basically what they are proposing will limit what they can do as far as uses concerns in the future.
- Because they've maximized all the parking that they have.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Here is the require reserve parking plan, you can see basically the same area that we're looking at now that they have.
- There's that parking here.
- Obviously you can't do that without affecting that truck maneuvering area that the exhibit was showing, and that may be but you may not do this in its entirety you may be able to do just a portion of this.
- What I'm saying is the reserve parking plan along this lines you may take this bank out because you need it for the trucks maneuvering but it would give the applicant the option of building some or all of this in the future if he needed it and not have to come back to this board to get approval for this, it is like a preapproval loan.
- You are preapproved now you can buy the car.

Chairman Pinadella

- I know exactly what you're saying.
- The answer doesn't make sense to me at this point.
- Because this, if they want to change it, they have to come back here and explain to us how they are going to fit a different tenant there that is going to require that kind of parking.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- If that's what everyone wants to do that's fine.
- I'm just trying to point out that if it's not clear this is what it's all design for.
- The whole code section is design to avoid the need to come back to the board every time that that the parking needs changes.
- You've already preapprove and ultimate version that gives them the flexibility to do it either way.

Chairman Pinadella

- They would have to avoid the types of tenants that required that kind of parking.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- That may be.

Chairman Pinadella

- Because they don't have the ability for that kind of trucks on that property.

Mayor Francioli

- It appears they are willing to do that.
- You're willing to do that so why don't we go with what the request is.

Chairman Pinadella

- Okay so we're past that.

Mayor Francioli

- Blais in one of your comments; 'May accommodate alternate parking plan on the site?'

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- They have alternate parking plan over 200 parking spaces already preapproved in 1973.

Mayor Francioli

- So they do have a plan that's physical alternate parking.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- They have a plan yes.
- I was reading in my report asking for an updated it version keeping in mind changes are being made in the site as part of this application.
- That plan might not be fully possible what we're talking about with the dumpsters and with other things going on. So you may need to make an update it version of that plan to do that.

Mayor Francioli

- The dumpster areas will now consume parking spaces that will be removed from the ultimate parking plan.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Yes of what it's shown.

- Again standards have changed from back 1973. I think we were only requiring 1 space for every 250 sq. ft. for the whole building.
- We change the warehouse requirement to 800 sq. ft. so the actual parking requirements are much less today that they were in 1973.
- Therefore the new parking plan that you need today would not need all that's in this 1973 plan to comply with our order.
- But if the applicant wants to proceed on that basis of not having the future parking plan, then they have to provide proofs and if the use where to change in the future the zoning officer would be obligated to say go back to the board.

Chairman Pinadella

- That's where we're at.
- I think that they've made their decision that they have presented to us.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- I think that there is nothing that would be administratively proof that I would think anything is going to trigger a site plan or if we change the infrastructure in anyway.
- I think that it is sort of all and nothing sort of discussion on that.

Chairman Pinadella

- It's been presented to you, there is an option.
- You have chosen not to take it so let's move on.
- We're going to go with the plan that is before us.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- I suppose, yes sir.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- You were somewhere in section B of Mr. Brancheau's report; do you want to continue with that?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes, a lot of these were duplicates.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- I guess my pint would be if there's something you think they need to testify to; it would be fine.
- If you are stipulating that you will satisfy and comply with condition just tell us.
- If there is something you think it's a problem, let us know.

- I think you should discuss it a minimum.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- I really read through this and I really think the applicant is willing to comply with all of the items on section B planner's memo.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Blais in the past when we've seen a discrepancy on floor area ratio, we have no history that variances seem to exceeded, we either put in a finding that says "we're recognizing it but we're not approving it".

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- You can't you don't have jurisdiction.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Correct.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- So basically we've said we note it for the record, but we do not approve it.
- We do not have the ability to approve it or deny it, if it were to become an enforcement issue.
- In other words it can't be legally relied upon by the applicant in an enforcement act.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- But what we can say in the record is that there's been know not committed expansion on this building since it was developed in its facing as approved.
- We've seen CO's issued internally our team in the last day or so that have showed CO's and architectural drawing reflecting the building as it exists there today with no changes.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- So you're saying; there have been no expansions of the floor area, since when?
- I didn't hear what you said.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Since the time of buildup and CO.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- It violates today, I don't know the history of how or what had happened. Whether the code before the ratio went down and again that's on move; even if the applicant had a type case of grandfathering to present to the board we are powerless to accept that or reject not in our jurisdiction.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- The resolution will reflect Mr. Brancheau's comment so that you are aware of that.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- It is also relevant to the parking calculations of what's required and to approve the variances being sought.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- So the applicant is stipulating they are willing to comply with the remaining comments of Mr. Brancheau's memo.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- That is correct.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- The floor area that you stated in the plans, you stated to be the accurate floor area of the building.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes, that is correct.

Township Planner, Blais Brancheau

- Because that is less than what other records indicate.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Applicant is willing to comply with all of the times in section B of the planners report review date of 4/16/19.
- I'd like to touch up on the two variances.
- I know we have a variance for another parking space.
- Also the setback of Troy Rd.
- We believe that this site has more than adequate parking based on our experience out there.
- We're improving truck circulation drastically in the back of the Northern portion of the building.

- The added drainage where there's currently none, aligned with the curve line of the property line, we're providing landscaping.
- As far as planning goes, we feel that or I feel that this is a C1 hardship variance due to the nature of the site.
- We have a corner lot that restricts parking on the right away 75 ft. back.
- We have a large building located in the center of the site with only limit areas to park only in the back alongside the property lines.
- Because of that configuration it blends it shelf with the C1 hardship variance.
- I believe that it can be granted without the detriment of the public and also the imparity zone plan, master plan or land use.

Chairman Pinadella

- I would like to clarify one point.
- You are going to put landscaping around both parking areas that in the front yard; the one in Algonquin Parkway and the one on Troy Rd.
- You've agreed to that?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Is that shown in the plan?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- No.

Chairman Pinadella

- That should be done with our Planner and Arborist with their approval as to what you want to do and how you want to do it.
- We'd like those areas screened form the road. Okay?

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- Yes.

Mayor Francioli

- I know we have a comment regarding the fire chief's comment on these issues.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Was that the title 39 Mr. chairman?

Mayor Francioli

- Member Francioli.
- He is requesting the discussion with you regarding circulation around the site and its equipment so he can read his report he is also asking for that report consideration of title 39 agreement.

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- That's not a problem we will provide that.

Member Francioli

- I don't know what side entry in referring to?
- It does say the way will discuss the way out of the fire wings and signage.

Engineer and Planner for the Applicant, Peter Korzen

- I'm familiar with the fire wings but I will coordinate with the fire chief.

Chairman Pinadella

- I think he wants to make sure that any fire trucks can get around the building.

Open to the Public

After hearing none
After seeing none

Closed to the Public

Attorney for the Applicant, Larry Calli

- Summarized the application.
- The life in discussion brought to the Board request wasn't an instant application for development.
- This wasn't an applicant holding any violations.
- This wasn't an applicant seeking to disrupt a new principal structure.
- This is an improvement of existing of accessory areas for existing industrial uses on the property.
- It's not perfect working with the site that we've got and we have our own limitations here but I think that the board appreciates the fact that parking is expanding here, drive outs are improving here.
- Site functionality is improving here.
- There is a long list of accessory improvements that the applicant is conceding and willing to do to continue development and bettering of this property and in the future by growth of

development on the site; by the way of the shrubbery, landscaping, the side walk, the resurface, dumpster areas etc.

- I think over all it sort of a win, win application. It sort of works to everyone's benefit.
- If the applicant did choose one day to come in front to this board for this application and this proposal.
- With that being said Mr. Chairman we can put it in your hands and thank you for your time.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- Just to make that clarification on that one point the additional landscaping you requested and that's going to be subject to the arborist and to the planner is going to be?

Chairman Pinadella

- It's surrounding the parking area that's on the front yard on Troy Road., and the same with parking area that's in the front yard with Algonquin Parkway.

Member Nardone

- And that dumpster?

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- It's going to be subject to all those comments that we went through; Mr. Brancheau's report of April 16; B1 through B10 was clarified in the conversation there, which included the additional request for the Truck Turning Diagram for the trucks leaving the site out to Troy Rd.
- Mr. Maceira's report comments; 1 through 13 of this April 17 report; and that was also extended upon to provide.
- We don't want to specify the 6 ft. height fence but let's just say a suitable enclosure pending to their review.

Chairman Pinadella

- Except the bullet to the planner and to the engineer.

Member Nardone

- But with some protection and fence. That's where I would start and question.
- I wasn't sure we had agreed on bollards.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- We are requiring an enclosure that would provide sufficient protection.

Member Nardone

- So Jerry (Gerardo) would work on the structure with the applicant, that's where I was going.

Attorney for the Board, Michael Sullivan, ESQ.

- They need the variance that they originally applied for and now that we've also determined that there's also the 27 ft. setback in the parking area based upon our requirement to expand that area there.

A motion to Approve with conditions was moved by Member Critchley and seconded by Mayor Francioli.

Members Critchley, Dobson, Nardone, Byrne, De Nigris, Ferramosca, Mayor Francioli and Chairman Pinadella all voted in favor of approving with conditions.

Chairman Pinadella

- Wants the neighboring signage company property maintenance issues addressed by the property maintenance officer.
- My only comment is if it is perfectly acceptable and it is going to be outdoor storage then it needs to be screened because it looks horrendous.
- In the back of their property the signage property has stuff thrown in the corner. There may be signs that they are saving for whatever reason but if they are going to store outside it needs to be screened.

OTHER BUSINESS

Referral of Ordinance 19-2019 amending section 166-183.2 Permitted principal uses in the B-10 zone district and authorizing the Chairman to sign the referral letter to the Township Committee

A motion to refer to Township committee and authorized Chairman Pinadella to sign letter to township committee was moved by Member Nardone and seconded by Member De Nigris.

Members Critchley, Dobson, Nardone, Byrne, DeNigris, Ferramosca, Mayor Francioli and Chairman Pinadella agreed to refer to Township committee and authorized Chairman Pinadella to sign letter to township committee.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Member Ferramosca and seconded by Mayor Francioli.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:50 PM

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