

**WARREN TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
7:30 p.m. – Susie B. Boyce Meeting Room – 44 Mountain Boulevard
September 27, 2021
APPROVED**

CALL TO ORDER

FLAG SALUTE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR OUR TROOPS

ROLL CALL

Mayor Lazo (excused)
Committeeman DiNardo
Mr. Toth
Mr. Lindner (excused)
Mr. DiBianca
Mr. Argiro

Mr. Scuderi
Mr. Esposito
Mr. Pasi (excused)
Mr. Villani (excused)
Mr. Gallic

Statement by Presiding Officer: Adequate notice of this meeting was posted on January 14, 2021 on the Township bulletin board and sent to the Township Clerk, and The Echo-Sentinel per the Open Public Meetings Act. All Board members are duly appointed volunteers working for the good and welfare of Warren Township. We plan to adjourn no later than 10:00 p.m.

■ **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

September 13, 2021

ROLL CALL

Motion was made by Mr. DiBianca, seconded by Mr. Esposito to approve the minutes.

All were in favor

Reports:

Alan Siegel, Esq.

John T. Chadwick, IV, P.P., Professional Planner

Christian Kastrud, P.E., Professional Engineer

Maryellen Vautin, Clerk

■ **CORRESPONDENCE**

■ **CITIZENS HEARING non-agenda items**

■ **RESOLUTIONS**

None.

**WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 2**

Public Hearing:

Courtesy Review

Watchung Hill Regional High School
Power Purchase Agreement
Solar Panel installation

The board asked a few questions on the solar panels. They will be over most of the high school roof.

Motion was made to ask the clerk to write a letter to the state informing them the Planning Board does not have any issues with the plans. Seconded, all were in favor.

PB21-02 Jewish Community Foundation of Greater MetroWest NJ

B 95 lots 2 and 25-Old Stirling Road (4 lots)
Preliminary Major Subdivision

Mr. Ronald Shimanowitz came forward as attorney for the applicant, Jewish Community Foundation of Greater MetroWest NJ/Ness Realty Holdings, LLC. The applicant seeks Preliminary Major Subdivision approval with bulk variances. It is for two existing lots located in the CR130/65 and would divide into four new building lots. The property fronts Old Stirling Road and Helen St. Two variances are proposed, for minimum front yard setback and the lot on Helen Street has insufficient lot width. The property was donated to the Jewish Foundation from Mr. Ness via his will. The foundation conveyed it to Ness Realty Holding, which is a wholly owned company by the Jewish Foundation. The goal is to develop it, raise money, and allow those funds to support the non profit corporation. There are two witnesses, the professional engineer, Cathy Mueller, and a professional planner in regard to the variances, Christine Cafone.

Mr. Siegel, attorney for the Planning Board, swore in Ms. Mueller, Ms. Cafone, and the Township Engineer, Christian Kastrud, and Township Planner, John T. Chadwick, IV.

Ms. Cathy Mueller was accepted by the board. The original plans were submitted earlier and she went over the plans. The cover shows the existing conditions of block 95 lots 2 and 25. Lot 2 is the northern lot at 11.491 acres and lot 25 is the southern lot at 4.721 acra. Lot 2 has frontage along Old Stirling Road. Lot 25 does not go through to Old Stirling Road but has a small lot frontage out to Helen Street. There is an existing paper street for the extension of Old Church Road, which is 33 ft wide. It may have been a cut through, but it is unimproved. Part of the application is to vacate that 35 ft. of Old Church Road. This results in an

**WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 3**

unusual frontage. The applicant did approach the owner of lot 24 and they did not want to do a land swap.

Ms. Mueller continued -- the property contains wetlands in the northern portion of the lot and there is a band of steep slopes through the middle. There are three existing homes on the property and are shown on the plans. One is directly across from lot 13.02 with a driveway and is in the wetland buffers. The second home is smaller home that is across from lot 13.04, and directly behind that home there is another house.

On sheet two of five the proposed four lot subdivision is shown. Lot 2.01 to the south, and working north proposed lot 2.02, 2.03, and 2.04. The lots of minimum three acres. Lot 2.04 has 6.231; lot 2.03 has 3.001, and lot 2.02 has 3.0011 and lot 2.01 has 3.295 on the lot on Helen Street. The size confirms with the three acre zone.

For lot 2.03 they propose a front yard setback of 50 ft. vs. 75 ft. required. There is an odd right of way frontage on Helen Street (a pre-existing condition). They ask for a 51ft. frontage due to ROW configuration. The original tract is 16.212 acres but it runs to the centerline of Old Stirling. They propose a 25ft. ROW dedication for Old Stirling. There is an existing sanitary easement along the frontage. The property to the north had applied to the sewerage authority to get their sewer service for that subdivision. The sewer is able to be used on Old Stirling Road and have been approved. They will be on public water. The lot on Helen Street will be served by gravity sewer to the existing sewer on Helen Street and will have a private well.

Both lot 2.03 and 2.04 would have 50 foot front yard setbacks. Lot 2.04 with wetlands and wetland buffer will require a permit from the DEP but they made sure with the wetland consultant that the permits will be possible to do a transition area buffer averaging permit for lot 2.04.

Lot 2.03 with the existing house has enough room to construct a house without going into the buffer. The houses shown are 2800SF footprints. Proposed lot 2.02 keeps the same driveway location. They propose a walk out basement to work with the slopes.

The house fronting Helen Street is unconstrained. They show conceptual homes and driveways. They show conceptual stormwater management on the property. It is a major development, the increase is in the roof areas. There was further discussion on the stormwater management for each lot.

Mr. DiBianca asked what the frontage is on Helen Street. The frontage along the skewed right of way is 51.1 feet. The required is 100 for the frontage. The

WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 4

driveways for both 2.01 and 2.02 are 14 feet wide. They can have some separation from the neighbors.

Ms. Mueller went to page 4, the utilities. The three lots on Old Stirling Road will be connecting to the existing force main and they have sewer authority approval. They applied for the single family connection on Helen Street and got approval also.

Mr. DiBianca went back to the 14 ft driveway and the Fire Chief comments wanting it to be wider. Ms. Mueller has spoken with the Fire Department several times on this topic and they agree it can be 14 feet wide with two on each side to total 18 feet. The two driveways closer to the road are 12 feet wide due to 50 ft setbacks. The applicant will work with the Fire Marshall.

The soils are not great in that area and there are some septic tanks and will be abandoned. The last page has technical details.

Mr. Gallic asked if the sewer line was gravity. Ms. Mueller said it is unique, the ones out on Stirling Road are forced main but pumping down (due to the subdivision north). The Helen Street dwelling will be gravity.

Mr. Gallic asked if the board had any other comments. Mr. Gallic asked Mr. Kastrud for comments. Mr. Kastrud asked about the 33 ft. Old Church right of way and if they knew the ownership of it. The applicant would dedicate the right of way to Warren Township on Old Stirling. But Old Church is a 33 ft. right of way that goes out to Old Stirling Road. The applicant would seek for it to be vacated by the township governing body.

Mr. Kastrud continued and stated that Old Stirling Road was paved over the past year so there will be no intrusion into the roadway. The moratorium would be for five years. Mr. Kastrud went through his memo. He did not have the Ecolsciences letter concerning wetlands. Mr. Kastrud believes they need the wetland boundary and buffer lines, an LOI. Ms. Mueller said they preferred to have the preliminary approval with the variances first.

There was a wetlands letter by Mr. David Moskowitz, Senior Professional Wetland Scientist with EcolSciences, Inc. dated April 27, 2021. They located the wetlands on the property and Mr. Moskowitz feels the lots are achievable. They did get a general permit from the DEP for the sewer lines. The wetlands were flagged and surveyed. The applicant's engineer is assured the lines will not change. They have not gone to DEP as they would like to get the preliminary approval before going to the DEP. They recognize it is at the applicant's risk. They will submit, it is a timing issue. Mr. Kastrud went over his memo including the right of way, and setbacks, insufficient frontage, LOI and proposed lot 2.03 not showing the adjacent lots and most likely continuing and impacting the building envelope.

WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 5

Mr. Gallic stressed the lot 2.01 will have wetlands and buffers. Mr. Chadwick said the applicant is asking the board to approve the plan subject to DEP. Mr. Kastrud discussed the clearing limits affecting the drainage calculations. The applicant will supply engineering with drainage reports.

Committeeman DiNardo has concerns with any impact on residents on Helen. Lot 2.01 looks like a flag lot.

Mr. Chadwick clarified that the lot areas do not include the Old Stirling Road right of way but does include the vacation of Old Church vacation. The area without the vacation area is 3 acres. Mr. Chadwick asked about the riparian buffer and the areas already improved are shown within the riparian buffer except the one area. There was discussion about the two houses and the 50 ft. setback variance. There will be a revision of the plans with buffer averaging. The DEP jurisdiction easements will be conservation easements. Mr. Chadwick also suggests the steep slope areas be included. Ms. Mueller would like the steep slope to be delineated at the time of plot plan.

The planner for the applicant, Christine Cafone, came forward. She gave her qualifications and was accepted. Mr. Shimanowitz asked Ms. Cafone about the front yard set backs. Ms. Cafone considers this case a classic c1 hardship variance. The variance for the frontage of lot 2.01 to be accessed off Helen St, is an existing condition. That lot has a certain amount of frontage on Helen St. They are asking to subdivide that off of the remaining lot so they can put a home on it.

On Old Stirling they propose to create three single-family homes. There exists three single family home. They would demolish all three of those homes and put up three new homes. Two of those three new proposed homes on Old Stirling would require front yard setback variances. So the whole subdivision is four lots, three of the four lots are just over 3 acres and conform with lot size but one lot is at six acres, well over the minimum lot area.

The Helen lot is a little over 50 ft. frontage and 100 is required. The two variance setbacks on Old Stirling is 50 ft. where 75 ft is required. A c1 can be granted at the planning board under two criteria. The hardship has to have something to do with the piece of property, perhaps topography or encumbrances. There is some substantial environmental constraints and dictate where dwellings can be built.

The c1 statutory criteria area for a lawful pre-existing condition. Ms. Cafone sees that applied to the frontage on Helen, as an existing condition. If the board finds that there are purposes of zoning that would be advanced by the grant of the variance, then you could invoke a c2 or statutory criteria. She feels it comes into play with the front yard setback. It is a better zoning alternative. The proposal stays away from the environmentally sensitive areas and also trying to

WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 6

create reasonable, usable yard areas. The board can look at criteria c of the land use law, providing adequate light, air, and open space. Criteria g talks about providing sufficient space and appropriate locations, they meet the criteria. She also spoke about criteria e and establishing appropriate population densities.

Ms. Cafone continued with the negative criteria and that it does not ask that there be no negative but that the benefits outweigh the negatives. One of the structures is in a wetland buffer and it would be removed and the new dwelling would not be in the wetland buffer. The master plan already considered that these lots in this zone were heavily constrained and determined that three acres is the minimum size. She feels they meet all measurements for variance requests. She again stated she feels this case is a text book c1 hardship variance.

Mr. Gallic asked about the structure in the wetlands buffer and the buffer averaging may take the one house out of the buffer area and therefore, not a beneficial good to the positive for this application.

Mr. Gallic asked about lot 24 and a significant chance of wetlands and the current lot position would require a GP crossing permit, which is very likely to be required. Mr. Gallic felt that to approve something that requires a GP crossing is not good. Ms. Cafone stated they will have to go to the DEP but the board can condition any approval on outside agencies. If they can't get those permits, then the applicant goes back before the planning board.

Committeeman DiNardo asked about the c2 and the idea that the plan doesn't interfere with the wetlands was a positive criteria. He asked about the rest of the homes in the neighborhood and if they were at 75ft. or greater setback. It is not consistent with the rest of the homes in the neighborhood at 50 ft. He said there could be land that would be swapped with lot averaging and the lots could be moved back to the 75 ft. setback. Ms. Cafone stated they were trying to balance and create a usable yard area. They can look at a balance to move the house back a bit and have a yard. Mr. Chadwick suggests that if they do buffer averaging it does cure the front yard setback. Mr. Gallic suggests that the applicant get an LOI first.

Mr. Shimanowitz said they had preferred to get the Preliminary approval before going to DEP. Mr. Shimanowitz requests that they continue the application and take a look at some of the issues the board has brought up and figure out the timing with the DEP.

Mr. Gallic asked the board to give a motion to carry this application with notice. There may be major changes.

Mr. Toth made a motion, and Mr. Esposito seconded it. All in favor.

WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 7

PB 21-03 BCUW/ Madeline Partners, LLC

B 83 L 4

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan – Special Needs Housing

Mr. Gallic called for a two minute break and then called the meeting back to order. There will be architecture testimony.

Mr. John Wyciskala, the attorney for the applicant, came forward and introduced the witness, Michael Scro. Mr. Scro was sworn in and gave his qualifications and was accepted. There will be some exhibits and they will go through the plans already submitted. Exhibit A-6, Elevation of the Upper Common Building and parking lot. The site is a 10.2 acre property and in the AH-3 affordable housing zone. Maximum building height is 35 feet and all buildings will conform with that. The cottages around the green vary in size but are all around 23 feet height. There is one way vehicular driveway, double lane width. They wanted vehicular access on the perimeter of the buildings so the residents don't have to cross the road very often.

The front cottage (closest to the Mountain Avenue roadway) is set back 350 ft. from the midline of Mountain Avenue. The main building is a shared common building for resident activities. The principal building has two floors and a walkout basement where the back side of the floor plan is storage, mechanical. The building will be fully sprinklered on all floors with a code compliant suppression alarm system. Mr. Scro did speak with the Fire Marshall, Al Shjarback and reviewed the plans and his letter. The Fire Marshall wanted to ensure there was ample area to drop tanks, that they can fight fires from. They had spoken about not paving some parking spots or banking some. The Fire Marshall may want to have them paved.

The first floor is 3218SF with an additional roughly 1000SF of porches and elevated balcony to take advantage of the outdoors. The second floor is 2025SF, and the basement is 4129SF. The usable space is 7350SF. The first floor includes meeting rooms, restrooms, it will have an elevator, and two stair towers. The basement includes a wellness gym, an entertainment flex space, a lounge area, a gathering t.v. area, an occupational therapy space. There is a kitchen and dining area to help gain cooking skills, but nothing commercial.

The cottages are 4227SF of living space with an additional 700SF of exterior spaces. Each unit is comprised of one two-bedroom, and four one-bedroom units. So there are 30 units and a total of 36 beds/residents. There will be hardy panel, natural stone veneer, asphalt shingles, and other architectural details. They will be similar to single family residences.

The outdoor pathways will be ADA compliant. Mr. Scro continued to go over the building layout. He brought in Exhibit A-7, it shows the terrace space outside. It is

WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 8

a view of the common building. There is an elevator, conference room, some work stations, support office spaces. The basement of the common building that has gathering/movie/flex space, a wellness/exercise room, rest rooms, and mechanical along the back. There is occupational therapy space. The test kitchen is for basic life skills teaching.

These elevations are posted on the Warren Township website.

The cottage crawl space will keep mechanicals. He went over a two bedroom in the middle with the green spacing and the roadway renderings. Each unit will have a living space, a dining space, a kitchen space, and also contains an office. You can access the other units from the interior of the buildings. Each unit has a washer and dryer. So there is one bedroom unit on each side with a two bedroom unit in the middle.

Mr. Gallic felt the depiction of the tree line is deceiving. They do always plant the perimeter and the elevation is pretty low.

Exhibit A-8 was brought in and it is an aerial/birds eye. He went over the one way loop, the parking area, an area where the fire department could drop a tank. All buildings are interconnected with interior pathways. They have vehicular traffic on the perimeter and pedestrian traffic on the center/interior.

Exhibit A-9 is the interior green and retaining wall at the first terrace drop. There are pergolas and places to gather. There will be smaller plantings.

Committeeman DiNardo asked how they came up with the concept of cottages and the architectural design. They worked through some designs and tried to keep in the style of Warren and keep the size of each cottage on the smaller side. They broke up the building with details, and stone. They also used colors to break up the scale.

Mr. Gallic likes the architecture of the development. Committeeman DiNardo felt it is soft and blending in with the residential properties. The design took comments from parents.

Mr. Chadwick asked if one could walk from a cottage up to the common building in rain and snow. It is uncovered sidewalks. Mr. Chadwick asked about the cisterns of the water supply and if it was pressurized. It is likely. The multipurpose space could be used for a resident to use for a party. They could use for yoga, puzzles, or holidays. They do mixed community events also. Mr. Scro commented that it is amazing how the residents integrate and make the community better. There is no intention for a cafeteria and no common eating areas.

Mr. Kastrud, the Township Engineer, asked about the Fire Marshall, and that he is in favor of keeping some of the parking lot that at last meeting was discussed to

WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 9

eliminate some of it. They want optimal tank storage within each unit. The water tanks will be in each unit. Each cottage has its own suppression system and wired back centrally. The Fire Marshall talked about a mobile tank they can drop, like a small pool. It is brought in (the pool) if there was a fire. They have more than what is needed for parking.

The accessory buildings will be 13 feet max height with a little stone masonry and the same color for clapboard siding.

Mr. Gallic opened the meeting to the public.

Ms. Catherine Niemeyer from 136 Charles Road came up and asked about food and how it is prepared and delivered. Or do they make their own food? The residents will be preparing meals, some people will have help with day to day activities, shopping, etc.

Mr. Toronto said they may have transportation, or a home health aide. Residents are affiliated with agencies that provide transportation. Residents can order food in. Each unit has a full kitchen with ADA accessibility. There are separate bedrooms, kitchen, and dining area. Mr. Ocro marked the exhibit for each apartment on the exhibit and showed boundary of a one-bedroom.

Mr. Papazian came forward from 178 Mountain Avenue and asked about the people providing services. He has worked with Cerebral Palsy associations in New York and is an architect. When they have a development to propose they go to Office for People with Developmental Disabilities (OPWDD) to review and a feasibility study is done. They look at budget, saturation and there is an effort to integrate into communities and neighborhoods and not to have too much density of these residences.

Mr. Toronto said the project was fully vetted with the state department of developmental disabilities and he is aware of the process that New York goes through. A team from New York visited the project in Florham Park, which is three times the size of this proposal. Some of the units might be licensed but for the most part this is independent living.

Mr. Papazian said they also have connecting doors to be able to move between the different dwelling units. He asked if there was a potential to be staffed 24 /7. Mr. Toronto said that is possible. In Florham Park there is 102 bedrooms and one four-bedroom is licensed. There are 7 other small apartment buildings at the request of the state of New Jersey Department of Developmental Disabilities they licensed 8 of those units. Mr. Papazian said the site work here and cost required would never be approved. In New York there would be more people in each dwelling unit so staff could take care of them within a single dwelling unit. So this is more staff.

**WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 10**

The development is independent living. They build in partnership with the State Department of Developmental Disabilities.

Mr. Papazian felt it is a little too much the same with each cottage and has institutional qualities. The architect feels it is appropriate for the residents and keeps it somewhat close and safe for the residents instead of spreading the cottages a little more. There was continued discussion on the design/layout of the site plan.

Mr. Papazian asked about light poles and that was covered by the engineer earlier. Mr. Papazian said it won't extend past the property line but you will see them from everywhere around there, you will see 36 of them, and this will not fit in with the area.

Ms. Sandra Carlock from 145 Mountain Avenue came forward and she feels they have lost so much of the open space property in Warren with the hotel coming in on Mount Bethel at route 78. Condos are being built there also. Wouldn't it make more sense to put a development like this closer to places like Dunkin Donuts. They could be centered closer to the hub of Warren, where they can walk to places. This land should be left open she said.

The applicant was asked by the Township to develop this parcel. Ms. Carlock is sorry to see this development and the lights at night along with the other development nearby this site.

Mr. Bill Gilbert from 17 Flintlock Drive came up and asked about the setbacks and height of the development. The buildings are a football field away but it will be raised. Mr. Gallic asked the engineer for the applicant to reply. The elevation along Mountain Avenue is approximately 245 ft. The elevation at the lowest point of the cottage is 288. Mr. Gallic asked what the height of the retaining wall is. It is approximately four feet. It is partially decorative. The building height at roofline will be about 40 ft up from Mountain Avenue. There was further discussion on the height.

Mr. Ed Carlock from 145 Mountain Avenue came up and asked about the heat pump. They often do use a heat pump and he was concerned with using water. The engineering said it is not a geothermal system.

Mr. George Vetter from 186 Mountain Ave. was sworn in. Mr. Vetter was confused about the employee number and the club house, and was it bedroom assisted people or hospital people. George asked about the 32 units and now it is 36 and was confused. There are 30 units total. Six buildings with one two bedroom and two one bedroom units flanking either side. Mr. Chadwick said it meets the plan, they had a minimum of 32 required but have 36.

Mr. Vetter asked where the nearest place for residents to get groceries. Mr. Vetter asked if there was still one egress and one exit. It does. Mr. Vetter talked

**WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 11**

about setting the development with green acres on one side and residential on the other. Mr. Vetter mentioned someone referred to the garden state and he thinks the best crop in New Jersey is condos.

Mr. Vetter spoke about the exterior lighting and they would like to see it lower lumens as much as possible. There are people who have Astronomy Clubs that come to Wagner Farm. The lights are on dusk to dawn and can be adjusted. There are minimal requirements for residential properties. The lights are down lighting.

Mr. Vetter asked if there was a cost per bed for the project per day. Mr. Vetter asked if anyone knew how long the area/street had gone without power during storms. Mr. Vetter wants to stress how rural the area is. Mr. Vetter doesn't feel the cottages fit in, feels it is more an institutional look.

Mr. Vetter asked if anyone has considered the noise or decibel counts from route 78. Typically the buildings are insulated to meet Resjec energy codes. Today's windows and insulation for the units will be very quiet. They are 200 ft off of route 78.

Mr. Vetter asked if there are any electrical problems with the cell tower being close. Mr. Totonto said the state architect visited the site and it was approved for residential use for the population to be served.

Mr. Jack Klingert came forward from 80 Briarwood Drive East and asked about the rendering with the pump house and generator. The well house had a generator. He did not see anything on the plans for the cottages generators.

On some projects they include generators and some they do not. They have not looked into that yet. There will be generators for the sewerage systems.

Mr. Gallic did say there were a lot of power outages. They are considering them but their experience is that residents tend to go the family or guardians. They are not yet sure.

Mr. Gallic said he has been out of power ten days a number of times in the last two years. They will consider that. It is a real issue in many parts of town.

Mr. Klingert also asked about two drafting spots that are kind of blocking the roadway. The cisterns have no pull-out area. If a pumper is starting to draft, it will block access into the facility. Is it possible to get an emergency access road off of Route 78? Committeeman DiNardo said the Fire Department will be working with the developer. Mr. Gallic thought getting emergency access off of Route 78 is not possible.

There is the adjacent property that the township owns but there is a retaining wall. Mr. Gallic suggests they look at that possibility and a fire lane.

**WARREN TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 27, 2021
PAGE 12**

Mr. Gallic saw no one else come forward and closed this portion of the meeting. The application will be continued to October 18, 2021 and the town will notice that the meeting will include this application.

In Need of Redevelopment Study

Block 8 lot 2 and 3, 15 Mountain View Road and 45 Mountain View Road

Mr. Chadwick, the Township Planner, prepared a Preliminary Redevelopment Report for what is commonly known as the Chubb property. It is between Mountain View Road and Route 78. The study has been properly advertised in accordance with the requirements under the Redevelopment Act. This is the first step in consideration of a plan for the future for that site. It gives the township a great deal of control over aspects that aren't necessarily allowed within a simple zoning criteria; hours of operations and different things that aren't part of a zoning ordinance but can be part of a Redevelopment. This property has a building on it that is approximately 535,000 SF. It is obsolete. They have tried to market the property for over four years. The basic plan would be to allow the demolition of the building and replace with another use. They are not at that stage yet. The basic policy is to use the Redevelopment statute to have much control over the new development of that property.

Mr. Gallic asked if there is a pilot being considered for this development. It has not been discussed. At some time the planning board would get a redevelopment plan that the Township agrees with. Mr. Chadwick said that the value of the site and its decline over the last seven years (Table 1) is phenomenal. It is over 100 acres. The value was 89 million down to 22 million. It has been empty for four years and it impacts the Township finances and it will continue without some redevelopment. Mr. Chadwick recommend they adopt the redevelopment study and he recommended to the Township Committee to also adopt it.

The Township Committee adopted a resolution to prepare a study to determine whether or not it is in need of redevelopment. The board now would make recommendation back to the Township Committee that yes they agree or no you do not. The Township Committee then accepts or not the recommendation.

Then the Planning Board would hear the ordinance for the Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Gallic requests that the board take some time to review the plan. The In Need of Redevelopment hearing will be carried to the November 8, 2021 Planning Board meeting at 7:30 p.m at the court room. All members were in favor.

Motion was made to adjourn, seconded and all were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:10.

■ **SCHEDULE OF NEXT MEETING:**

Special Meeting October 18, 2021
November 8, 2021