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VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Good evening and welcome to tonight's meeting of the Cranford Planning Board, Wednesday, January 18th, Room 108 of the Municipal Building, 8 Springfield Avenue, Cranford, New Jersey.

This meeting is in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, as adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by publishing a notice of this meeting in the Westfield Leader with the -- sure. I'll read that slower.

So this meeting is in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, as adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by publishing a notice of this meeting in the Westfield Leader with the agenda specifying the time, place and matter to be heard, having been posted on the bulletin board in Town Hall reserved for such announcements and the filing of said agenda with the Township Clerk of Cranford. Formal action may be taken at this meeting.

May we please all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance?
(Pledge of Allegiance takes place.) VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Roll call, please.

MS. LENAHAN: Sure.
Mr. Pistol?
MR. PISTOL: Here.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Here.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?

MS. PEDDE: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?

MS. DIDZBALIS: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Here.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Drill?

MR. DRILL: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: And I am here.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: So tonight it's
the deliberation and voting on Application Number PB-20-002. The applicant being Hartz Mountain Industries, Inc., 750 Walnut Avenue, Block 541, Lot 2. The applicant in this matter is seeking preliminary and final major subdivision, preliminary and final major site plan residential and preliminary and final major site plan non-residential. Prior to our deliberations I would now like Mr. Drill to explain the procedure for tonight.

Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: So the board members -- I'm reading from a jury charge that I prepared and I sent out to all the board members on January 6th. It was posted up on the Township's website. Board members have now either heard in person, read transcripts of and/or viewed and listened to video recordings of the seven hearing sessions on the 750 Walnut application. The first hearing session was conducted on July 20,2022 and the seventh hearing session was conducted on December 14th, 2022. The eighth and last hearing session is scheduled for this evening, January 18, 2023, and it is devoted to board deliberating and voting on the application. As I said I would during the

December 14 th hearing session, I prepared a written jury charge to guide the board in deliberating and voting on the application. I've also prepared jury deliberation sheets to make it easier for board members to organize their thoughts in preparation for tonight's deliberations and voting. The jury charge contains my legal advice to the board as to the standards that the board should follow when deliberating and voting on each and every item of relief involved in the application. Most of the jury charge emanates from my planning board crib sheets which are available on my firm's website. Rather than providing copies of the applicable crib sheets for use in this application, I copied from portions of the applicable crib sheets and transformed the collection of crib sheets into a comprehensive document tailored to the 750 Walnut application. Now, I am not gonna read the remainder of the jury charge into the record because, again, the board members have had it, it's lengthy, it's 22 pages long, it's been up on the website. I do want to note that some board members had questions about my advice and the procedures that should be utilized for deliberating and voting tonight so the board went into a closed session to
get attorney/client privileged legal advice from me earlier this evening, after the board reorganized at 7:00. At approximately 7:30 the board went into closed session, and that took approximately a half hour, came out of closed session after getting my attorney/client privileged legal advice and I'm going to now give my suggestion for the procedure to be utilized and then ask the board to, on a motion, to either approve my suggested procedure or reject it and come up with one of your own.

So my suggested procedure -- I prepared these jury deliberation sheets. My suggested procedure is that the board chairman go through each and every piece of relief, there's nine pieces of relief identified in my jury deliberation sheets, and ask the board members -- for example, relief one, ask the board members if anyone wants to say anything about it. That's gonna be the deliberation. And then after board members -- they don't have to, but if they want to say something, they want to deliberate, they can. If people don't have anything to say, they don't need to say anything, but after everyone who has wanted to say something on sheet number one says whatever they want to say or not say, then we would -- my
suggested procedure is to then go back and straw poll all the board members on number one by reading my question so we can have an idea of where we stand and then we go to sheet number two, same procedure, sheet three, four, all the way to number nine and then at the end I'll tally up the straw poll and I'll have an idea of what the ultimate motion will be. Now, we also have -- I also prepared conditions suggested to the Planning Board, which I also sent out January 6th even though it's dated January 5th, I guess we could -which is seven pages long and that will be dealt with at the end.

Now, a couple minor things. All regular board members, if they want to deliberate, they can deliberate and they should straw poll. Dave Leber is the alternate who can straw poll and vote. Mr. Pistol is the alternate who is not gonna be able to vote. He can deliberate but I think it's cleaner if he doesn't straw poll because he's not eligible to vote. So that is my suggested procedure. You might want to ask if anyone disagrees with it, or if no one does, make a motion to adopt this procedure of how to do the deliberation.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are there any
board members that have any comments on the procedure that was just outlined for tonight?

Seeing none. So are there any board members that have any comments on the procedure outlined by Mr. Drill?

MR. DRILL: Or objections.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Or objections?
Seeing none. I would like to make a
motion that we use these procedures for tonight's deliberations. May I have a second?

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I'll second. VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Roll call, please, Miss Lenahan.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Motion passes.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you, Miss
Lenahan.
So as the procedure was just laid out, I'm going to go through each piece of relief requested, and as Mr. Drill outlined, board members will have the opportunity to comment on said relief requested and at the end of that particular piece of relief the board members will entertain into a straw poll on that particular piece of relief.

So we're beginning with (C) variance -this is the first order of relief, (C) variance from paragraph 4.2B.2.C.ii of the Walnut Avenue Redevelopment Plan, which requires a minimum 100 foot front yard setback for commercial buildings to property lines to allow a 63.2 foot setback between one of the two commercial buildings and the proposed property line separating the commercial lot from the residential lot. The applicant has
sought a (C) (2) or so-called benefits versus burdens variance and not a (C) (1) or so-called hardship variance. I would now welcome any board members that would like to comment on this particular relief requested.

MR. DRILL: Someone's got to be first.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Anyone
indicate -- Miss Lenahan will be keeping track so indicate by raising your hand or turning on the light on your microphone on this particular relief.

Okay. So I believe I would support this particular piece of relief. I believe that it was adequately proven in the applicant's plan and for that reason $I$ believe that the relief should be accepted in this matter.

MS. DIDZBALIS: I would agree with my colleague, Carlos.

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I would agree, they met the -- I'm sorry.

MR. DRILL: You believe they met the criteria; is that --

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: I didn't hear her. I'm sorry.

MR. DRILL: She agreed that they met the
criteria. Is that what you said?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: Yeah. I concur, and I guess just to make one editorial, I think that -- you know, I'll just leave it there. I concur. VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Sen or -yup.

MS. SEN: I agree with my colleagues. VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Okay. Are there any other members of the board that wish to comment on this particular matter of relief?

Seeing none. Miss Lenahan, may I have a straw poll?

MR. DRILL: So --
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Drill, go
ahead.
MR. DRILL: Yeah. So the first straw poll question is, 1 A , has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence the positive criteria of the (C) (2) variance to allow the front yard setback deviation for one of the commercial buildings to be 63.2 feet from the proposed property line, separating the commercial lot from the residential lot; yes or no?

That's the first straw poll.
MS. LENAHAN: Ready?
Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Second straw poll
question, has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence the negative criteria of the (C) (2) variance to allow a front yard setback deviation for one of the
commercial buildings to be 63.2 feet from the proposed property line, separating the commercial lot from the residential lot?

MS. LENAHAN: Ready?
Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Number two.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you.
So now we'll be discussing the second
piece of relief requested, so this is a (C) variance from paragraph 4.7D. 12 of the Walnut Avenue Redevelopment Plan which requires a full size basketball court and equipment with appurtenant parking facilities to allow the elimination of the basketball court and equipment and appurtenant parking. The applicant has sought a (C) (2) or so-called benefits versus burdens variance and not a (C) (1) or so-called hardship variance.

I would like to comment on this particular matter first. This was a direct ask from the members of the public through robust discussion that was engaged throughout this entire process and so meeting the demands of the public, I would be in favor of this particular relief requested. I would now invite my fellow board members to speak on that.

MR. DRILL: Can you identify yourselves for purposes of the court reporter?

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Commissioner
Prunty. Can you hear?
I would concur and you've articulated it quite well. The applicant responded to, to repeated requests from the general public so for
that reason I absolutely would support this.
MR. DRILL: For that reason -- I know, but she's -- I understand. Can you just pull that microphone closer? She said for that reason, for that reason she would support --

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I apologize.
Little laryngitis here.
MR. DRILL: Go ahead. Identify yourself for the record.

MS. PEDDE: Donna Pedde.
I do agree with my colleagues up here. The public did come out very strong and I commend Hartz for listening to them so I'm support.

MS. RAPPA: I'm Kate Rappa.
I'm also in support of this, especially as it advances our townships flood control efforts.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are there any other members of the board that would like to comment?

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Jason Gareis.
I would concur with what Miss Rappa said. The discussion that ensued regarding the basketball court ultimately lead to a discussion about additional flood measures and everyone, all of our residents understand the issues we deal with
with flooding so I would wholeheartedly support the change from the court to additional, additional flood measures. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are there any other members that wish to comment on this matter of relief?

Okay, Mr. David Leber.
MR. LEBER: I concur with my colleagues on this and I think that it's, you know, really -there was insight that was presented by the public that, that was insightful to me that I hadn't thought of, and again, $I$ just think that, you know, it shows the value of having these, these -- input from the public to bring these things out that, you know, we may have overlooked or not taken the perspective that some folks did in terms of safety on this particular issue.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you.
Any other members wish to comment?
Mr. Drill, I would invite you to now read the question.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So straw poll, this is 2A, has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence the positive criteria of the (C) (2) variance to allow the

```
applicant to eliminate the required basketball
```

court?

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: 2B, has the applicant met
its burden by proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the negative criteria of the (C) (2) variance to allow the applicant to eliminate the required basketball court?

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?

MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?

MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
Thank you. We will now be moving to the third piece of relief requested, exception from paragraph 4.7.F. 2 of the Walnut Avenue Redevelopment Plan which requires a dedicated pedestrian zone along the sidewalk adjacent to Walnut Avenue be provided with a minimum unobstructed width of 8 feet at all points to allow

1,268 lineal feet of sidewalk, 62 percent of the sidewalk to be 6 feet wide and 785 lineal feet of the sidewalk, 38 percent of the sidewalk to remain 4 feet wide.

I now invite my colleagues to comment on this particular matter.

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I'd like to comment. I would support this relief. While 8 foot sidewalk is optimum in a Business District that has restaurants, lots of pedestrian activity for events, etcetera, as I said, outdoor dining, this is not that and I think $I$ have a concern about disruption to the berm by expanding the sidewalk and eliminating trees, which is also something the residents feel strongly about, about having that coverage. I think, I think as presented this is acceptable.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen has the floor.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Sen.
MS. SEN: Thank you.
I vote -- I disagree with this
exception. I would recommend that we deny it. I believe that because of public welfare, health and safety, it is critical that we expand those sidewalks. I mean, throughout the hearings I've
mentioned my concern about the safety particularly about sidewalks that just go from sidewalk to street without a grass buffer. That's always been a concern. I drove by today to just look at it again and I thought, could you imagine having people walking from there to the school in this very small sidewalk, so $I$ cannot in good conscience with safety and health and public welfare concerns not expand the sidewalk.

> VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Taylor, go ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: To me, as an engineer, I think it would be impractical for the widening of the entire length of the sidewalk. The sidewalk is adjacent to a sloped portion of the property which is undisturbed and it's covered with existing vegetation and $I$ think from an engineering point of view you'd require a retaining wall in order to make it an 8 foot width. A 4 foot width sidewalk is acceptable. It's code compliant. It's safe and it's what most pedestrians walk on throughout Cranford. Additionally, the sidewalk reduces to a 4 foot width at the railroad overpass and for the entire length of the sidewalk from the overpass to the school is 4 foot in width so I don't see why
the exception would need to be in front of the development. I would be voting for the, for the exception.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I know that one of our board members wants to respond to one of the comments made. Are there any new comments on this particular matter?

MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: I was just going to say I concur with the points that Commissioner Miller Prunty made, as well as the points that were made by Mr. Taylor.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner
Prunty.
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Actually, I was just going to bring up the point that Mr. Taylor made, that as you transition towards the Con Rail overpass and then eventually moving your way to the residential neighborhood and to the school, it is a 4 foot sidewalk. It is a 4 foot.

MR. DRILL: A 4 foot width sidewalk. As it transitions to the overpass it is a 4 foot sidewalk.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: You know, I'll be honest, I
struggled with this and I think that $I$ agree that in an optimal environment it would be great to have an 8 foot sidewalk, but considering that, to the point made earlier, that it's going to condense down to 4 feet once you get close to the Con Rail overpass towards the school, I think having the 6 foot wide section to the south of that where, if there will be increased traffic, $I$ do think that, you know, people may, from the residential area, walk down to Clark Commons and it wouldn't be inappropriate to have, you know, a wider sidewalk down in that area, but $I$ think that as you're gonna condense down to the 4 foot sidewalk that exists by the overpass, that that's kind of what we're stuck with and so after struggling with this for a while, I would support the variance.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Go ahead. MS. DIDZBALIS: I, too, have struggled --

MR. DRILL: For the record identify yourself.

MS. DIDZBALIS: Julie Didzbalis. Sorry.
I, too, struggled with this a bit.
Obviously safety is a concern for all of us, but also, it's been made very evident by the
neighborhood members that have joined us for the meetings and also most of us up here have expressed concern, as well, as far as the berm and existing vegetation, $I$ would prefer not to disturb it and so, therefore, I would be in support of the exception.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Sen, would you like to respond?

MS. SEN: I just wanted to clarify. I think there's two issues. Right? There's the one issue of expanding to 8 feet, because that's what the Redevelopment Plan is and that's what I believe would be safe, right, there's that issue, related to public safety, public welfare, health and safety, right, but the other issue that $I$ find very troubling and very concerning is the fact that when we talk about areas that are just 4 feet, there is no buffer between the sidewalk and the street, so whether -- to just say okay, we're gonna do nothing and we're just gonna keep it that way, I think that is a serious public welfare, health and safety concern so I think we should absolutely reconsider that position and consider that. When I think about taking my little two kids and walking down, and imagine people who live in 750 Walnut and
they're gonna walk to the school, because believe me, I live in a street where the school is down the street, you are gonna walk, and to know that those kids with their parents are gonna be walking in that area where there's absolutely no buffer throughout that area, to me, that is absolutely lead to danger, so I ask you to please reconsider and think about this seriously because this is a very important issue.

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: If I can just add, the area that you're referencing has quite a large hatched area that -- it's outlined, it's striped, so vehicles are not driving up along curb-side.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. Additionally, it's an as-built condition. People have been walking on the sidewalk safely for years. I know of no accidents of pedestrians getting struck by a car because they fell off a sidewalk at this location. I think it's improper to say that it's unsafe. It's a 4 foot sidewalk which meets all code requirements and is acceptable.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Okay. Miss Pedde.

MS. PEDDE: If you're talking about
the --
MR. DRILL: Identify yourself.
MS. PEDDE: Donna Pedde.
If you're talking about the -- that
there's no -- between the sidewalk and the street and front, right in front there is a space, grass where some trees are and telephone poles. When you get down to the railroad, no, there is not, but there is that stripe there, so I think, like some of my colleagues have said, that there -- it's been like that and it's been safe and even some people who live in that area do walk down to the school and when you get from underneath the bridge going up on to Walnut towards the school, that is just 4 feet, it is.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Seeing none, I would like to, you know, obviously this board considers public safety and pedestrian safety very important. I would like to -- and I thank everyone for their comments on that. I would like to concur with most of my colleagues, especially Mr. Taylor, on the -- I do think that the 4 feet requirement is currently safe. I feel that it will be safe for pedestrians and for that reason I support this majority opinion on the relief.

So Mr. Drill, can you proceed with the question?

MR. DRILL: Yes.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you.
MR. DRILL: The straw poll on this one is just $3 A$, there is no B. 3A is, has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that granting the exception is reasonable and within the general purpose and intent of the provisions for site plan review and approval and that the literal enforcement of the site plan ordinance requirement will result in undue hardship or be imprudent or impractical so as to allow the sidewalk along Walnut Avenue to vary between 4 feet to 6 feet in width? That's the straw poll question. Mr. Nordelo read the exact relief being requested.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: I think I'm going to abstain at this juncture, if I'm allowed to. No, I can't?

MR. DRILL: Well, you can abstain but my advice is, if you're abstaining because you're on the fence, my advice is that would be no. If you're -- you're saying abstaining but you don't really mean that, because if you abstain, legally
that's an ascent to whatever the majority does, and quite frankly, the burden of proof is on them, so if you don't feel they've proved it, the vote should be no. If you want to hear and still think about it, say I'd like to pass on the straw poll for now and you'd like to be called at the end. MR. LEBER: Okay. I'd like to pass and be called at the end.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes. MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?

MS. SEN: No. I would just like to add that obviously the impact statement needs to be revised, but there's an assessment that there's about 25 children, so there's 25 children expected in the 750 Walnut residence building, so imagine those 25 kids likely to go to the elementary school on the same street, so to say you're gonna only walk in safety and certain amount and then there's a little line or a little zone or something and then you can kind of be careful and try to do your best with small children in an elementary school I think is very, you know, treacherous and you have to be careful, so please, be careful. MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?

MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Can you call again Mr.
Leber?
MS. LENAHAN: Yes.
Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you.
Moving along, we're now to the fourth relief, matter of relief requested. This is an exception from site plan ordinance section 255-26.G, which requires lighting in parking areas to be a minimum of 1.5 foot candles to allow the lighting in the parking areas on the commercial lot to be decreased to 0.5 foot candles.

I welcome comment on this matter.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I guess I should comment, since I brought this up in the first place.

It's industry standard to have a . 5 foot candle at the property lines, not a 1.5, and I think it's really in the public's interest so that we don't have glowing, you know, areas of illuminated parking lot at night when it's unnecessary. . 5 is perfectly safe to walk and see your car and to see any obstruction that may be in front of you, so it's perfectly safe. It's what the -- I forget the acronym the lighting industry professionals publish in terms of the minimum requirements, so I'm for that.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I, for one, am grateful for the expertise.

MR. DRILL: Identify yourself.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Juan Carlos
Nordelo.
I'm, for one, grateful for that
expertise. I think it's within the public's
interest to grant this particular relief for all the reasons that Mr. Taylor indicated, so I would also support this relief.

MS. DIDZBALIS: I would also support
this relief. It's the least disturbance to the surrounding properties and still meets the standard and there -- and still provides safety.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are there any other comments?

Seeing none. Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: So this straw poll is -again, just an $A$, not $a$ B. It's an exception, not a variance. Should the board grant the exception from the 1.5 foot candle minimum lighting requirement in parking areas to allow 0.5 foot candles for the parking lot lighting on the commercial lot? And has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that granting that exception is reasonable and within the general purpose and intent of the provisions for site plan review and approval and that literal enforcement of the site plan ordinance requirement at issue will result in undue hardship or be imprudent or impractical?

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?

MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
Moving on to the next matter, this would be exception from site plan ordinance section 255-26.G which restricts the height of site lighting fixtures to 16 feet above grade to allow site lighting fixtures up to 25 feet high on the commercial lot.

I welcome comment.
MR. TAYLOR: Pete Taylor.
MR. DRILL: Our resident lighting expert.

MR. TAYLOR: You know, once their engineer redesigns the parking lighting, this may
not -- this may be a moot point, anyway, but it kind of goes in stride with reducing the number of lighting and the overlighting of a particular area, so there's a benefit to the public for this.

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I would concur
with Mr. Taylor and thank you, our resident engineer lighting expert.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Any other
members?
Seeing none. Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: Straw poll is, has the
applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that granting the exception from the 16 foot maximum height limitation for site lighting fixtures to allow site lighting fixtures as high as 25 feet on a commercial lot is reasonable and within the general purpose and intent of the provisions for site plan review and approval and that literal enforcement of the site plan ordinance requirement at issue will result in undue hardship or be imprudent or impractical?

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?

MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
Next matter of relief, exception from site plan ordinance section 255-26.J which prohibits facade mounted signage facing residentially zoned areas within 150 feet of a residentially zoned area, to allow facade mounted signs on the proposed commercial building on the commercial lot which will face the residential zones to the north as close as 100 feet of the residentially zoned area.

This one is more technical in nature but

I believe that the applicant proved the need for this particular exception within the public interest, so for that reason I would support based on the evidence that was provided by the applicant, and Juan Carlos Nordelo, to identify myself.

Are there any other board members that wish to comment on this one? Lone voice, okay.

Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: I guess everyone agrees with you on that one.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: The question here is, should the board grant the exception from the 150 foot setback requirement for commercial facade signs facing residential zones to allow commercial facade signs on the commercial buildings as close as 100 feet to a residential zone and facing that residential zone? And the question for the straw poll is, has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that granting the exception is reasonable and within the general purpose and intent of the provisions for site plan review and approval and that literal enforcement of the site plan ordinance requirement at issue will result in undue hardship or be
imprudent or impractical?
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
Next matter, exception from paragraph
4.6.C.2 of the Walnut Avenue Redevelopment Plan which requires 35 percent of the ground level primary facade of the residential buildings to have door and window transparency, to allow the ground level of both of the residential buildings to have

34 percent of the ground levels of the primary facades to have door and window transparency. Apologies.

Are there any comments?
MR. TAYLOR: I think we had testimony that $I$ recall from your architect that this is just on the ground floor level and it's a very minor missing of the requirement, but the overall building exceeds the total requirement for all of the lighting and all of the windows so I don't think that it's necessary to force them to put a window in an area of the building which would not be architecturally appropriate so I would be willing to grant this.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: I, too, recall that there was a lot of testimony regarding this from the architect and $I$ found his testimony on this issue to be persuasive. I think we're really talking about a difference of possibly one window, if $I$ recall the evidence correctly. As we can see, the requirement is 35 percent and the proposed change is 34 percent, so it's a 1 percent change and I think it's appropriate.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: I just agree.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Okay. Mr.
Drill, can you proceed with the question?
MR. DRILL: Yes. The question here, should the board grant the exception from the 35 percent transparency requirement for the ground level primary facades of the residential buildings to allow the ground level primary facades of the residential buildings to have 34 percent transparency? And I might add, yes, it was only one window. The question for the straw poll is, has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that by granting the exception is reasonable and within the general purpose and intent of the provisions for site plan review and approval and that literal enforcement of the site plan ordinance requirement at issue will result in undue hardship or be imprudent or impractical?

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?

MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
Moving along, relief eight, de minimus exception from New Jersey Administrative Code 5:21-4.14, the RSIS provision which requires more than the 1.8 parking spaces per multi-family unit proposed by the applicant. The RSIS provision at issue requires 1.8 spaces per one bedroom unit, 2.0 spaces per two bedroom unit and the 2.1 spaces per three bedroom unit. To allow the applicant to provide 1.8 spaces per multi-family unit regardless of the number of bedrooms for a total of 450 parking spaces for the residential lot, which is the amount required by paragraph 4.3.A.3 of the Walnut Avenue Redevelopment Plan.
I'd invite Mr. Pistol.

MR. PISTOL: Yes. The applicant proposed the parking plans for the residential portion of this development in compliance with the Redevelopment Plan but the Redevelopment Plan requires less than what the RSIS, which is the Residential Site Improvement Standards, they're state standards, than what they require. My opinion is that typically the RSIS standards are the bare minimum but there could be mitigating circumstances in this situation because of where the development, the proposed development is cited. The Walnut Avenue shopping area and the services provided there and the bus route that's on Walnut Avenue could entice some people who are not drivers and don't have cars to live in that area, so it's possible that there may be some tenants that don't have vehicles but $I$ think that the amount that would be there probably would be less, the amount of people that wouldn't have cars would be less than in the downtown area, so I don't know if there would be sufficient parking under the standard that is in the Redevelopment Plan and the danger of this is if there's not enough parking there, there really is not enough parking, spill-over parking, like in the downtown area, you have a lot of
streets and then you have parking lots and things like that and I think we really need to be proactive in looking at this, because if we say okay, let's see what happens, then what do we do if parking were to spill over into the adjacent residential areas on the opposite side of Walnut Avenue. The thing is, on a property like this, there's really no excuse for the property -- no reason for the property to generate parking demand that goes beyond the property itself. Unlike a lot of properties in Cranford, a lot of times we deal with situations in Cranford where we have land poor properties, you know, there's not enough land to sufficiently accommodate what is needed. In this case the land is -- we have plenty of land there so the property itself should be able to hold all of the parking that is generated there. I think that the parking spill-over issue into the residential areas, we don't know if that's going to happen but we should be prepared for it. I think that we could prevent that in two ways. I think, number one, is we could request the township to ask the county to allow parking on the west side of Walnut Avenue in front of the development and that, I believe, would be a sufficient number of parking
spaces to prevent any spill-over of cars into the residential areas. It would be, you know, like a relief safety valve in terms of allowing for spill-over parking. It also would be a traffic calming effect on Walnut Avenue, also. You have cars that are parked there so it would slow the cars down, as well, but $I$ believe that that frontage there, even if it -- even if the entire --

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Pistol, I just wanted to ask, are these conditions that -- I mean, you're suggesting solutions. Are these conditions that you're trying to impose?

MR. PISTOL: It could be a condition but it's not a condition that's --

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are you recommending conditions right now or are you outlining your potential solution?

MR. PISTOL: Well, if it requires a condition, then this is something that we can ask for.

## VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Okay, but stop

 for a second.> MR. DRILL: If it's a condition -- you only can impose conditions if there's an approval. So are you against -- if you're against granting
the relief, then you can't impose a condition. If you're in favor of granting the relief, you could say $I$ would grant it subject to a condition. So what exactly are you saying?

MR. PISTOL: I would grant it subject to those conditions.

MR. DRILL: Now I have --
MR. PISTOL: The one condition would be that the, you know, if the township requests the county to allow parking either on the entire frontage of 750 Walnut or on portions of it, because I know that the --

MR. DRILL: You got to go -- woe. You got to go slower at this point.

MR. PISTOL: Okay. The road width is not consistent along the whole area from the railroad to Walnut Av -- to Raritan Road, so there may not be sufficient areas, especially in the area where the sidewalk has -- comes up against the road without the grassy area in between. The area, there may not be -- there definitely is not a place for parking spaces at that point but further down there's plenty of room for parking spaces, so that's one thing. The other way, the other type of relief could be a condition that -- like, in other
words, $I$ think if the county will allow that, $I$ think that would be sufficient, but if that can't be done, I think if we could pose a condition on the developer to, you know, to require Hartz to allow temporary residential parking in the commercial parking lots but not, not for the residents to park, like, a week at a time or whatever, but if people have -- companies say and there's not enough sufficient parking spaces, then there would be signs in the lot, in the residential lots to say spill-over residential parking should take place in the commercial areas there. The thing is, and this could be limited hours, maybe evenings during the week and on weekends and depending upon who leases the space in the warehouse or flex space, commercial areas, there probably would be less demand for parking, the commercial parking in the evenings and on weekends, so in that sense, all the parking could be accommodated on the Hartz property, that would be spill-over parking, because otherwise I don't think there's going to be enough of a margin of error if, if a lot of people say have company and we have -we're down below RSIS standards in terms of the parking that's there, so that's --

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you, Mr.
Pistol. I know that some of our board members want to comment. I would like to acknowledge Miss Rappa, then I'll go to Mr. Taylor and Commissioner Prunty, so Miss Rappa.

MS. RAPPA: Hi. Kate Rappa.
I'm inclined to provide this exception or this relief because $I$ think that the development offers a lot of green space, which is something that the residents wanted, and $I$ think that in a town prone to flooding, any time we can sort of eliminate our impervious coverage, we're doing the residents a service. I, of course, hope that the township committee will be open-minded if there are concerns from residents in enacting some parking restrictions that benefit the neighborhood so that there isn't overflow parking in residential neighborhoods, because I understand that concern, as well, but overall, $I$ believe that, you know, for aesthetic reasons and also for practical flooding concerns in our town, I'm inclined to accept fewer parking spaces because I do believe that the parking available will be sufficient for the proposed development.

MR. DRILL: I just want to clarify.

What you're basically saying is you're in support of the exception and if there's a problem, not that this would be a condition, but if there's a problem you would hope the township would basically request that the county, using Mr. Pistol's example, allow parking or the township come up with some other type of thing, but not as a condition, but that's your solution if there was a problem, you're saying?

MS. RAPPA: I'm not proposing a solution. I'm just stating that we understand the residents concern, as well.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Got it.
MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Pistol, you started out great, you said that Hartz Mountain complied with the Redevelopment Plan, and they did, and they provided 450 parking spaces. That's 1.8 for one bedroom unit and all the other units, which in my opinion is ample and it's what we requested as the township in the Redevelopment Plan. One of the main reasons we probably did that was to reduce impervious area, you know. If we had said that they had to stick by the RSIS, there's a good chance we'd be trying to knock off parking spaces at this point to reduce coverage. 450 spots is
ample amount of parking. I do not recommend going to the county for any recommendations for anything, especially parking on Walnut Avenue, and I don't think there's going to be a problem so that's my opinion.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner. COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: So I concur with my colleagues, that the applicant met the standards set in the Redevelopment Plan and while RSIS standards are higher, they are absent a particular project. They are just general standards. It's not looking at a particular project. It cites for one, two and three bedroom. If my rec -- if my memory serves, there are very few three bedroom units in this complex so, you know, you take into account the project you're dealing with, not just the standards, the RSIS standards. Having said that, in addition to what my colleagues, Miss Rappa and Mr. Taylor stated, I would support this exception.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: I agree with Commissioner
Miller Prunty. David Leber. Sorry. I concur with Commissioner Miller Prunty. I think that, you know, it is what we set forth in the Redevelopment

Plan. The number, the number of spots that, you know, would have been incremental if the RSIS was filed is really immaterial. I'm not in favor of encouraging people to park on Walnut Avenue. I think that that poses a safety issue and I think if -- and there is the possibility and we need to be cognizant of it, that there will be some spill-over where people may park across the street in the residential areas that exist now and I think the township could have remedies for that by having residential stickers for that area and dealing with that if and when that occurs. I do think that, you know, availing some of the commercial spots to residents over the weekends or in the evenings or something like that, maybe, but that's for Hartz to decide. I guess, you know, the capitalist in me says that if it becomes burdensome to the tenants, they'll live somewhere else, and I think, you know, the market will take care of itself and I think if, you know, a company that has experience in doing this feels that this is appropriate and fits within the Development Plan that we've negotiated, then I would support this.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Pistol, did you want to respond to that or are you okay?

MR. PISTOL: I'm okay.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I'm sorry, Mr. Gareis, go ahead.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: I just wanted to concur with the points that Miss Rappa and Mr. Taylor made regarding the impervious surface issues. You know, throughout our township we have taken steps to reduce impervious coverage wherever possible and $I$ think that this relief supports that goal and so -- and I would also note that there are other areas of town where we do have residential parking stickers and if that is something that needs to be dealt with, and I think that was Miss Rappa's point earlier, about, you know, resident parking in that area, it's certainly something that we've dealt with before and I think we can deal with it again if it becomes an issue.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are there any other members?

So I would just like to concur with my colleagues on all the points raised. I also, for me personally, the relief requested, it was noted, I must highlight, is de minimis in nature which for that reason and everything that was said, $I$ would support this relief.

Mr. Drill, can you read the question? MR. DRILL: Okay. This straw poll has an $A$ and a $B$ because it deals with a de minimis exception from RSIS. So the overall question shortened down is, should the board grant the de minimis exception from the -- should the board grant a de minimis exception from the RSIS requirement for the number of residential parking spaces, which is the 1.8 per unit which comes to -the 1.8 is what the Redevelopment Plan requires and the RSIS requires more. So the first straw poll question is, has the applicant met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that granting the de minimis exception is reasonable and with the general purpose and intent of the RSIS and that literal enforcement of the requirement will result in undue hardship or be imprudent or impractical? That's the straw poll question. I just want to add the editorial comment that the jury charge, in there $I$ gave the intent and purpose of RSIS from the statute and when we get to the next question $I$ also gave that information in the jury charge, but that's the straw poll.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. The second straw poll
on this issue is, is the grant of the exception consistent with the RSIS, is it limited in scope and not unduly burdensome, does it meet the needs of public health and safety and does it take into account existing infrastructure and possible surrounding future development? And again, editorial comment, the jury charge included citations to where that standard comes from.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?

MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?

MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. We're up to --
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Number nine.
MR. DRILL: -- number nine.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: We are now at
number nine. This is the all-inclusive, so preliminary and final subdivision approval to divide the property into the commercial lot and the
residential lot and preliminary and final site plan approval to allow construction of the commercial development on the commercial lot and the residential development on the residential lot.

MR. DRILL: And before you ask people to deliberate on that, on this one, if you notice, on page 10 of 10 I have four different scenarios. So the first scenario is, does the proposed development and the site and subdivision plans comply with all provisions of the Redevelopment Plan and RSIS? I don't think it's worth even deliberating that. The answer is no or they wouldn't need the variance and exception relief. So if the answer were yes, but it's not, so we don't -- we skip down to the next one. B, if the proposed development and/or the site plan or subdivision plans do not comply with all provisions of the Redevelopment Plan and the RSIS, that's R-S-I-S, but the board granted variances and/or exceptions from all of the ordinance/RSIS requirements that have not been complied with, does the proposed development and/or site -- and/or subdivision plans comply with the remaining provisions of the Redevelopment Plan and the RSIS requirements? If the answer is yes to this, then
my legal advice is that you have to grant preliminary and final site plan and subdivision approval. I think you should get deliberations on this, on $B$, and then straw poll it after deliberations. But again, just counting up the straw polls, the straw polls at least are gonna grant all the relief. One of the pieces of relief has one negative vote but vast majority, all the rest are unanimous.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I'd invite members to comment.

MR. DRILL: Oh, and on this one -VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Go ahead, Mr. Drill.

MR. DRILL: -- this is where all this other relief, as you've been straw polling, I know that you have conditions in mind. On this one, when you straw poll we're gonna deal with these conditions after so this -- I understand that any straw poll is subject to the conditions so you don't have to go through the conditions now. Let's do the conditions at the end.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: So understanding that this is the comprehensive question, does anyone have any comments?

Okay, Miss Sen.
MS. SEN: Just to confirm, you're reading 9B for the jury instructions and the first part relates to -- I think my question relates to the second part. You're saying if all the variances and everything were granted, which they seem to have already granted, been granted, is there anything that's non-compliant with the current plan?

MR. DRILL: Correct. That's the issue.
MS. SEN: Okay. And so yes, I believe there are certain issues that are not compliant with the Redevelopment Plan, particularly the Community Impact Statement. It does not have a reflection of the pilot cost assessment, I believe that it is a requirement of the plan, obviously there are differing views, they may say it's a condition, but $I$ think it's required and I think that when you -- I believe that not including that is disingenuous. We can't really assess the community impacted. We've known that there's been a pilot project $I$ guess in the works for a very long time and to not even have an assessment of that, that's an essential requirement of an application, so I disagree. I don't think it's a
condition. I think it's more like a fraud on the court, it should be included, so I think that that is a component that's not there. I also was not convinced by the evidence about the safety and welfare of the traffic studies. Obviously I mentioned the sidewalk and, you know, I don't want to repeat what $I$ 've said. I can refer to that. I'm sorry. I'm Diana Sen. I know I keep on forgetting to say that. But I do believe that there are some traffic concerns that were unresolved. I think the evidence was not clear and convincing. I think it was not more likely than not. I feel like it was very confusing and I'm concerned about the safety with the traffic in that area with the current Redevelopment Plan. I also am concerned about the flooding area. I know and I'm thankful to Hartz for the additional flood mitigation efforts. I think they are very helpful, but I do think as it stands there are still some concerns. Obviously it's a high flood area, obviously that's an issue that plagues Cranford and I think it's something that we really need to focus on.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you, Miss Sen.

So I believe that the applicant, first of all, is engaged in the process that has been responsive to community needs in some instances. I believe that this was a process that was marked by community participation and involvement. I was proud to have the community come out and ask their lines of questioning and $I$ think the applicant dealt with the community's questions in an appropriate and responsive manner. I think that the applicant also answered the questions of this board in particular and this board is of paramount concerns for the future of this community, concerned about safety, concerned about flood control, concerned about the development and how it impacts the neighborhood. I think that the applicant did provide compelling evidence and I think that the robust discussions that we had on these previous matters of relief that this board was contending with are proof of that process and for that reason I would, I would support this application. I think that the process went well. COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I'd just like -MR. DRILL: Prunty. COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Kathleen Miller Prunty. This time I remembered.

I'd just like to address a few things.
It's not required that the pilot be part of the Community Impact Statement, but for the record, the township did numerous presentations both on-line, in person, at township meetings, special meetings to go into great detail about the pilot associated with this project. As far traffic concerns, I've certainly heard about them for a good long time. I had opportunity to meet, I don't know, five or six times with residents before we got to this point, these meetings, community meetings, several of which our own engineer was present, as well as our traffic engineer, and $I$ know that in our conditions a number of things that were of great concern, rightfully so, to the people who live in that neighborhood, they have every right to be concerned, and I believe we will be addressing those in the many conditions that we have already talked about somewhat, so --

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Pedde. MS. PEDDE: So through these last seven long meeting -- I'm sorry. Donna Pedde.

Through these seven long meetings I think Hartz had been very amenable to the many requests, the conditions and the safety concerns
that were put forth from the residents, the dedicated residents who have come to every meeting and still here, we have our last standing residents that have come, so cheers to you. The town, I feel, and what Commissioner Prunty had said, that very transparent, the town has been very transparent through these meetings and beyond and before holding those Town Hall meetings. With that being said, that through much deliberation and many, many talks and workshops that this board has gone through, I mean, kudos to everybody here on the board for, really, has been very dedicated and want to do the best for our, for our town, for our residents, especially the ones who live in that neighborhood. I just wanted to just really make everybody aware that, and even if you didn't watch all the time or come, that -- how much work has gone into this and that working with Hartz, it's, you know, even before this, the other long road, too, that some of us were up here on the board and sat through and to come down to this and to work together and so I think we can get to a good end from all these meetings.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I just wanted to add, finally, Commissioner Miller Prunty pointed
out a very good thing, the conditions that Mr . Drill is going to review now, there's about 43 of them so, you know, the sheer number and volume of these conditions I think demonstrates appropriately that each member of this board has taken the community's concerns directly into their deliberations. They have requested these conditions as a part of this application, its approval, that these be met as they're reflective of the concerns of the township, the concerns of that community and the concerns of the dedicated residents who took the time to come out to each of these meetings and I think that those will be expressed in those conditions as they're reviewed and discussed, so it's appropriate that that, for the record, be shown, that this board worked hard and the applicant was amenable to these changes. Thank you.

Sorry. Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: I just want to -- David
Leber. Sorry.
I just wanted to just take a moment to kind of highlight and maybe reiterate some of the points that were made and I think that, you know, kudos to the members of the community that have
invested their time and done their homework and came here prepared with constructive suggestions that I think has made this project better had they -- than had they not had these public hearings and I think, you know, kudos to Hartz for their patience. I know some of this has been frustrating but they were open and amenable to suggestions that they made. I guess, you know, one point I want to make in terms of, you know, this development is not going into, you know, a virgin forest. You know, it's going into an area that was already developed, that had a viable commercial center that $I$ think the township got a little used to being empty, and as a result, we've gotten a little bit -- I don't want to use the word complacent but we did get used to having, you know, less traffic there and, you know, that it was dormant, so we really need to compare an apple to an apple and we have to compare what will be there to what was there, you know, 10 or 12 years ago. There was traffic there and there was, you know, cars going in and out and there was, there was viable businesses there and this is going to replace that. I think it's just important to note that this is, you know, sort of a dormant area now but it wasn't and so I think we need to compare
what was there years ago to what will be there, not what's there today, which is, you know, a construction site.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Didzbalis.
MS. DIDZBALIS: Julie Didzbalis.
I just wanted to say that it's been a long road. I've been here for quite a while with Hartz, several, several times, but how important it was to have the public here. They came so well-informed. Their questions were excellent. We, as a board, are all members of this -- you know, citizens of this town. We don't take our jobs lightly. We do our homework. There's a lot of reading. There's a lot of work that goes into it and it's so nice to have the public here and have them here well-informed and come with great questions. Because of their input and our work we have many conditions and you're getting, you know, we're getting hopefully a good result here and I really appreciate those that came out to support us. I know we only have two here tonight but you were wonderful to work with.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Rappa. MS. RAPPA: Yeah. Kate Rappa. I'm just going to echo the comments of
my fellow board members, which is we were all just thoroughly impressed and happy to hear from the public on this project. The residents did truly come very well-informed and provided a lot of things for us to think about and deliberate about and a lot of which resulted in the conditions that we'll discuss, so it was just -- it's not an easy thing to do, to come and give public input, and it was all very thoughtful and respectful and just really nice to see, so thank you to everybody that came out.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Taylor, then
I know, Miss Sen, you wanted to respond to Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: So I'll give praise to the public but also to Hartz Mountain's experts. I thought that they did a good job in responding to criticism or questions and presented their case in a professional manner, so thank you to them, as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Sen.
MS. SEN: Yeah. So I just wanted to add, you know, related to -- I don't want to sound like a broken record but $I$ want to thank the community for coming and $I$ want to thank Hartz and
obviously everybody here who's been here, right, we've all dedicated a significant amount of time and I also want to thank your families, right, because the families that are not here are there sort of helping it so that we can be here.

I just had a couple echo safety concerns, you know. I'm also concerned about tractor trailers. There was some testimony by the community in different things. I personally live in a school zone and I will tell you, obviously during school hours it's absolutely crazy and it's even hard just to drive or to walk, but off hours is also really crazy. I'm very concerned all the time about my kids just being -- and it's a small town, it's a small street, but it's next to a school so when I imagine what Walnut is, right, without the development and the traffic concerns and everything that we have and the sidewalks and the like, I am concerned about the safety, so I just ask that -- there hasn't been sufficient evidence to say why certain areas of the sidewalk could not be expanded, but if Hartz can at least try to look at the areas that just go straight into the street where there's no buffer or areas -obviously, you know, the committee has voted but,
you know, if you could please, you know, make that assessment, but I am concerned about safety with the tractor trailers and the impact that that could have with all of the traffic and the flooding and the like.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are there any additional comments as we deliberate from board members?

Okay. Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: I obviously don't comment on anything factual, that's up to the board, but I just want to comment on the Community Impact Statement, because looking at my notes, Miss Sen brought this up during the December 14 th hearing session. You saw me get up and check with Nick Dickerson and what $I$ checked with him on was, again, $I$ wanted to see if my notes were correct. My notes said that the requirement for the submission of a Community Impact Statement was not in the Redevelopment Plan, it was in the general ordinance section 255-24D(22), and my notes say, and I double-checked it, that ordinance says that either the Board of Adjustment or the Planning Board "may condition" preliminary approval on submission of a CIS. I rendered an opinion on

12-14 that the board could not deny the application even if the applicant hadn't submitted the CIS but they submitted one ahead of the vote and I don't have it on my list of 43 conditions, I added it as 44, because the board that evening said that a condition, a potential condition of approval would be to submit a revised CIS pursuant to ordinance section 255-24D(22) and what has to be revised about it is what Miss Sen commented on, which is -well, she didn't say the words but she's correct, and Commissioner Prunty brought it up, it's because that that $C I S$ that they submitted did not take into account the pilot, and the board said that, well, the pilot wasn't in existence at the time that CIS was submitted, that's why they want to make it a condition, so in my opinion the board can not deny this application based on the CIS. You can add that to the list of conditions if you approve it. That's my legal opinion, and again, that's my opinion. You guys don't have to agree with my opinion but that's my opinion.

MS. SEN: Well, respectfully, I remember
we talked about that and what I did is I looked at -- and, you know, just from my background, obviously I'm here as a community member but $I$ am a
lawyer, you know, for 22 years or the like and for me I see it as a different perspective. I actually see that the current Community Impact Statement that has not been revised, even though I have repeatedly requested it throughout the hearings, it is disingenuous because it does not deal with a pilot program. It is dated after, it was submitted and dated after a pilot program was envisioned and talked repeatedly. In fact, my understanding was that Hartz would not be able to do this if not for the pilot program, so because it's disingenuous, which I even said those words, I believe under the legal principles of the fraud on the court that it must actually be submitted, so it is not a condition, right, if you have to do this as a requirement for Planning Board approval, you have to actually do the submission and I believe that as written in its -- the way it stands, it is disingenuous and it is actually a fraud on the court, requiring an actual resubmission and a clarification, because as is, it is not appropriate and fraud on the court and all of the common law that we've ever dealt with deals that with if they're related to something that's disingenuous, incorrect or even a factual omission and/or a fraud
on the court, that it needs to be reevaluated, so I believe there's an important body of law that needs to be considered here.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you, Miss Sen.

Mr. Drill, can we proceed with --
MR. DRILL: Straw poll.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: -- the straw
poll on this particular matter?
MR. DRILL: So the straw poll question is, 9B, does the proposed development and the site plan and the subdivision plans comply with the remaining provisions of the Redevelopment Plan and the RSIS requirements that were not subject to the variances and exceptions?

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
I believe now, Mr. Drill, we're going to discuss the conditions.

MR. DRILL: Yes, before a formal vote on the application.

So the 43, now 44 conditions, just --
MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Drill, before you begin, can we take, like, a two minute --

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yeah. So we'll adjourn for a five minute break.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.
(A brief recess was taken.)
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Drill, so I believe -- oh, no problem.

MR. DRILL: For the record, Miss Court Reporter is causing the delay. I'm kidding. That was a joke.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: All right. So
we are going to restart these proceedings. Mr. Drill, can you explain the conditions that we're about to discuss?

> MR. DRILL: Right. So this is the process. I went through my notes and I copied down all the conditions that any of the board members mentioned, that the applicant had offered up, that the board experts had offered up and then -- and I went hearing session by hearing session, just because it was easier to go through my notes that way, so when these conditions eventually wind up in the resolution they're going to be in a different order, but I sent them all to Henry Kent-Smith to ask him, because $I$ had in my notes, a lot of the notes about the applicant consenting to the conditions, so I sent them this and thought the applicant consented to all the conditions and then Mr. Kent-Smith sent back an e-mail disagreeing that they consented to all of them, but as it turns out in the end, there are only a few that they didn't consent to. So my suggestion is, to save time, since this document was sent out to all the board members and posted on the website on January 6th, that we don't have to discuss the ones that are not consented to, we only have to discuss the ones that
are either not consented to, and my legal advice to the board is, you don't need the applicant's consent but we should talk about it if they don't consent. I think there should be some discussion about it and there's one or two board members who do not agree with a couple of the conditions and they want to talk about it. I know this because they called me and I'm sure you're gonna -- you'll hear about it.

So let's start with condition number eight on page two of seven. My note said that the applicant shall contact the County of Union to request permission to cut into the slope -- I am sorry. Yeah.

Number eight on page two of seven says the applicant shall contact the County of Union to request permission to cut into the slope adjacent to the Walnut Avenue sidewalk to widen the sidewalk in the area of the slope. That's what my notes reflected. Mr. Kent-Smith said his notes reflected that the applicant consented to request permission to cut into the slope only where it relates to widening of the sidewalk proposed by the applicant to be widened. Now this is, not that it's moot, but this dispute now has disappeared because the
board, at least on the straw poll, is granting the exception and so this condition will go in here but it will actually have the language that Mr. Kent-Smith has indicated, because they're gonna need to contact the County of Union for some of that sidewalk that they have agreed to widen, so this one no longer has to be discussed unless someone wants to discuss it. Good.

Next, condition number 14, on the bottom of page three of seven going on to the top of four of seven. What about 11? Oh, yes. I am so sorry. This is a condition that one of the board members is not particularly fond of. The applicant agreed -- this is the one that says if the township wishes to pursue lowering the speed limit along the frontage of the property, the township shall apply for county approval of same and in the event that the county lowers the speed limit along the frontage, the applicant shall deposit funds with the township in an escrow account which shall be established to pay for township installation of new speed limit signage to be installed by the township. I just want to make something clear. The board here is not saying that the speed limit should be reduced. That's what you were objecting
to. The board here is saying that if the township wishes to do it, and the township always has the right to do it, and it says that if they wish, if they wish to do it and the county agrees, it talks about the money for the signs.

MR. TAYLOR: We're the Planning Board and my position is we don't have to make a recommendation to the township committee, because that was what $I$ recall during testimony, is that we could put a recommendation --

MR. DRILL: Just so you understand, this is not a recommendation.

MR. TAYLOR: I agree, but I'm against us having any wish or any positive impact to the township saying that we want to reduce the --

MR. DRILL: Here's the issue. Let's say we get rid of the condition. Let's say the township independently contacts the county and says will you lower the speed limit and let's say the county says yes and then the township says to these guys, you got to pay for it, there's nothing in there that says they have to pay. The condition that I've written, and you can even say that the Planning Board doesn't take an issue on whether to pursue it but if the township wants to pursue it
this is a money paying condition.
MR. TAYLOR: Understood, and I think I made my point.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Are you still against the condition? Just curious.

MR. TAYLOR: Not the way you worded it in terms of monetary but --

MR. DRILL: I'm going to reword it.
MR. TAYLOR: -- the reason I wanted to make my comment is because it was made -- the testimony will show that someone said that the Planning Board could make a recommendation to the township and I want to avoid that.

MR. DRILL: I'm going to say the Planning Board specifically, the Planning Board does not make a recommendation to the township on this issue. How's that?

MR. TAYLOR: That's my opinion. The board members may disagree 100 percent with me but that's just my opinion.

MR. DRILL: Can you straw poll people on whether we should add that sentence that Mr. Taylor would like added?

MS. LENAHAN: Okay. Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: And Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Now, condition 14, which the applicant has since sent an e-mail to me on January 16 th saying they consent so we don't have to deal with that.

Number 15, the applicant shall, at its -- the applicant agrees to this condition. There's a board member who's against this condition. The applicant shall, at its sole cost and expense, install a crosswalk along with a
flashing light sign device on Walnut Avenue near Behnert Place in accordance with that reflected on Exhibit A-13 subject to review and approval by the county and subject to review and approval by the township professionals.

MR. TAYLOR: There are crosswalks already on Walnut Avenue and Walnut Avenue is a high trafficked roadway and my concern is if we have multiple locations instead of just having people walk on one side of the street to the existing crosswalks and make those perhaps better, it would be safer, so having multiple crosswalks I don't think is in the interest of the township in terms of providing a benefit. I don't see why at that location people couldn't walk to the current walkways or at the light at the intersection, so I'm against having a crosswalk but $I$ understand it may not be the consensus.

MR. DRILL: Can you straw poll to find out what the consensus is? The straw poll is a yes for condition 15 or no, take out condition 15. MR. PISTOL: Comment? MR. DRILL: Yeah. Into the microphone. MR. PISTOL: Okay. This is Jeff Pistol.

I think that crosswalk with the flashing
signal at Walnut Avenue and Behnert Place is necessary because although there are crosswalks at Raritan Road and at Chester Lang Place, that's a considerable distance and for pedestrians to just say, oh, well, you could walk a quarter of a mile out of the way or whatever it is, even if it's an eighth of a mile out of the way, that really defeats the purpose because a lot of people are not going to do it, they will just run across the street, not in a crosswalk, and that's one thing, with the behavior and having them go out of the way. The other thing is with the new development there will be residents that are living in those apartments that may have friends in the neighborhood across the way or vice versa and this will facilitate their movement also across the road. I think that you really can't have too many crosswalks there and that may be one of the reasons that the county might want to and the township might want to lower the speed limit there, but the thing is, there needs to be traffic calming there and pedestrians need to be taken seriously in that area.

## VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you.

I would invite any -- the board to straw
poll any other member to comment on this particular -- Mr. Leber.

MR. LEBER: I agree with -- this is
David Leber.
I agree with Mr. Pistol. I realize that Walnut is a busy street but $I$ frequently cross from Holly Street across Springfield, which is a busy street, as well, and the flashing crosswalk there is a godsend. It's effective, people actually adhere to it, surprisingly, and I think that, you know, Mr. Pistol's point about the people will dash across the street is probably reality.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner Gareis or --

MR. TAYLOR: The only comment I would make, I think the existing crosswalks are at a location where the roadway is narrower so when you have a crosswalk at a very wide roadway, it's going to take forever for people to go across. You have the flashing lights and people don't realize that when they're flashing red that they can go if there's no pedestrian so you're just gonna build up traffic. I'm just -- I don't see it helping traffic in any way and $I$ don't see it helping the safety of the pedestrians.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner. COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I was gonna say -sorry.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner Gareis, Miss Rappa and then Commissioner Prunty. DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: I'm not trying to read ahead to the next chapter but we have a similar --

MR. DRILL: He disagreed with that one, also.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: So I guess my point being, you know, we were talking about subdividing this into two sections, a residential section and a commercial section. The residential section, though, is going to include for all intents and purposes a park for the benefit of all residents and I understand the point of not having two, it's kind of a short run between the two, but I do think we need to have one somewhere in there, especially if we want to have residents have the ability to safely use the, you know, the park that we're gonna -- not we're but that Hartz is going to be creating. I don't know the best way to articulate that, to be honest. I do think there should be one somewhere to allow residents to go
across. I don't, I don't know whether or not we do need two. To Mr. Taylor's point, you're talking about having a light at Raritan, then you'd have a possible stop at the first cross street, possible stop at the next cross street and then I could see how that could get -- could back up traffic and be a little disjointed. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Rappa. MS. RAPPA: Kate Rappa.

I just want to say that $I$ am in favor of this condition for two reasons. The first is that it is subject to the review and approval of the township professionals and I do believe that the township professionals have made decisions, thoughtful decisions about crosswalks in various places around town and it hasn't always been in favor of a crosswalk. If they don't believe that it should be there it's not been approved and so I trust the professionals to do the work and make the correct decision. The first sentence, that it's at the sole cost and expense of the developer, which I think is important if the township chooses to make that decision, that we have that language in there, that Hartz will be paying the bill.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner

Miller Prunty.
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Actually, I concur with a good deal of what was said and I just wanted to add that pedestrian safety, creating safer crosswalks throughout town is a priority for the township. We've made great improvements in the last year or two with the installation of the flashing beacons and so $I$ think this is, this is a crossing that would warrant that so I would support that.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Are there any -Miss Pedde.

MS. PEDDE: Real quick. So being that there is --

MR. DRILL: Identify yourself.
MS. PEDDE: Donna Pedde. Sorry. It says it right there. Thank you.

Being that there is just a crosswalk up by Raritan Road and then down through the underpass at Chester Lang and Walnut, that's a big stretch, and what Kate Rappa said about that green space, that park, to invite people or people that want to visit that, to have that crosswalk, I could see one, I can't see two because that would just back everything up. I would be in favor of just that
one.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: So before we do the straw poll, to save some time, skip down to number 19. This one is the applicant shall, at its sole cost and expense, install a second crosswalk along with a flashing light signed device on Walnut Avenue dear Lexington -- near Lexington in accordance with that reflected on Exhibit A-13 subject to review and approval by the county and subject to review and approval by the township professionals. Again, Mr. Taylor's going to be against this one for the same reason he was against 15. I just want to ask anyone, does anyone change their position or do you want to treat 15 and 19 together?

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner
Gareis.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: So I'm just -- my point is, in relation to what $I$ said earlier, I'm going to say $I$ would vote yes for both and I think a lot, in big part because of what Miss Rappa said. Obviously our township professionals can figure out whether we need two or one. To Mr. Drill's point earlier, the fact that this will be at the sole cost and expense of Hartz, I'd rather have it in
there now and let our professionals make the call down the road, so I think it's prudent to vote yes for both of them.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: You know, I agree with Deputy Mayor Gareis about that, also. Even though they're close by, on Springfield Avenue near the high school we have crosswalks on every block over there and there will be people who would be crossing from that residential area on the other side of Walnut, there are a lot of streets there and it could cause them to have to go out of their way if they have to go down to another block to cross the street, so to have the three crosswalks there, it would be okay, I think, and it would slow the traffic down.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you, Mr. Pistol.

Are there any other comments?
Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Can you straw poll, yes for conditions 15 and 19 or no as to conditions 15 and 19?

MS. LENAHAN: Got it.
Mr. Leber?

MR. DRILL: Okay. Fine. Two straw polls. Straw poll for, yes for condition 15 or no for condition 15.

MS. LENAHAN: Okay. This is 15.
Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: For 15 I'm going to switch
my vote to yes for 15.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?

MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
Can we have a straw poll on the next
one?
MR. DRILL: Straw poll, yes for condition 19 or no for condition 19.

MS. LENAHAN: Okay. Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: No.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. I'll tell you, you
guys were right, two separate votes. You never know.

Next condition, condition 18, the
applicant shall perform a traffic study postapproval and analyze the results of the postapproval study with the preapproved traffic study that was presented to the board as part of the application and submit the postapproval study and analysis to the township engineer and the township traffic engineering expert. My notes reflected that the applicant consented. Mr.

Kent-Smith advised me that his notes reflect that the applicant did not consent. I added in here as an editorial, the condition was recommended by the township traffic engineering expert and regardless of whether the applicant consents to its imposition, it's my opinion the condition is a reasonable condition and can lawfully be imposed in the event the board wants to impose it, but I think the board should discuss it since there is an objection to it.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Commissioner Miller Prunty.

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Okay. So we talked earlier about the amount of time that we spent in conversation and hearing from residents and this came up frequently. I would support this because while our engineers and planners have given
us great information about how the site will function, how the site will work, no one knows for sure until it is, in fact, built out and operating. While we can go back and think about when it was an active 100 percent commercial site, that is different than what it will be with the development, this Hartz development. I think it is, I think it's important for the township and the developer and the residents to understand how this, as $I$ said, how this site will work. Maybe just absolutely fine. There may be things that we can anticipate that would certainly be important to know about from a safety standpoint, for the township's own planning, for, again, for Hartz to understand, so I think this is -- I actually don't think this is a big deal but it is a big deal. I think it's important information for everyone to have so I feel strongly that this should be done, but once -- you know, the site has to be fully, fully occupied for, I'll say like a year, year-and-a-half. I'll leave it to planners to tell us the --

MR. DRILL: Well, no. No. No. Let's set the condition. Unless I see any of the professionals saying no, maybe a year after,

80 percent COs?
(Discussion held out of microphone range.)

MR. DRILL: All right. You know what, if the board's in favor of this condition, this language, this is going to have to be worked out afterwards because it's already 9:46 so --

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: We'll work out that language but $I$ just want to get an order. So Mr. Leber, Mr. Pistol and then I'll move to this side of the room. If you could keep your mikes on to indicate that you'd like to comment on this. Mr. Leber, you're recognized.

MR. LEBER: Thank you. David Leber.
You know, I concur with Commissioner Miller Prunty.

MR. DRILL: You got to go slower and louder.

MR. LEBER: So I concur with the previous comment. The traffic study that was done is a baseline and we added some formulaic projections, which are just projections, and we won't know what reality is until reality is real and, you know, based upon what was seen in political polls that don't work out and other
projections that, you know, are projections, you don't really know until reality hits and I think that, you know, it's a large change of development in the demographics of the residents and commercial folks that are going to be in this area are different than they historically were and the township has changed and we won't know what reality is until reality is here, so I think it's -- we owe it to the community to have a traffic study done when reality has settled in.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Pistol. MR. PISTOL: I agree with the two previous speakers but $I$ think that the studies should be done --

MR. DRILL: Listen, I don't want to spend any time when the study should be done. I think we should kick that off to say that the time period should be chosen by the traffic expert, because he's the one who suggested the condition in the first place.

MR. PISTOL: Okay.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. -- sorry. Deputy Mayor Gareis and then Miss Pedde.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Just very quickly, I'm sure this is kind of included but not stated
specifically. Postapproval study analysis to be presented to the township engineer and the township traffic engineering expert for their review, I think that should also be at the expense of Hartz, too.

MR. DRILL: If I didn't say that, you're right.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: It's probably in there, it's just not clear.

MR. DRILL: No, it's not. At its sole cost and expense. Thank you, very much.

DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Thank you.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Miss Pedde.
MS. PEDDE: I had this whole thing written but everybody said it so I wholeheartedly agree. The end.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I would also
like to concur with the rationale provided by my colleagues on the board.

Are there any other members that wish to comment on this condition?

Do we need a straw poll?
MR. DRILL: I need a straw poll, yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Condition 18?
MR. DRILL: Yes, 18. Yes or no, we're

```
gonna make two revisions. It's gonna be the
```

applicant shall perform at its sole cost and
expense and the timing to be established by the
board -- the township traffic engineering expert.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Drill, before you go on
to the next, can we go back to 19 for one second?
MR. DRILL: Yup.

MR. TAYLOR: What Deputy Mayor Gareis had mentioned was he would like to leave it to the traffic --

MR. DRILL: The traffic engineer.
MR. TAYLOR: The overview and the review of the township engineers to see if two are needed. If we put it in as this, we're gonna get two, but I'd rather have a professional engineer look at it from a traffic point of view.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So what you're saying is 15 is a definite yes. As to 19, even though you voted no, you're willing to vote yes if I add language saying that the determination of whether to install the second crosswalk near Lexington shall be determined by the township traffic engineering expert?

MR. TAYLOR: That sounds fine with me.
MR. DRILL: So that would move your straw poll from a no to a yes?

MS. SEN: I would disagree with that. I think it's too contingent. I think we need to be very clear about what the conditions are and that way we can better account for it.

MR. DRILL: You know what, let's straw poll that. Let's straw poll if we want to add
language that --
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: As written, it states "subject to the review and approval by the county and subject --

MR. DRILL: I understand, but Mr. Taylor's right. It says shall install, okay, shall install and the design is gonna be reviewed and approved. He's right, that the review and approval as written, might not have intended it that way, but as written there are going to be two of them.

MR. TAYLOR: I was only going off of what you had stated which I thought was good and have a professional see if two are needed. We're not -- we don't know. We're not the experts so let the experts decide.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Mr. Drill's going to --

MR. DRILL: The cross poll -- the straw poll is whether to add a sentence in condition 19 saying the decision on whether the second crosswalk shall be installed shall be determined by the township traffic engineering expert.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Ready?
Mr. Leber?

MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Let me just finish writing that second sentence in.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: There are no other matters before Mr. Drill moves on with conditions, correct, from colleagues on the board?

All right, Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: Condition number 28, the applicant agreed in an e-mail dated January 16 th so
that no longer has to be discussed.
Condition number 29 is the last condition that has to be discussed. 29 says there shall be -- let me start, 28 , which they agreed to, there shall be no rentals of the residential building amenities (rooms) -- slow down.

28 says there shall be no rentals of the residential building amenities (rooms, outdoor areas, etcetera) to nonresidents. The applicant has now agreed to this.

29 says, and they have not agreed to this, 29 says there shall be a limitation on the number of outside guests using the residential building amenities rooms. What the applicant's position, as relayed in an e-mail to me from Mr. Kent-Smith, is the applicant agrees that the use of the amenity rooms will not exceed the building code occupancy limits only. The applicant does not agree to a limit on the number of invited nonresident guests less than the building code occupancy limits. So the issue is whether -- the straw poll is, is condition number 29 imposed and, if so, how do you figure out, who do you ask about the number of guests?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Prior to the
straw poll I'd want to see if any members have any comments on this particular condition. I know that Commissioner Miller Prunty does.

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Actually, I was going to make the point that was already stated. The code, the building code, the occupancy load dictates the number of people that can be in the facility. It should not be our business where the guests live who are invited to an event, as long as they meet the safety, fire safety requirement and occupancy load.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I would agree with Commissioner Miller Prunty. I think that those two codes are the guiding principles and not in particular this condition.

Are there any other members that have any comments on this condition?

Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. I'll just add that both the RSIS and our parking requirement in the Redevelopment Plan, the 1.8, that accounts for guests showing up at different sites so it's not just a hard number for the occupants or the residents of the building but for guests that are gonna come for a certain time.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you.
Mr. Drill, would you like to proceed on
the straw poll?
MR. DRILL: Yeah. Straw poll, the straw poll is a yes for 29 or no, take it out.

MS. LENAHAN: Okay. Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: No.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?
MR. TAYLOR: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?

MS. SEN: No.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: No.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: No.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: No.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: No.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Okay. I believe
that that closes the discussion on conditions, Mr. Drill.

MR. DRILL: At this point someone, based on the straw polling, should make a motion to grant all the relief subject to conditions and will be --

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Drill, are we supposed to discuss 32?

MR. DRILL: Hold on.
MS. LENAHAN: I had it circled.
MR. DRILL: No. The applicant consented.

MS. LENAHAN: Okay. I have it circled. MR. DRILL: No. The applicant consented.

So at this point I would suggest that someone make a motion to grant all the relief subject to all the conditions that the applicant consented to, that the straw poll was indicated would be imposed with the addition of 44 , which I read into the record, which is submit a revised CIS pursuant to ordinance section 255-24D, as in David, (22). There should be at least, I mean, one member should be voting no on this motion or be making some other sort of motion. This is the motion to grant all the relief subject to these conditions.

The condition would not include widening the sidewalk to 8 feet. That's the motion on the table.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: So --
MR. DRILL: That would be the motion on the table.

MS. SEN: Could I do a motion to add a condition to have a sidewalk expanded to 8 feet?

MR. DRILL: Right. That's why I'm bringing this to your attention.

MS. SEN: Okay. Yes.
MR. DRILL: So let's have someone start by making the motion to grant all the relief subject to the conditions and then have an amendment to that motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I will make a motion to grant all of the relief enumerated and subject to all of the conditions that were discussed, straw polled and outlined.

MR. DRILL: Someone second that.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: May I have a second?

COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: I'll second.
MR. DRILL: Now you have a motion to amend that to include a condition.

MS. SEN: Yes. To include a condition
to extend the sidewalk to at least 6 feet everywhere.

MR. DRILL: To 6 feet or 8 feet?
MS. SEN: 8 feet.
MR. DRILL: You said 6. You meant 8?
MS. SEN: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Anyone gonna second that condition?

Okay. So the motion to amend fails so what you have on the floor --

MS. SEN: So I would like to make a motion to amend to 6 feet for sidewalks.

MR. DRILL: Anyone second that motion?
No, so that motion fails. So again, the motion on the floor is to grant all the relief subject to conditions and that's been made and seconded.

MS. LENAHAN: Ready?
MR. DRILL: Ask for the roll call.
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: May I have a roll call, Miss Lenahan?

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber?
MR. LEBER: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Sen?
MS. SEN: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Rappa?
MS. RAPPA: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Commissioner Prunty?
COMMISSIONER PRUNTY: Yes.

MS. LENAHAN: Miss Pedde?
MS. PEDDE: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis?
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Miss Didzbalis?
MS. DIDZBALIS: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo?

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes.
MS. LENAHAN: Motion passes.
MR. DRILL: Thank you. We're done with
this.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you. I really do -- I've kept quiet all night. Henry Kent-Smith on behalf of the applicant. I greatly appreciate --

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Is the microphone on, Miss --

MS. LENAHAN: Yes. It's on.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I really appreciate this board's time, energy and effort. This has been a very long, very difficult, complex application. You guys have done a great job and we just can't wait to get under construction. Thank you, so much.

VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Thank you, Mr. Kent-Smith.

So seeing that this matter is settled --
MR. DRILL: Hold on. We have to get --
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: We're going to take a two minute recess just to get ourselves in order.
(A brief recess was taken.)
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: I would like to provide the opportunity, Mr. Drill, there's a member that wanted to clarify their vote, there is a member that would like to clarify their vote on the application that was just deliberated on, 750 Walnut Avenue. Mr. Drill will explain the clarification.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. I'm going to let Miss Sen do it because I think Miss Sen was confused. She told me at the break that she thought the vote was only on the conditions and not on approving the
application with the conditions so she intended to vote no but she actually voted yes so she's basically -- I have to figure out how we can do this but she basically wants to change her vote from yes to no. Is that correct?

MS. SEN: I just wanted to clarify that
I voted no to the redevelopment proposal and I was confused because of the conditions, I'm thankful for the conditions and I think that they are helpful but $I$ do want to be on record that $I$ am against the plan for all the reasons I've stated for a very long time period, so thank you, and apologies.

MR. DRILL: I envision --
MS. SEN: And this is Diana Sen.
MR. DRILL: I envision I'm going to have some sort of footnote in the voting block on this resolution.

You want to call the next case?
VICE CHAIRMAN NORDELO: Yes. Thank you. (At 9:54 p.m. proceedings were concluded.)
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| 9:11,22,23 | 57:8 60:6 | 12:4,6 15:23 | 100:17 |
| 11:18,22 | companies | 16:21 17:8 | 02:25 |
| 12:2 13:11, | 44:8 | 22:10 26:20 | conducted |
| 12 14:13,14 | company | 33:5 47:7,23 | 5:20,21 |
| 15:21 16:6 | 44:23 48:20 | 49:5,20 81:2 | confirm |
| 18:11,12 |  | 88:15,19 | 55:2 |
| 19:9,10 20:7 |  | 90:18 | confused |
| 22:10,13,15 |  | condense | 102:23 |
| 25:10 29:2,3 | compelling $57: 16$ | $23: 4,13$ | confusing |
| $32: 4,5$ 33:5 | complacent | condition | 56:13 |
| 34:6,7 | complacent | $25: 1642: 13,$ | conscience |
| 36:10,11 | complex | $14,19,23$ | 21:7 |
| 39:2, 3 45:4 | Complex | $43: 1,3,8,25$ | consensus |
| 47:6,7,22,24 | 47:15 102: | $44: 3 \quad 46: 3,7$ | 76:18,20 |
| 51:7,8 52:9, | compliance | $55: 18 \quad 56: 1$ | consent |
| 10 57:22,24 | 3:6,11 40:3 | $65: 24 \quad 66: 6$ | $70: 21 \quad 71: 3,4$ |
| 59:5,25 | compliant | $1667: 15$ | $75: 19 \quad 86: 10$ |
| 66:11 68:24, | 21:20 55:12 | $71: 10 \quad 72: 2$ | consented |
| 25 75:7,8 | complied | $9,12 \quad 73: 17,$ | $70: 17,19,25$ |
| 78:13 79:1, | 46:15 53:21 | $2274: 1,5$ | 70:17,19,25 <br> $71 \cdot 1,21$ 86.8 |
| 2,4,5 80:25 | comply | $22$ | 71:1,21 86:8 |
| 81:2 82:16 | 53:10,17,23 | $76: 21$ | enting |
| 84:15,16 | 68:12 | 84:2,3 85:3, | onsenting |
| 85:12,13 |  | $25 \text { 86:11,14, }$ | 70:15 |


| consents | correctly | criteria | David |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 86:13 | 37:20 | 11:21 12:1, | 17:7 47:23 |
| consider | cos | 21 13:24 | 60:20 78:4 |
| 24:23 | 88:1 | 17:25 18:23 | 88:14 98:21 |
| considerable | cost | critical | de |
| 77:4 | 55:15 75:24 | $20: 24$ | $39: 12 \quad 49: 23$ |
| considered | 80:21 82:5, | criticism | 50:3,5,7,14 |
| 68:3 | 25 90:11 | 63:18 | deal |
| considering | 91:2 | cross | 16:25 41:11 |
| 23:3 | counting | 78:6 80:4,5 | 49:16 54:18 |
| considers | 54:5 | 83:14 93:18 | 67:6 75:20 |
| 26:18 | county | crossing | 81:3 87:16 |
| consistent | 41:23 43:10 | 81:9 83:10 | dealing |
| 43:16 51:19 | 44:1 46:5 | crosswalk | 47:16 48:11 |
| construction | 47:2 71:12, | 75:25 76:17, | deals |
| 53:2 62:3 | 16 72:5,17, | 25 77:10 | 50:3 67:23 |
| 102:5 | 18 73:4,18, | 78:8,18 | dealt |
| constructive | 20 76:4 | 80:17 81:18, | 8:12 49:13, |
| 61:2 | 77:19 82:10 | 23 82:6 | $1657: 8$ |
| contact | 93:4 | 92:14 93:20 | 67:23 |
| 71:12,16 | couple | crosswalks | dear |
| 72:5 | 8:14 64:6 | 76:6,11,12 | 82:8 |
| contacts | 71:6 | 77:2,18 | December |
| 73:18 | course <br> 45:13 | $\begin{array}{ll} 78: 16 & 80: 15 \\ 81: 5 & 83: 8,14 \end{array}$ | $5: 21 \quad 6: 1$ |
| contains | court | curb-side | decide |
| 6:7 | 15:4, 6, 20 | 25:13 | $\begin{array}{rr}\text { 48:16 } & \text { 93:15 }\end{array}$ |
| contending $57: 19$ | $16: 23 \quad 17: 2$ | curious | decision |
| contingent | $18: 2,25$ $67: 13,20,22$ | 74:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 20,23 \\ & 93: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 92:21 | 68:1 69:22 | $55: 9 \quad 56: 15$ |  |
| ```control 16:16 57:14``` | coverage | 67:3 76:15 | $80: 14,15$ |
| conversation | $20: 16$ $46: 25$ $49: 12$ | cut | decreased |
| $86: 23$ | covered | 71:13,17,22 | 29:24 |
| convinced $56: 4$ | 21:16 | D | dedicated 19:22 59:2, |
|  | Cranford |  | 12 60:11 |
| $56: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 2,5,19 \\ & 21: 22 \quad 41: 11, \end{aligned}$ | danger | 64:2 |
| copied | 12 56:21 | 25:7 40:22 | defeats |
| 6:14 70:5 |  | dash | 77:8 |
| copies | crazy | 78:11 | definite |
| 6:13 |  | dated | 92:11 |
| correct | $79: 2381: 4$ | 8:11 67:7,8 | definitely |
| 55:10 65:17 |  | 94:25 | 3:21 |
| $66: 10 \quad 80: 20$ | $6 \cdot 11,13,15$ | Dave | delay |
| $94: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 11,13,15, \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | 8:16 | 69:23 |


| deliberate | 79:6,11 | Didzbalis | disagrees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:21 8:15, | 82:18 83:6 | 4:18,19 | 8:22 |
| 16,19 53:6 | 84:19,20 | 10:3,4 11:16 | disappeared |
| 63:5 65:7 | 85:16,17 | 13:17,18 | 71:25 |
| deliberated | 89:23,24 | 14:19,20 | discuss |
| 102:19 | 90:8,12 | 18:17,18 | 63:7 69:10 |
| deliberating | 91:17,18 | 19:15,16 | 70:3,24,25 |
| 5:24 6:2,9, | 92:1 93:2 | 23:18,22 | 72:8 86:17 |
| 24 53:12 | 94:12,13 | 29:8,9 30:25 | 98:7 |
| deliberation | 97:18,19 | 32:10,11 | discussed |
| 5:1 6:4 | 101:10,11 | 34:12,13 | 60:15 72:7 |
| 7:12,15,19 | design | 36:16,17 | 95:1,3 99:19 |
| 8:24 59:9 | 93:7 | 39:8,9 | discussing |
| deliberations | detail | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 13,14 \\ & 52: 15,16 \end{aligned}$ | 14:25 |
| 5:8 6:6 9:10 | $58: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 15,16 \\ & 62: 4,569: 5 \end{aligned}$ | discussion |
| 54:3,5 60:7 | determination 92:13 | $675: 13,14$ | $15: 14 \quad 16: 22$ |
| demand | 92:13 | $84: 21,22$ | $23 \text { 71:4 88:2 }$ |
| $41: 94$ | 92.15 93.21 | 85:18,19 | $98: 1$ |
| demands $15: 15$ | developed | 91:19,20 | discussions $57: 17$ |
| demographics | 61:11 | 97:20,21 | disingenuous |
| 89:4 | developer | 101:12,13 | 55:20 67:6, |
| demonstrates | 44:4 80:21 | difference | 11,19,24 |
| 60:4 | 87:9 | 37:19 | disjointed |
| deny | development | different | 80:7 |
| 20:22 66:1, | 22:2 40:3,11 | 53:7 64:9 | dispute |
| 16 | 41:24 45:8, | 67:2 70:12 | 71:25 |
| depending | 24 48:22 | 87:6 89:6 | disruption |
| 44:15 | 51:23 53:3, | 96:22 | 20:13 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { deposit } \\ 72: 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,9,16,22 \\ & 57: 1461: 9 \end{aligned}$ | differing $55: 17$ | distance $77: 4$ |
| Deputy | $64: 1$ | difficult | District |
| 4:16,17 | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 1 \\ & 89: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 102:3 | 20:9 |
| 10:1,2 | deviation | dining | disturb |
| 13:15,16 | $12: 22 \quad 13: 25$ | 20:11 | 24:4 |
| 14:17,18 | 12:22 13:25 device | direct | disturbance |
| 16:20 18:15, | $76: 1 \quad 82: 7$ | 15:12 | 31:1 |
| 16 19:13,14 | devoted | directly | divide |
| 22:8,9 29:6, | $5: 23$ | 60:6 | 52:25 |
| 7 32:8,9 | Diana |  | document |
| 34:10,11 | Diana | 20:21 55:25 | 6:17 70:22 |
| 36:14,15 | 56:8 | $74: 19 \quad 92: 20$ | doing |
| 37:15 39:6,7 | Dickerson | disagreed | $45: 12 \quad 48: 20$ |
| 49:4 51:11, | 65:16 | disagreed | 45:12 48:20 |
| 12 52:13,14 | dictates | 79:9 | Donna |
| 69:3,4 | $96: 7$ | disagreeing | 16:10 26:3 |
| 75:11,12 |  | 70:18 | 58:22 81:16 |


| door | 25 91:23,25 | efforts | 92:4,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36:24 37:2 | 92:4,10,18, | 16:16 56:18 | engineering |
| dormant | 24 93:5,18 | eight | 21:17 86:7, |
| 61:17,24 | 94:18,21,23, | 39:12 71:11, | 12 90:3 91:4 |
| double- | 24 97:2,4,24 | 15 | 92:16 93:22 |
| checked | 98:2,3,6,8, | eighth | engineers |
| 65:22 | 10,13 99:5, | 5:22 77:7 | 86:25 92:6 |
| downtow | 9,12,20,24 | either | ensued |
| 40:20,25 | 100:4, 6, 8, | 5:16 7:9 | 16:22 |
| Drill | 14,20 101:17 | 43:10 65:23 | entertain |
| 4:22,23 5:9, | 102:10,16, | 71:1 | 10:15 |
| 11,12 9:5,6 | 20,22 | elementary | entice |
| 10:12 11:6, | Drill's | 28:17,22 | 40:14 |
| 20,25 12:3, | 9 | eligible | entire |
| 15,16,18 | drive | 8:20 | 15:14 21:14, |
| 13:21 14:23 | 64:12 | eliminate | 24 42:8 |
| 15:19 16:2,8 | drivers | 18:1,24 | 43:10 |
| 17:20,22 | 40:14 | 45:12 | enumerated |
| 18:21 22:21 | driving | eliminating | $99: 17$ |
| 23:20 26:2 | 25:13 | 20:14 | environment |
| 27:1,3,5,21 | drove | elimination | 23:2 |
| 29:12 30:17 | 21:4 | 15:6 | envisioned |
| $31: 6,7$ 32:22 |  | ema | $67: 8$ |
| $33: 10,11$ $35: 8,9,12$ | E | 6:11 | equipment |
| $\begin{aligned} & 35: 8,9,12 \\ & 38: 2,3 \quad 42: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  | empty | 15:4,6 |
| $38: 2,3 \quad 42: 23$ $43: 7,13$ | e-mail | 61:13 | error |
| 45:25 46:13 | 70:18 75:18 | enacting | 44:22 |
| 50:1,2 51:17 | 94:25 95:15 | 45:15 | escro |
| 52:19,21 | earlie | encouraging | 72:20 |
| 53:5 54:12, | 7:2 23:4 | 48:4 | essential |
| 14,15 55:10 | 49:14 82:19, | end | 55:24 |
| 57:23 60:2 | 24 86:22 | 8:6,13 10:14 | established |
| 65: 9, 10 | easier | 28:6,8 54:22 | 72:21 91:3 |
| 68:6,7,10 | 6:4 70:10 | 59:22 70:20 | etcetera |
| 69:9,11,14, | easy | 90:16 | 20:11 95:9 |
| 20,22 70:2,4 | 63:7 | ener | evening |
| 73:11,16 | echo | 102:2 | 3:1 5:23 7:2 |
| 74:4,8,14,21 | 62:25 64:6 | enforcement | 66:5 |
| 75:17 76:19, | editorial | 27:12 31:18 | evenings |
| 23 79:9 | 12:5 50:19 | 33:19 35:24 | 44:14,18 |
| 81:15 82:2,3 | 51:24 86:11 | 38:15 50:16 | $48: 14$ |
| 83:20,21 | effect | engaged | event |
| 84:1,10 | 42:5 | 15:14 57:2 | $72: 1786:$ |
| 85:2,22 | effective | engineer | $96: 9$ |
| 87:23 88:4, | 78:9 | $21: 12 \quad 32: 25$ |  |
| 17 89:15 | effort | $33: 758: 12,$ | $20: 11$ |
| 90:6,10,23, | $102: 2$ | $1386: 6 \quad 90: 2$ |  |



| five $58: 969: 17$ | forget $30: 12$ | G | give $7: 7 \quad 63: 8,15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fixtures $32: 17,18$ | forgetting $56: 9$ | Gar | given $86: 25$ |
| 33:15,16 | formal | 4:16,17 | glowin |
| flashing | 3:19 69:11 | 10:1,2 | 30:7 |
| 76:1,25 | formulaic | 13:15,16 | goal |
| 78:8,20,21 | 88:21 | 14:17,18 | 49:10 |
| 81:8 82:7 | forth | 16:20 18:15, | godsen |
| flex | 47:25 59:1 | 16 19:13,14 | 78:9 |
| 44:16 | found | 22:8,9 29:6, | goes |
| flood | $37: 17$ | 7 32:8,9 | 33:2 41:10 |
| 16:16,24 | four | 34:10,11 | 62:14 |
| 17:3 56:17, | 8:5 53:7 | 36:14,15 | going |
| 20 57:13 | 72:10 | $37: 15$ 39:6,7 | 7:7 10:11 |
| flooding | fourth | 49:3,4 | 22:9,16 23:4 |
| 17:1 45:11, | 29:18 | 51:11,12 | 26:13 27:19 |
| 20 56:16 | frankly | 52:13,14 | 41:19 44:22 |
| 65:4 | frankly $28: 2$ | 69:3,4 | 47:1,4 60:2 |
| floor | fraud | 75:11, 12 78.14 79:5, | 61:10,11,21, |
| 20:18 37:7 | 56:1 67:13, | 78:14 79:5, | 22 62:25 |
| 100:11,16 | 19,22,25 |  | 69:9 70:1,12 |
| focus | frequently | 184:19, 20 | 72:10 74:8, |
| 56:22 | 78:6 86:24 | 85:16,17 | 14 77:9 |
| folks | friends | 89:23,24 | 78:18 79:15, |
| 17:16 89:5 | 77:14 | 90:8,12 | 22 82:12,20 |
| follow | front | 91:17,18 | 84:8 88:6 |
| 6:8 | 10:21 12:22 | 92:1 93:2 | 89:5 93:10, |
| fond | 13:25 22:1 | 94:12,13 | 11,17 96: |
| 72:13 | 26:6 30:11 | 97:18,19 | 102.11,22 |
| foot | 41:24 | 101:10,11 | good |
| 10:21,22 | frontage | gave | $46: 2358: 8$ |
| 20:9 21:19, | 42:8 43:11 | 50:20,22 | $59: 22 \quad 60: 1$ |
| 23,25 22:20, | 72:16,19 | general | $62: 19 \quad 63: 17$ |
| 21,22 23:3, | frustrating | 15:25 27:9 | 72:8 81:3 |
| 7,13 25:21 | 61:6 | 31:16 33:17 | 93:12 |
| $29: 22,24$ 30.431 .10 | full | 35:22 38:13 | grade |
| 30:4 31:10, | 15:3 | 47:11 50:15 | $32: 17$ |
| 11 33:14 | fully | 65:20 |  |
| 35:1 | 87:19,20 | generate | 30:22 31:9 |
| force $37: 1$ | function | 41:9 | 35:13 37:14 |
| forest | 87:2 | generated | 38:4 43:3,5 |
| $61: 10$ | funds | 41:17 | 50:5,7 51:18 |
| forever | 72:19 | getting | 54:1,7 98:4, |
| 78:19 | future | $7: 5 \quad 25: 18$ $62: 18,19$ | 16,25 99:13, |



| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 1 \quad 38: 18 \\ & 50: 18 \end{aligned}$ | infrastructur | involvement $57: 5$ | juncture |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| impressed 63:2 | 51:22 | issue | jury |
|  | input | 17:17 24:11, | 5:13 6:2,3, |
| improper$25: 20$ | 17:13 62:17 | 13,15 25:9 | 6,11,19 |
|  | 63:8 | 31:19 33:20 | 7:12,15 |
| Improvement 40: 6 | insight | 35:25 37:18 | 50:20,23 |
|  | 17:10 | 38:16 39:17 | 51:24 55:3 |
| improvements$81: 6$ | insightful | 41:18 48:5 |  |
|  | 17:11 | 49:17 51:18 | K |
| imprudent | install | 55:10 56:21 |  |
| 27:13 31:20 | 75:25 82:6 | 73:16,24 | Kate |
| 33:21 36:1 | 92:14 93:6,7 | 74:17 95:21 | 16:14 45:6 |
| 38:17 50:17 | installation | issues | 62:24 80:9 |
| inappropriate$23: 11$ | 72:21 81:7 | 16:25 24:10 | 81:21 |
|  | installed | 49:7 55:12 | Kathleen |
| inclined$45: 7,21$ | 72:22 93:21 | item | 57:24 |
|  | instances | 6:9 | keep |
| include | 57:3 |  | 24:20 56:8 |
| 79:15 99:1, | instructions | J | 88:11 |
| 25 100:1 | 55:3 |  | keeping |
| included | intended | January | 11:8 |
| 51:24 56:2 | 93:9 | 3:3 5:14,23 | Kent-smith |
| 89:25 | intent | 8:10,11 | 70:13,18 |
| including | 27:10 31:16 | $70: 23$ 75:19 | 71:20 72:4 |
| 55:19 | 33:18 35:22 | 94:25 | 86:9 95:16 |
| incorrect | 38:14 50:15, | Jason | 101:19,20 |
| 67:25 | 20 | 16:20 | 102:1,8 |
| increased | intents | Jeff | kept |
| 23:8 | 79:16 | 76:24 | 101:20 |
| incremental | interest | Jersey | kick |
| 48:2 | 30:6,22 35:3 | 3:5 39:13 | 89:17 |
|  | 76:13 | job | kidding |
| $73: 18$ | intersection | 63:17 102:4 | 69:23 |
| indicate | 76:16 | jobs | kids |
| 11:8,9 88:12 | invested | 62:13 | 24:24 25:4 |
| indicated | 61:1 | joined | 28:17 64:14 |
| 30:23 72:4 | invite | 24:1 | kind |
| 98:18 | 15:17 17:20 | joke | 23:14 28:21 |
| Industries | 20:5 39:25 | 69:24 | 33:2 60:23 |
| 5:3 | 54:10 77:25 | Juan | 79:18 89:25 |
| industry | 81:22 | 30:18 35:5 | knock |
| 30:4,12 | invited | Julie | 46:24 |
| information | 95:19 96:9 | 23:22 62:5 | know |
| $50: 22 \text { 87:1, }$ | involved | July | 12:6 16:2 |
| 17 (1) | 6:10 | 5:20 | 17:9,12,15 |
|  |  |  | $22: 4,25$ |


| 23:9,11 | large | legal | 83:24 84:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25:3,17 | 25:11 89:3 | 6:7 7:1,6 | ,11,13,15, |
| 26:17 28:23 | laryngitis | 54:1 66:19 | 17,19,21,23 |
| 30:7 32:24 | 16:7 | 67:13 71:1 | 85:4,6,8,10, |
| 40:20 41:13, | law | legally | 12,14,16,18, |
| 19 42:2 | 67:22 68:2 | 27:25 | 20 90:24 |
| 43:9,12 44:4 | lawfully | Lenahan | 91:5,7,9,11, |
| 45:2,19 | 86:15 | 4:1,4, 6, 8, | 13,15,17,19, |
| 46:22 47:15, | lawyer | 10,12,14,16, | 21 93:24 |
| 25 48:2,13, | 67:1 | 18,20,22,24 | 94:2,4,6,8, |
| 16,18,20 | lead | 9:13,14,16, | 10,12,14,16 |
| 49:7,14 | 16:23 25:7 | 18,20,22,24 | 97:6,8,10, |
| 54:16 56:6, | Leader | 10:1, 3, 5, 7, 9 | 12,14,16,18, |
| 8,16 58:9,13 | Leader 3:9,14 | 11:8,23 | 20,22 98:6, |
| 59:19 60:3, | 3:9,14 leases | 12:13 13:2, | 9,12 100:19, |
| 24 61:5,6,8, | leases | 5,7,9,11,13, | 22,23,25 |
| 9,10,16,17, |  | 15,17,19 | 101:2,4,6,8, |
| 19,21,24 | leave | 14:4,7,9,11, | 10,12,14,16, |
| 62:2,12,18, | 12:6 87:21 | 13,15,17,19, | 25 |
| 21 63:13,23 | 92:2 | 21 18:3,5,7, | length |
| 64:7,25 65:1 | Leber | 9,11,13,15, | 21:14,24 |
| 66:24 67:1 | 4:4,5 8:16 | 17,19 19:1, | lengthy |
| 71:7 78:11 | 9:14,15 | 3,5,7,9,11, | 6:21 |
| 79:12,21,23 | 12:3,4 13:3, | 13,15,17 | level |
| 80:1 83:5 | 4 14:5,6 | 20:18 22:8 | 36:22,25 |
| 85:24 87:13, | 17:7,8 18:3, | 27:18 28:9, | $37: 7$ 38:6,7 |
| 19 88:4,15, | 4 19:1,2 | 11,25 29:2, | levels |
| 23,24 89:1, | 22:24,25 | 4,6,8,10,14 | 37:1 |
| $2,3,7$ 92:24 | 27:18,19 | 31:21,23,25 |  |
| 93:14 96:2 | 28:7 29:13, | $32: 2,4,6,8$, | $82: 8 \quad 92: 14$ |
| known | 15,16 31:21, | 10,12 33:23, | light |
| 55:21 | 22 33:23,24 | $2534: 2,4,6$, | 11:10 76:1, |
| kudos | $36: 2,3$ | 8,10,12,14 | $1680: 3 \quad 82: 7$ |
| 59:11 60:25 | 37:24,25 | $36: 2,4,6,8$, | lighting |
| 61:5 | 38:19,20 | 10,12,14,16, | lighting $29: 21,23$ |
|  | 47:21,22,23 | 18 38:19,21, | $30: 12 \quad 31$ |
| L | $50: 24,25$ $52: 1,2$ | 23,25 39:2, | 12 32:17,18, |
|  | 60:19 | $4,6,8,10$ | 22,25 33:3, |
| laid | $68: 16,17$ | 50:24 51:1, | 7,15,16 |
| 10:10 | 74:24,25 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,5,7,9,11, \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | 37:10 |
| land | 78:2,3,4 | $3,5,7,9,11,$ | lightly |
| 41:12,13,15 | 83:25 84:5,6 | $13,15,17$ | 62:13 |
| Lang | 85: 4, 5 | $68: 16,18,20$ | lights |
| 77:3 81:20 | 88:10,13,14, | $22,24 \text { 69:1, }$ | 78:20 |
| language | 19 91:5,6 | 3,5,7 74:24 | limit |
| 72:3 80:23 | 93:25 94:1 | 75:1, 3, 5, 7, | 72:15,18,22, |
| 88:6,9 92:13 | 97:6,7 | 9,11,13,15 | 24 73:19 |
| 93:1 | 100:23,24 |  | 77:20 95:19 |


| limitation | long | $22: 6,11,12,$ $1723: 4,25$ | maximum $33: 14$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| limited | 55:23 58:8, | 49:6 60:24 | Mayor |
| 44:13 51:19 | 22,23 59:19 | 61:3,8 74:3, | 4:16,17 |
| limits | 62:7 96:9 | 10 80:14 | 10:1, 2 |
| 95:18, 21 | 102:3 | 81:6 100:17 | 13:15,16 |
| line | longer | main | 14:17,18 |
| 10:24 12:24 | 72:7 95:1 | 46:21 | 16:20 18:15, |
| 14:2 28:20 | look | major | 16 19:13,14 |
| lineal | 21:4 64:23 | 5:5,6,7 | 22:8,9 29:6, |
| 20:1,2 | 92:8 | majority | 7 32:8,9 |
| lines | looked | 26:25 28:1 | 34:10,11 |
| 10:22 30:5 | 66:23 | 54:8 | 36:14,15 |
| 57:7 | looking | make | 37:15 39:6,7 |
| list | 41:3 47:12 | 6:4 8:23 9:8 | 49:4 51:11, |
| 66:4,18 | 65:13 | 12:5 21:19 | 12 52:13, |
| Listen | lot | 59:15 61:9 | 69:3,4 |
| 89:15 | 5:3 10:25 | 65:1 66:15 | 75:11,12 |
| listened | 12:25 14:3 | $72: 23$ 73:7 | 79:6,11 |
| 5:17 | 29:23 30:8 | 74:10,12,16 | 18 83: |
| listening | 31:12,13 | 76:11 78:16 | :19,20 |
| $16: 13$ | 32:19 33:17 | 80:19,22 | 85:16,17 |
| literal | 34:22 37:16 | 83:1 91:1 | 90:8,12 |
| 27:11 31:18 | 39:22 40:25 | 96:5 98:4,16 | 91:17,18 |
| 33:19 35:23 | 41:10,11 | , | 92:1 93:2 |
| 38:15 50:16 | $44: 10,23$ $45: 952$. | making | 94:12,13 |
| little | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 9 \\ & 53: 1, \end{aligned}$ | manner | 97:18,19 |
| 16:7 24:24 | $62: 13,14$ | $57: 963:$ | 101:10,11 |
| 28:20 61:13, | 63:4,6 70:14 |  | mean |
| 14 80:7 | 77:8 82:21 | margin 44.22 | 20:25 27:25 |
| live | 83:11 |  | 42:11 59:11 |
| 24:25 25:2 | lots | marked | 98:22 |
| 26:12 40:15 | 20:10 41:1 | 57:4 | meant |
| 48:18 58:15 | 44:6,11 | market | 100:6 |
| 59:14 64:9 | louder | 48:19 | measures |
| 96:9 | $88: 18$ | matter | 16:24 17:3 |
| living | lower | $3: 15$ $11: 15$ 12: | meet |
| 77:13 | 73:19 77:20 | 11:15 12 | 51:20 58:9 |
| load |  |  | 96:10 |
| 96:6,11 | $72: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 622: 7 \\ & 29: 19.25 \end{aligned}$ | meeting |
| location | lowers | 32:14 34:16 | 3:2, 6, 8, 9, |
| 25:19 76:15 | 1owers $72: 18$ | $36: 20 \quad 68: 9$ | 11,13,14,20 |
| 78:17 |  | 102:9 | 15:15 58:22 |
| locations $76: 9$ | M | matters | $\begin{gathered} 59: 2 \\ \text { meetings } \end{gathered}$ |
| Lone $35: 7$ | made | 57:18 94:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 7,12 \quad 24: 2 \\ & 58: 5,11,23 \end{aligned}$ |



| 26:16 27:4, | noted | occupants | 10 37:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 29:10,11, | 49:22 | 96:23 | 38:10 39:17 |
| 17 30:15,18, | notes | occupied | 41:22 43:8, |
| 19 31:4 | 65:13,17,18, | 87:20 | 24 46:17,20 |
| 32:12,13 | 21 70:5,10, | occurs | 47:13 53:6, |
| 33:8 34:14, | 14,15 71:19, | 48:12 | 15 54:7,8, |
| 15 35:5,11 | 20 86:7,9 | offered | 12,17 61:8 |
| 36:18,19 | notice | 70:7,8 | 66:3 71:5 |
| 37:24 38:1 | 3:7,9,12,14 | offers | 72:7,12,14 |
| 39:10,11 | 53:6 | $45: 9$ | 76:10 77:10, |
| 42:9,15,21 | number | okay | 18 79:9,19, |
| 45:1 47:6,21 | 5:1 7:24 | 11:11 12:10 | 25 81:24 |
| 48:24 49:2, | 8:2,4,5 | 13:21 14:23 | 82:1, 5, 12, 23 |
| 18 51:15,16 | 14:23 33:2 | 17:7,22 | 85:1 87:2 |
| 52:17,18, 20, | 39:21 41:21, | 24:19 25:23 | 89:19 91:24 |
| 22 54:10,13, | 25 48:1 50:8 | 28:7 35:7 | 98:22 |
| 23 56:24 | 52:20,21,23 | 38:1 41:4 | ones |
| 58:20 59:24 | 58:14 60:3 | 42:21 43:15 | 59:14 70:24, |
| 62:4,23 | 71:10,15 | $46: 13$ 48:25 | 25 |
| 63:12,21 | 72:9 75:21 | 49:1 50:2 | open |
| 65:6 68:4,8 | 82:4 94:24 | 51:17 52:19 | 3:7,12 61:7 |
| 69:7,8,16, | 95:2,13,19, | 55:1,11 65:9 | open-minded |
| 20,25 75:15, | 22,24 96:7, | 74:4,24 | 45:14 |
| 16 77:24 | 23 | 75:17 76:24 | operating |
| $78: 13 \quad 79: 1,4$ | numerous | 83:15,21 | 87:3 |
| $81: 11 \quad 82: 2$ | 58:4 | 84:1,4,10 | opinion |
| 16 83:4,17 |  | 85:4,22 | 26:25 40:8 |
| 84:23, 24 | 0 | 86:21 89:21 | 46:19 47:5 |
| 85:20,21 |  | 92:10 93:6 | 65:25 66:16, |
| 86:19 88:8 | objecting | 94:18 97:6, | 19,20,21 |
| 89:11, 22 | 72:25 | 24,25 98:12 | 74:18, 20 |
| 90:13,17 | objection | 99:11 100:8, | 86:14 |
| 91:21, 22 | 86:18 | 10 | opportunity |
| 93:16 94:16, | objections | om | 10:13 58:9 |
| 17,20 95:25 | 9:6,7 | 67:2 | 102:16 |
| 96:12 97:1, | obstruction | on-line | opposite |
| 22,23,25 | 30:10 | 58:4 | 41:6 |
| 99:4,16,21 | obviously | once | optimal |
| 100:21 | 23:24 26:17 | 23:5 32:24 | 23:2 |
| 101:14,15,23 | 28:13 55:16 | 87:19 | optimum |
| 102:7,11,15 | 56:5,20,21 | one | 20:9 |
| north | 64:1,10,25 | 7:10,17,24 | order |
| 34:23 | 65:10 66:25 | 8:2,23 10:23 | 10:18 21:18 |
| note | 82:22 | 12:5,23 | 70:13 88:9 |
| 6:22 49:10 | occupancy | 13:25 22:4,5 | 102:13 |
| 61:24 71:11 | 95:18, 21 | 24:10 27:5 | ordinance |
|  | $96: 6,11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 15,20 \\ & 34: 25 \quad 35: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 27:12 29:20 |


| $31: 18$ 32:15 | parents | patience | 76:10,15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33:20 34:17 | 25:4 | 61:6 | 77:8 78:9, |
| 35:24 38:16 | park | pay | 11,19,20 |
| 65:21, 22 | 44:7 48:4,8 | 72:21 73:21, | 81:22 83:9 |
| 66:7 98:21 | 79:16,21 | 22 | 96:7 |
| ordinance/ | 81:22 | paying | percent |
| rsis | parked | 74:1 80:24 | 20:1,3 36:22 |
| 53:20 | 42:6 | PB-20-002 | 37:1,21,22 |
| organize | parking | 5:2 | 38:5,8 74:19 |
| 6:5 | 15:5,7 | Pedde | 87:5 88:1 |
| outdoor | 29:21,23 | 4:14,15 | perfectly |
| 20:11 95:8 | 30:8 31:11, | 9:24,25 | 30:9,11 |
| outlined | 12 32:25 | 13:13,14 | perform |
| 9:2,5 10:12 | 39:15,22 | 14:15,16 | 86:1 91:2 |
| 25:12 99:19 | 40:2,21,23, | 16:10 18:13, | period |
| outlining | 24 41:1,5,9, | 14 19:11,12 | 89:18 |
| 42:17 | 17,18,23,25 | 25:24, 25 | permission |
| outside | 42:4 43:10, | 26:3 29:4,5 | 71:13,17,21 |
| 95:13 | 22,23 44:5, | 32:6,7 34:8, | person |
| overflow | 6,9,11,17, | 9 36:12,13 | 5:16 58:5 |
| 45:17 | 18,19,21,25 | 39:4,5 51:9, | personally |
| overlighting | 45:15,17,22, | 10 52:11,12 | 49:22 64:9 |
| 33:3 | 23 46:6,17, | 58:20,21,22 | perspective |
| overlooked | $49: 12,15$ | $69: 1,2$ 75:9, $1081: 12,13$, | 17:16 67:2 |
| 17:15 | 50:8 96:20 | 16 84:17,18 | persuasive |
| overpass | part | 85:14,15 | 37:18 |
| 21:23,24 | 55:4,5 58:2 | 89:23 90:13, | Pete |
| 22:18,22 | 60:8 82:21 | 14 91:15,16 | 32:21 |
| 23:6,14 | 86:4 | 94:10,11 | piece |
| overview | participation | 97:16,17 | 7:14 10:11, |
| 92:5 | $57: 5$ | 101:8,9 | 14,16 11:12 |
| owe | particular | pedestrian | 15:1 19:20 |
| 89:8 | 10:14,16 | 19:23 20:10 | pieces |
|  | 11:5,10,12 | 26:18 78:22 | 7:14 54:7 |
| P | 12:12 15:12, | 81:4 | pilot |
|  | 16 17:17 | pedestrians | 55:15,22 |
| page | 20:6 22:7 | 21:21 25:18 | 58:2, 6 |
| 53:7 71:11, | 30:22 33:3 | 26:24 77:4, | 66:13,14 |
| 15 72:10 | 35:2 47:10, | 22 78:25 | 67:7,8,11 |
| pages | 12 57:11 | people | Pistol |
| 6:21 8:12 | 68:9 78:2 | 7:21 21:6 | 4:2,3 8:18 |
| paragraph | 96:2,15 | 23:9 24:25 | 39:25 40:1 |
| 10:19 15:2 | pass | 25:16 26:11 | 42:9,13,18 |
| 19:21 36:20 | 28:5,7 | 40:14,19 | 43:5,8,15 |
| 39:23 | passes | 44:8,23 | 45:2 46:14 |
| paramount | 10:7 101:16 | 48:4,8 53:5 | 48:24 49:1 |
| 57:11 |  | 58:15 74:21 | 76:22,24 |



| problem | 41:7, 8, 9, 10, | Prunty | publishing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46:2, 3, 8 | 16 44:20 | 4:12,13 | 3:8,13 |
| 47:4 69:21 | 52:25 72:16 | 9:11,22,23 | pull |
| procedure | proposed | 11:18,22 | 16:3 |
| 5:9 7:7,9, | 10:24 12:24 | 12:2 13:11, | purpose |
| 11,13 8:1,5, | 14:2 34:21 | 12 14:13,14 | 27:10 31:16 |
| 21,24 9:2,4 | 37:21 39:16 | 15:21,22 | 33:18 35:22 |
| 10:10 | 40:2,11 | 16:6 18:11, | 38:14 50:15, |
| procedures | 45:24 53:8, | 12 19:9,10 | 2077 78 |
| 6:23 9:9 | 16,22 68:11 | 20:7 22:11, | purposes |
| proceed | 71:23 | 14,15 25:10 | 15:20 79:16 |
| 27:1 38:2 | proposing | $29: 2,3$ 32:4, | pursuant |
| 68:6 97:2 | 46:10 |  | 66:7 98:21 |
| proceedings | proud | $\begin{aligned} & 736: 10,11 \\ & 39: 2,3 \quad 45: 5 \end{aligned}$ | pursue |
| 70:1 | $57: 6$ | $47: 7,23,24$ | 72:15 73:25 |
| process | proved | 51:7,8 52:9, | put |
| 15:15 57: | 8:3 | 10 57:22,23, | 37:11 59:1 |
| 4,19,21 70: professional | proven 11:13 | 24,25 59:5, | 73:10 92:7 |
| professional $63: 19 \text { 92:8 }$ | 11:13 | 25 66:11 |  |
| 93:13 | provide 39:20 | 68:24,25 | Q |
| professionals | 57:16 102:16 | 5 81:1,2 | quarte |
| 30:13 76:5 | provided | 84:15,16 | 77:5 |
| 80:13,14,19 | 3:8,13 19:24 | 85:12,13 | question |
| 82:11,22 | 35:4 40:13 | 86:20,21 | 8:3 12:19 |
| 83:1 87:25 | 46:17 63:4 | 88:16 91:13, | 13:22 17:21 |
| program | 90:18 | 14 94:8,9 | 27:2,16 |
| 67:7,8,11 | provides | 96:3,4,13 | 35:12,18 |
| prohibits | 31:3 | 97:14,15 | 38:2,3,10 |
| 34:18 | providing | 99:23 101:6, | 50:1, 4, 12, |
| project | 6:13 76:1 | 7 | 18,22 54:24 |
| 47:11,12,16 | proving | public | 55:4 68:10 |
| 55:22 58:7 | 12:20 13:23 | 3:7,12 | questioning |
| 61:3 63:3 | 17:23 18:22 | 15:13,15, 25 | 57:7 |
| projections | 27:7 31:14 | 16:12 17:10, | questions |
| 88:22 89:1 | 33:12 35:20 | 14 20:23 | 6:23 57:8,10 |
| rone | 38:11 50:13 | 21:8 24:14, | 62:10,17 |
| 45:11 | provision | 21 26:18 | 63:18 |
| proof | 39:14,16 | $33: 4$ 35:2 | quick |
| 28:2 57:19 | provisions | 51:21 61:4 | 81:13 |
| properties | 27:10 31:17 | 62:9,1 | 1 y |
| 31:2 41:11, | 33:18 35:22 | 63:3, 8, 1 | 89:24 |
| 13 | 38:14 53:10, | public's | quiet all |
| property | 17,24 68:13 | 30:6,21 | $101: 20$ |
| 10:22,24 | prudent | publish | quite |
| 12:24 14:2 | 83:2 | 30:13 | 15:24 25:11 |
| 21:15 30:5 |  |  | 28:2 62:7 |


|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { rationale } \\ 90: 18 \end{gathered}$ | recommendatio$\mathrm{n}$ | refer <br> 56:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R |  |  |  |
|  | read | 73:8,10,12 | referencing |
| R-S-I-S | 3:10 5:16 | 74:12,16 | 25:11 |
| 53:19 | 6:18 17:21 | recommendatio | reflec |
| Rail | 27:17 50:1 | ns | 86: |
| 22:17 23:5 | 79:7 98:20 | 47:2 | reflected <br> 71:20 76:2 |
| railroad | reading | recommended |  |
| 21:23 26:8 | $\begin{array}{ll} 5: 13 & 8: 2 \\ 55: 3 & 62: 14 \end{array}$ | $86: 11$ | 82:9 86:8 |
| 43:17 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recommending } \\ & 42: 16 \end{aligned}$ | reflection |
| raised | Ready |  | 55:15 |
| 49:21 | $\begin{array}{ll} 13: 2 & 14: 4 \\ 93: 24 & 100: 19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reconsider } \\ & 24: 22 \quad 25: 7 \end{aligned}$ | reflective |
| raising |  |  | 60:9 |
| 11:9 |  | record | regarding |
| range |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 19 \\ & 23: 20 \\ & 23: 9 \\ & 58: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 22 \quad 37: 16 \\ & 49: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 88:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:13 88:23 } \\ & \text { reality } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Rappa | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 12 \quad 88: 23 \\ & 89: 2,7,8,10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 60: 16 & 63: 24 \\ 69: 22 & 98: 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { regular } \\ 8: 14 \end{gathered}$ |
| 4:10,11 |  |  |  |
| 9:20,21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { realize } \\ & \quad 78: 5,20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recordings } \\ & 5: 18 \end{aligned}$ | reiterate |
| 13:9,10 |  |  | 60:23 |
| 14:11,12 | reason | red | reject |
| 16:14,21 | $\begin{array}{ll} 11: 14 & 16: 1, \\ 2,4,5 & 26: 24 \end{array}$ | 78:21 | 7:10 |
| 18:9,10 |  | redesigns$32: 25$ | ```related 24:13 63:23``` |
| 19:7,8 28:25 | $35: 3 \quad 41: 9$ |  |  |
| 29:1 32:2,3 | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 24 \quad 57: 20 \\ & 74: 9 \quad 82: 13 \end{aligned}$ | Redevelopment | 67:24 |
| 34:4,5 36:8, |  | 10:20 15:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relates } \\ & 55: 4 \quad 71: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $938: 25$ 39:1 | reasonable | 19:22 24:12 |  |
| 45:4,5,6 | 27:9 31:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 21 \quad 39: 24 \\ & 40: 4,22 \end{aligned}$ | relation |
| 46:10 47:18 | 33:17 35:21 |  |  |
| 49:5 51:5,6 | $38: 13$ 50:14 | 46:16,20 | 82:19 |
| 52:7,8 | 86:15reasons | 47:9,25 | relayed <br> 95:15 |
| 62:23,24 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 10 \\ & 18,24: 10, \\ & 55: 13 \end{aligned}$ | relief |
| 68:22,23 | 30:23 45:20 |  |  |
| $75: 5,679: 5$ | 46:21 77:18 | $56: 15$ 65:20 | $15,17 \text { 10:11, }$ |
| 80:8,9 81:21 | rec | 68:13 96:21 | $13,15,16,18$ |
| $82: 2184: 13$, $1485: 10,11$ |  | reduce | 11:5,10,12, |
| 14 85:10,11 $91: 11,12$ | 47:13 | $46: 21,25$ $49: 873: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \quad 12: 12 \\ & 15: 1,1617: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $91: 11,12$ $94: 6,7$ | recall | reduced |  |
| 97:12,13 | 37:6,15,20 |  | $19: 20 \quad 20: 8$ |
| 101:4,5 | rece | 72:25 | $26: 25$ <br> $29: 19: 17$ |
| Rappa's | recess $69: 19$ | reduces | $24 \text { 31:1 }$ |
|  | 102:12,14 | reducing | 34:16 39:12 |
| Raritan | recognized 88:13 <br> recommend $20: 22 \quad 47: 1$ | ```33:2 reevaluated 68:1``` | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 343: 1,2, \\ & 2545: 8 \\ & 49: 9,22,25 \\ & 53: 1354: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 43:17 77:3 |  |  |  |
| 80:3 81:19 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |




| sheer $60: 3$ | signal 77:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { small } \\ & 21: 7 \text { 28:22 } \end{aligned}$ | specifying $3: 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sheet | signed | 64:14,15 | speed |
| 7:24 8:4,5 | 82:7 | so-called | 72:15,18,22, |
| sheets | significant | 11:1,2 15:8, | 24 73:19 |
| 6:4,12,14, | 64:2 | 9 | 77:20 |
| 15,16 7:12, | signs | sole | spend |
| 16 | 34:21 35:14, | 75:24 80:21 | 89:16 |
| shopping | 16 44:10 | 82:5,24 | spent |
| 40:12 | 73:5 | 90:10 91:2 | 86:23 |
| short | similar | solution | spill |
| 79:18 | 79:8 | 42:17 46:8, | 41:5 |
| shortened | site | 11 | spill-over |
| 50:5 | 5:6,7 27:10, | solutions | 40:24 41:18 |
| show | 12 29:20 | 42:11 | 42:1,4 |
| 74:11 | 31:17,18 | Someone's | 44:11,21 |
| showing | 32:15,16,18 | 11:6 | 48:8 |
| 96:22 | 33:15,18,20 | sort | spots |
| shown | 34:17 35:23, | 45:11 61:24 | 46:25 48:1, |
| 60:16 | 24 38:14,16 | 64:5 98:24 | 13 |
| shows | 40:6 53:1,9, | sought | Springfield |
| 17:13 | 16,22 54:2 | 11:1 15:7 | 3:4 78:7 |
| side | 62:3 68:11 | sound | 83:7 |
| 41:6,23 | 87:1,2,5,10, | 63:23 | stand |
| 76:10 83: | 19 | sounds | 8:4 |
| 88:11 | sites | 92:17 | standard |
| sidewalk | 96:22 | south | 30:4 31:2 |
| 19:23 20:1 | situation | 23:7 | 40:21 51:25 |
| 2,3, 9, 13 | 40:10 | space | standards |
| 21:2,7,9,14, | situations | 26:6 44:15, | 6:8 40:6,7,8 |
| 19,22,24 | 41:12 | 16 45:9 | 44:24 47:8, |
| 22:20,21,23 | size | 81:21 | 10,11,17 |
| 23:3,11,13 | 15:4 | spaces | standing |
| 24:18 25:17, | skip | 39:15,17,18, | 59:3 |
| 19,21 26:5 | 53:15 82:4 | 20,22 42:1 | standpoint |
| 27:14 43:19 | slope | 43:22, 23 | 87:13 |
| 56:6 64:21 | 71:13,17,19, | 44:9 45:22 | stands |
| 71:18,23 | 22 | 46:17,24 | 56:19 67:18 |
| 72:6 99:2,8 | sloped | 50:9 | start |
| 100:2 | 21:15 | speak | 71:10 95:4 |
| sidewalks | slow | 15:18 | 99:12 |
| 20:25 21:2 | 42:6 83:15 | speakers | started |
| 64:18 100:13 | 95:6 | 89:13 | 46:14 |
| sign $76: 1$ | slower $3: 10 \quad 43: 14$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { special } \\ 58: 5 \end{gathered}$ | state <br> 40:7 |
| signage | 88:17 | specifically | stated |
| 34:18 72:22 |  | 74:15 90:1 | 47:19 89:25 |




| 90:2 91:4 | troubling | 45:18 46:11 | 13:24 15:2, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92:6,15 | 24:16 | 54:19 73:11 | 9,10 17:25 |
| 93:22 | trust | 76:17 79:17 | 18:24 23:16 |
| township's | 80:19 | 87:9,15 93:5 | 31:9 53:13 |
| 5:15 87:14 | try | understanding | variances |
| townships | 28:21 64:23 | 54:23 67:9 | 53:19 55:6 |
| 16:16 | trying | Understood | 68:15 |
| track | 42:12 46:24 | 74:2 | various |
| 11:8 | 79:6 | undisturbed | 80:15 |
| tractor | turn | 21:16 | vary |
| 64:8 65:3 | 11:9 | undue | 27:15 |
| traffic | turns | 27:13 31:19 | vast |
| 23:8 42:4 | 70:19 | 33:21 35:25 | 54:8 |
| 56:5,10,14 | two | 38:17 50:17 | vegetation |
| 58:7,13 | 8:4 10:23 | unduly | 21:17 24:4 |
| 61:16,20 | 14:23 24:10, | 51:20 | vehicles |
| 64:17 65:4 | 24 39:18 | Union | 25:13 40:17 |
| 77:21 78:23, | 41:21 47:13 | 71:12,16 | versa |
| 24 80:6 | 62:21 69:15 | 72:5 | 77:15 |
| 83:16 86:1, | 71:5,11,15 | unit | versus |
| 3,7,12 88:20 | 79:13,18 | 39:15,17,18, | 11:1 15:8 |
| 89:9,18 90:3 | 80:2,11 | 19,20 46:18 | viable |
| 91:4 92:3,4, | 81:7,24 | 50:9 | 61:12,22 |
| 9,15 93:22 | 82:23 84:1 | units | vice |
| trafficked | 85:23 89:12 | 46:18 47:15 | 3:1,24 4:21, |
| 76:8 | 91:1 92:6,7 | Unlike | 25 8:25 9:7, |
| trailers | 93:10,13 | 41:10 | 12 10:6,8 |
| 64:8 65:3 | 96:14 102:12 | unnecessary | 11:7 12:7, |
| transcripts | type | 30:9 | 10,16 13:20 |
| 5:17 | 43:24 46:7 | unobstructed | 14:22,24 |
| transformed | typically | 19:25 | 16:17 17:4, |
| 6:16 | 40:8 | unresolved | 18 18:20 |
| transition |  | 56:11 | 19:18 20:19 |
| 22:17 | U | unsafe | 21:10 22:4, |
| transitions |  | 25:20 | 13,24 23:17 |
| 22:22 | ultimate | utilized | 24:7 25:14, |
| transparency | 8:7 | 6:24 7:8 | 23 26:16 |
| 36:24 37:2 | ultimately | 6.24 7.8 | 27:4 29:11, |
| 38:5,9 | 16:23 |  | 17 30:15,18 |
| ransparent | unanimous | V | 31:4 32:13 |
| 59:6,7 | 54:9 |  | 33:8 34:15 |
| treacherous | underneath | value | 35:11 36:19 |
| 28:23 | underneath $26: 13$ | 7: | 37:24 38:1 |
| treat |  | valve | 39:11 42:9, |
| $82: 15$ | $81: 19$ | 42:3 | 15,21 45:1 |
|  |  | variance | 47:6,21 |
| trees | understand | 10:17,18 | 48:24 49:2, |
| 20:14 26:7 | 16:3,25 | 11:2,3 12:22 | 18 51:16 |


| 52:18,20,22 | 102:17,18,24 | 45:2, 25 | weekends |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:10,13,23 | voted | 48:25 50:19 | 44:14,18 |
| 56:24 58:20 | 64:25 92:12 | 56:6 59:13 | 48:14 |
| 59:24 62:4, | votes | 60:20 61:8, | welfare |
| 23 63:12,21 | 85:23 | 15 63:23,24, | 20:23 21:8 |
| 65:6 68:4,8 | voting | 25 64:3 | 24:14,21 |
| 69:8,16,20, | 5:1,24 6:3, | 65:12 66:15 | 56:5 |
| 25 75:16 | 6,9,24 22:2 | $71: 7$ 72:23 | well-informed |
| 77:15,24 | 98:23 | 73:15 74:13 | 62:10,16 |
| 78:13 79:1,4 |  | 77:19,20 | 63:4 |
| 80:8,25 |  | 79:20 80:10 | went |
| 81:11 82:2, | W | 81:22 82:13, | 6:25 7:3 |
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