

Minutes of the Planning Board Public Meeting of Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Present are Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Hirsch, Mr. Mirabal, Councilwoman Montone, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Vena, Mr. Shenton and Mrs. Williams

Also present are Michael Leckstein, Esq., Leckstein & Leckstein, Tim Gillen and Anthony Abbonizio, CME Associates, and Martin Truscott, T&M Associates.

Absent are Mr Awofolaju and Mr. Vinci

Mr. Mirabal moves to accept the minutes of the January 21, 2015 Reorganization and Public Meetings, seconded by Mrs. Sims, and on voice vote all members approve.

Mayor Tagliarini welcomes everyone present. He states that the New Jersey Transit Board approved unanimously 7-0 for our plans to develop a mixed use community at the Aberdeen train station. This has taken years to accomplish. It will be called Highview Homes, mixed use, and we are very proud of it because of the time it took to get State approval, County approval, developer approval, Council approval.

Another project, called the Glassworks, the old Anchor Glass factory, has Planning Board approval for a mixed use community of business and residents. They just announced that Cushman Wakefield will be handling the commercial rentals.

We are proud of a development at the South River Metals site on Church Street, consisting of 70 family and 70 senior housing units. We have been confronted many times by our seniors who say it is time to down size, but they want to stay in the community, so we are hoping this will keep some of our seniors on town.

He is pleased to announce that the Monmouth County Freeholders have acquired the last 88 acres to create a nearly 300 acre Monmouth County park in Aberdeen. That took years to accomplish, and the Township is very proud of this.

These projects have been going on for many years and all seem to be coming together at the same time.

New Business SP14-511(rev)/Yellow Brook Property Company, LLC, Applicant: Yellow Brook Property Company, LLC, Property Owner: Newbury Holdings, LLC, Highway 34 Block 114, Lots 6, 7.01, 13 and 13QFarm, Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Variances application to construct 18 buildings, consisting of 200 multifamily one and two bedroom residential units, clubhouse with pool, related driveways, parking lots, sidewalks, stormwater management facilities, landscaping, utilities, lighting and other related site improvements. Variances and/or Design Waivers required for Lot Area 28 acres required, 27.722 acres provided; Signage setback 25 ft. required, Variance or Design Waiver from Off Street Parking requirement that shade trees be planted in an area with a minimum of 125 sq. ft. per tree, proposed shade trees at building frontages in areas of approximately 100 sq. ft.; Variance or Waiver from Landscaping section of Redevelopment Plan that landscaping plans be drawn to scale of not more than 20 ft. to the inch, 30 ft. scale provided; Variance from Lot and Building Requirements that require front yard setback of 60 ft., guard house proposed at front entrance of property at approximately "0" ft., or Variance for accessory building setback of 5 ft. or a distance equal to one-half foot for each one foot of building height up to minimum setback required for principal building to permit location of proposed guard house; Variance to permit accessory building, guard house, to be located in front yard, where accessory buildings required to be

erected in side and rear yards; Variance to permit installation of entry gateway walls approximately 6 ft. high, where 4 ft. high or less permitted; Variance to permit disturbance of topographic steep slopes 15% or greater in slope; Variance to permit maximum grade for lawns within 10 ft. of building to be greater than 5% in certain locations, Variance, if necessary, to permit construction of retaining walls in excess of permitted height, on property located in the Redevelopment Zone.

Mr. Leckstein announces the procedure to be followed for the meeting; the applicant will speak first, and get thru the general application. Then there will be a period where members of the Board, the Board's professionals and the public will have an opportunity to ask questions. It is important to understand this period is about questions, not about comments. Then there will be a period for comments, where you can say what you feel about the project, what your problems are with the project, what you like about it.

Mr. Leckstein swears in the Board's professionals.

Tom Malman, Esq., attorney for the applicant, of the firm Day Pitney, states this is a project in an area of redevelopment decided by the Council. A plan was adopted by the Council and Planning Board, with parameters. This project was designed in accordance with the parameters. He states it is important to keep that in mind as he proceeds thru his comprehensive presentation and addresses reports from the Board's professionals.

Mr. Malman hands out to Board members what is marked as Exhibit A-1 with today's date, entitled "Hidden Village at Aberdeen," prepared by Maser Consulting, consisting of approximately 50 sheets, that matches the power point presentation he will be presenting.

Mr. Malman states he has other applications pending approval with other agencies on this project, the County Planning Board; the application requires a DOT permit because they front on a State highway.

Roy DeBoer is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states he resides in Monroe, NJ, and is a licensed professional architect and planner, although he is not here tonight in that capacity. He is here tonight to work the machine, and will not testify.

Going to the first slide in the presentation, Mr. Malman shows the list of witnesses that will testify tonight. Going thru the list, Mr. Malman says Mr. Mumford is a principal with the applicant and will be speaking first and giving an overview. Mr. Busch is their licensed engineer from Maser; Mr. Brennan is their licensed architect; Mr. Grealy is their traffic consultant, and Dave Roberts their planner.

Moving to the next slide, Mr. Malman says this is an outline of the proposed presentation tonight, saying there will be an introduction and history of the site, photographs, what the redevelopment plan provides for, talk about the site plan and engineering, architecture, traffic, and conclude with planning.

Roger Mumford is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states his office is located at 247 Bridge Avenue, Red Bank, NJ. Answering his attorney, Mr. Mumford states he is a principal in Yellowbrook Property, the developer for this project. Mr. Mumford states he has been in the

residential construction industry for 25-30 years, cofounding the Matzel Mumford organization. That company developed over 70 communities in New Jersey, about 4,000 homes. The company was sold in 1999, and since that time he has focused on opportunities such as this. He has always worked with incredibly capable people, which he feels is why projects he has built have always been beautiful projects.

When he first became aware this land was a potential opportunity, he went to the site over two years ago and did a topographic analysis, actually Roy DeBoer did the analysis, which he does with every site he develops. This site is almost 28 acres, and there are different approaches to development. He reviewed the natural features of the property to evaluate what would be a sensible development plan. Looking at the property, they thought that upscale residential rentals would be appropriate.

Mr. Mumford says the world is changing quickly; in the last five years home ownership in this country has dropped from 65% to 59%. The rental market has changed considerably, and so are the people that are renting. The fastest growing segment of tenants are older, from 30 to 64, but people in their 50's, 60's and 70's are renting when communities are built appropriately with high end finishes, which means finishes superior to what people generally find in upscale, for sale housing. People these days are interested in accessing structures, they don't necessarily have to own them.

With that in mind, they analyzed the site and understood what would be appropriate to develop. They spoke with their architect and came up with a development plan and building type he believes resonates with a broad spectrum of today's market.

They are interested in green issues in terms of conserving natural resources, analyzing indoor air quality, and talking about energy efficiency, virtually every large responsible supplier today except for Lumber Liquidators, takes energy efficiency seriously. These companies are enormous; his group understands this stuff, and although it is not an all or nothing proposition, he can assure what will be presented is a very high quality product, how the veneer stone is actually a real stone. If this were a for sale community he feels the public would be incredibly impressed with what he has in mind.

Daniel W. Busch is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states he is a Professional Engineer employed by Maser Consulting, Red Bank, NJ. He is a licensed Professional Engineer in the State of New Jersey.

Under questioning by Mr. Malman, Mr. Busch states the plans for this project were prepared under his jurisdiction. Talking about the historic development, and referring to his power point and Exhibit A-1, Mr. Busch shows a 1963 aerial photo, and shows where Route 34 is located, the site bounded by yellow lines, roughly 28 acres. The area on the lower right is Juniper Place. You can see in 1963 the beginning of the rough grading and the prepping for that development.

Within the site are still the two buildings remaining today. There is an asphalt operation where they made asphalt. They also mined the site for gravel for the purpose of making the asphalt. The truck repair in the northerly building and construction. Access was in the location pointed to by Mr. Busch.

Moving to the 1970 aerial photo in Exhibit A-1, Mr. Busch says Juniper Place has been constructed. The site is functioning at this time as the continued truck repair and in the northerly building materials storage, construction yard still occurring, and the area in the rear still had stock piles on it.

Moving to the 1971 aerial photo in Exhibit A-1, Mr. Busch says there was still the truck repair and construction operation occurring in the northerly building. The large cut areas delineates areas of slopes that had been disturbed during the mining operation.

Moving to the 1995 aerial photo in Exhibit A-1, Mr. Busch says you can see the Woodcliff clearing has begun; some of the areas are no longer being mined and have now started to rededicate, though slopes still disturbed, and you can still make out the outline of the road in the rear portion, and the surrounding development has occurred to the north.

Moving to the 2007 aerial photo in Exhibit A-1, Mr. Busch says you can see Woodcliff has been completed, vegetation on this site has been filled in, still disturbance in the rear, landscape operator in business and truck repair business is still operating in the rear building. This exhibit shows Route 34, and the yellow outline is the boundary of the applicant's site, and the two operations and stock piles are shown in the rear. The townhouse development is almost completed at that point in time.

Moving on Mr. Busch refers to a photograph in Exhibit A-1, saying it is a photograph of Route 34 looking northbound at Woodcliff; the project site to the right, showing the driveway coming out to the signal, where a fourth light will be added.

The next photo in Exhibit A-1 entitled **Adjacent Uses, Office and Child Care Centers across Route 34 to West**, Mr. Busch says there are commercial uses across the street, including two day care facilities and a commercial office building. Turning 180 degrees the other way, photo titled ***Project Site: Existing Landscaping Business***, shows the existing landscaping business on the northerly side, front and rear of the buildings.

Mr. Busch believes the photographs were taken this past fall, but they depict the conditions existing today. The only thing that has changed is the landscaping people stop operating at the end of the fall season. The building is still there.

The photo ***Project Site: Debris Piles*** in Exhibit A-1 shows the rear, the southerly building where the landscaper was operating, looking in a northeasterly direction toward the rear portion of the site, with the stockpiles on the left and right sides of the access drive in the rear.

The photo titled ***Project Site: Previously Disturbed Slopes***, Mr. Busch says is further back into the site, showing a continuation of the stockpiles; the picture on the left shows some of the vegetation that started to come back, but you can still see stockpiles. There are much shorter, less mature vegetation in the front, and in the background the more mature vegetation not touched during the mining of the site. There is a pretty distinct line showing vegetation, younger in the foreground and more mature in the rear.

The photo entitled ***Adjacent Uses: Townhouse Development to North*** in Exhibit A-1, Mr. Busch says is the recently completed Villages at Aberdeen development, to the north, looking in a northeasterly direction toward Juniper Place.

The photo entitled *Adjacent uses: Townhouse development to North* in Exhibit A-1, Mr. Busch says is the back right corner of the Villages development; the retaining wall that backs up to the applicant's project at the top of the slope. This would be a similar type of wall that would be seen in the applicant's project site.

The next heading is *Redevelopment Plan and Site Plan and Redevelopment Plan, Appendix A: Redevelopment Area Conceptual Plan*, in Exhibit A-1, which Mr. Busch says we are looking at the predevelopment concept plan, a part of the redevelopment plan adopted by the Township. This is actually attached to the redevelopment plan. Mr. Busch, pointing to his exhibit, says you can see the access drive on Route 34, Woodcliff, signalized driveway, clubhouse and a series of apartment buildings throughout the remainder of the site. Also shown is the proposed clubhouse. This plan was developed since the concept plan was first produced, according to Mr. Malman, more detailed, more engineering. Mr. Busch confirms it was before the Council and appears to be consistent with the Redevelopment Plan for the site.

Going thru the photo entitled *Proposed Site Plan*, Mr. Busch says there are 18 buildings, located on basically three roads, so you have (pointing to exhibit on wall) you have the northerly drive, which is right in, right out, and comes into the site. The signalized driveway at the south end of the site brings you in to access the site, so there are two means of access. Again pointing to his exhibit, Mr. Busch shows the clubhouse, with 25 parking stalls.

When you look at the plan it looks like a townhouse project in every way. You have driveways, garages, it looks aesthetically like a townhouse development, but it is one and two bedroom apartments. Most of the units have a driveway and a garage; the parking is met thru a mix of 154 garages, 154 driveways and 92 parking stalls on the streets adjacent to each of the building. It complies with the RSIS standards; 389 required, he has 425.

From an environmental standard, the site is about 74% of the site is wooded, which creates over 20 acres. They are preserving 12 acres of those woods. There is an existing area of wetlands; they received a permit from NJDEP for transition area buffering average to allow the project to be constructed with DEP wetlands. The wetland has a 50 foot buffer. The regulations allow you to do some disturbance in a portion of that buffer, providing you compensate with additional buffer elsewhere, which they were approved. As part of the permit you file a deed description that allows no further disturbance of that buffer, and place physical visual signage on the site that shows it is not to be disturbed in that area.

The closest building to Route 34 is at the northerly end, 74 ft. They are in accordance with Ordinance requirements. With the exception of the clubhouse, the remaining buildings are 200 ft. from Highway 34, thus the name Hidden Village. It is truly hidden, out of site from the highway.

Looking at how the site grades, the lowest area of the site is at the northerly end, pointing to the exhibit. The site generally grades up toward the end of the cul de sac, located at the eastern terminus. The roads are actually fairly flat, in the 1 to 5% range, a pretty mild slope.

In the area of buildings N, O and P, they have added significant evergreen plantings, and in the grading scheme they have graded in a manner that allows them to lose elevation adjacent to the foundations, so they expose more foundation as they move towards the rear of those buildings, which allows them to preserve more of the existing trees and vegetation at the rear, and keeps the retaining walls relatively short at the rear. It also provides an area to place the evergreen trees.

There are various retaining walls throughout the site, pointing to his exhibit, adjacent to the entrance from Woodcliff, at the end of the cul de sac. The walls allow them to retain the existing mature trees.

With regard to landscaping, our Ordinance has a very specific tree preservation calculation, which the applicant provided and meet the standards. Within the landscape plan there are 414 trees, 314 shrubs and 336 grasses located throughout the site. There is a heavy evergreen screen in the rear to supplement deciduous trees. They have added evergreen trees near the front entrance to provide screening for the first building, closest to Route 34, and provides a wind screen.

There is one waiver associated with the landscape plan, for the trees located in the middle of each of the buildings. The tree planting area should be 125 sq. ft., and they are at 100, so they can provide adequate sidewalk to access those buildings.

Trash and recycling will be handled by a private carter. Utilities are coming from Route 34, two water connections, one at each driveway, and sewer connections northerly of the two driveways.

Referring to the blow up of the clubhouse, it will be 3,800 sq. ft. with an adjacent pool area and 25 parking stalls provided. They have added some solar LED bollards in front of the clubhouse, an area they can assure they will work.

The yellow line shown in the exhibit photo represents the Route 34 right of way. It has a bit of a jog that result in a couple of variances associated with the sign location, which is in the right of way. Looking at the blow up of the intersection, Route 34 is the lower right. There is a gatehouse, which requires a set back variance because it is on the setback line. The black line is the property line. The property line itself is 54 ft. from the curb line of Route 34. That means when they place the sign compliant with the Ordinance, it is more than 100 ft. back form Route 34 and would serve no purpose. To make it visible to the motoring population, they placed it 25 ft. behind the NJDOT standard requirement. That is where they would place their right of way, so it is 25 ft. behind. It is going to appear to be compliant with the Ordinance but will not be. They will need, and have filed for, DOT approval.

The gatehouse has the same reasoning. The right of way has the jog, so in order to keep it at the entrance, they located it just inside the limits of the property.

Referring to the bioretention basin, pointing to the exhibit photograph, shows for orientation purposes, Route 35 and the northerly driveway. The bioretention basin is their stormwater retention basin, different from your standard detention basin for one obvious reason, being tree plantings located throughout. The use of a bioretention basin allows you to plant trees, provides for groundwater recharge and water quality and allows you to meet all residential site improvement standards and DEP Stormwater management requirements.

Basically retains water on site, discharges to DEP sewer located in vicinity of the northerly driveway and runs north to Route 34. It complies to DEP standards. He was made aware today that Freehold Soil has approved their plan, which is inclusive of the Stormwater Management design. He will provide this to the Board.

The next exhibit in A-1 is ***Proposed Street Lights***, which street light is an LED fixture, 90 watt, zero foot candles, at the property line and by the time you reach Route 34. LED fixtures are more energy efficient, that's why it is a 90 watt fixture rather than a metal halo type fixture, and meets all the Ordinance requirements.

Moving on thru the Exhibit A-1 to ***Grading and Steep Slopes***, as Roger mentioned in the beginning, before starting any land planning concept, the first thing done in May, 2012, before any layout was considered, was the steep slope analysis. Referring to Exhibit A-1, ***Steep Slopes: Original Slope Analysis by Developer***, you are looking at an analysis done by hand, the darker areas indicate steep slopes, the nonshaded areas indicate flat slopes. Route 34 is to the upper left, you can see the outline of the property and the water tank.

After they got their topographic survey, they prepared a computer generated steep slope analysis, generated by computer software, referring to Exhibit A-1 picture ***Steep Slopes: Original Slope Analysis by Developer***, May 15, 2012. The darker grey shaded areas are slopes in excess or 15% and the non dark shaded are less than 15% slopes. There is a dashed line that meanders along the perimeter of the site, which are the limits of the previously disturbed slopes, which go back to the pictures showing prior clearing and disturbed slopes. Mr. Malman says the photos with piles of soil are what they are referring to as disturbed slopes. They are manmade slopes as a result of activities. Mr. Busch says the computer does not delineate how a slope was created.

They took all the slopes previously disturbed and whited them out. It shows the remaining steep slopes in the perimeter, show in Exhibit A-1, ***Steep Slopes: Excluding man made slopes***. The darker heavier line is their limit of disturbance. This is the same exact exhibit with the exception they pulled away the mountain. You can see none of the buildings are in areas of natural steep slopes, they are all in areas previously disturbed, except for areas near the entrance (pointing to exhibit) and near the cul de sac. The development takes place fully within areas of prior disturbance.

When the Redevelopment Plan was adopted, there was a Phase 1 environmental investigation which was part and parcel to the report, in 2012. This past fall there was a Phase 11, 1 where they take samples of areas of concern. Two of the nine areas of concern came back with letters requiring further action. There are a couple of stockpiles that have elevated levels of action criteria, which means at the time of construction that material will have to be stockpiled, classified and appropriately exported off the site under an LSRP, a licensed mediation professional, essentially the equivalent of a DEP overseer. This means the site is clean to be developed.

They have a Letter of Interpretation for wetlands which is filed by the DEP permit for transition area averaging. The DOT access permit is pending before the DOT. Monmouth County Planning Board approval has been applied for and is pending. Freehold Soil he got word today that it has been approved and a letter should be expected next week. Township water and sewer will be a condition of approval and they will post accordingly. They comments emailed from the fire official to provide fire signage, lanes, striping, and they will comply with those requirements.

Referring to the CME review letter dated February 5, 2015, Mr. Busch has reviewed the letter and says the applicant can comply with all the technical items that need to be addressed in the letter. Mr. Malman says the letter requests certain plan revisions and modifications; Mr. Busch says the applicant will comply.

Referring to the T&M review letter dated February 6, 2015, Mr. Busch says most of the items in this letter relate to specific testimony during the course of this presentation.

Regarding the letter from the Township of Marlboro, dated February 27, 2015, Mr. Busch says there are five comments in the letter; the first comment relates to storm water management and does it fully comply with the standards, and the answer is, they do comply with NJ DEP and Residential Site Improvement standards.

The second question relates to traffic, on which there will be subsequent testimony.

The third question relates to buffering along Route 34. As he illustrated in the Landscape Plan presented, there is adequate buffers and adequate retention of the existing vegetation, which provides for buffering along Route 34. The site is well screened from the Highway.

The fourth question regarding lighting, Mr. Busch says lighting is of the nature of the LED fixtures, the light sources in the fixtures, is shielded already, and none of the light extends beyond the center line of Route 34 but is contained in the site. There is no need to do anything further.

The next question Mr. Malman says has to do with environmental and comply with DEP requirements, which Mr. Busch has already testified to.

Thomas Brennan is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein and states he is employed by Thomas J. Brennan Architects in Plano, Texas. He grew up in Linden, NJ, lived in Toms River and has a summer home and office in Long Branch. He is a licensed architect in the State of New Jersey for 28 years. He also holds other licenses in other states.

Under questioning by Mr. Malman, Mr. Brennan referring, to the power point exhibit, says Mr. Mumford's vision was to create an aesthetically pleasing, highly functional development, upscale apartment homes. They are primarily one and two bedroom homes, units that range from 780 sq. ft. to 1,350 sq. ft., with attached garages to give direct access to units. The interior of the units are largely open, with a living room dining room, kitchen combination. The bedrooms are appointed with large walk in closets. Features include washer/dryer, etc. that you find in upscale community. .

Regarding the outside, Mr. Brennan says outside features have a combination of horizontal siding, real stone, other features like in the gables cedar impression with detail, over the garage doors, carriage style garage doors with upscale trim, brackets, things you find in more of a single family type home that are incorporated into this elevation. The way the buildings articulate there are ins and outs, variations with gables, the center section is a court yard that goes back roughly 20 ft. As you look at the buildings, there is a lot of movement on the façade, and a lot of variation to the elevation character. There are two building types, a 10 unit and a 14 unit type. The intent was to create something that would have a very upscale elevation and more of a townhouse feel as far as the styling and elevation are concerned vs. an apartment. .

The living room and dining rooms are large combination rooms with the kitchens. The bedrooms are pretty large, 16 ft. long, closest space, two bathroom layouts in some of the two bedroom layouts. The garages have ample storage for the occupants. They have the balcony in the back or patio area that is covered, so that would be pleasing to go out sliding glass doors and sit outside. The power point is showing one half of the building, and then flips over to the other half.

There is an end unit and an interior unit. It is entered from the court yard.

Referring to the second floor, Mr. Brennan says on the end unit it is a repeat of the first floor, two bedroom type unit, with a large open area. It feels nice, living room, dining room and kitchen are large. The unit in the front is one bedroom, has a large living room, dining room with island in the kitchen. They are nice apartment homes.

The fronts have articulation with gables and movements of the front facades and also the rear sticks out and reverse gable sticks out. There is architectural interest, not just putting all the nice façade out front. The rears and sides look attractive as well. They tried to accommodate all four sides as they were designing this.

Mr. Malman recalls Mr. Mumford to talk about some of the materials and the green initiatives that are part of this project.

Mr. Mumford shows a sample of the stone and siding, says the stone is called Crystal Creek, has a lot of mica in it and is beautiful. The colors are off because of the lights, but it is sage siding, insulated garage doors. When it comes to green, it is not just using durable products but where the quarry is. When you take a green product and drive from Cleveland, it is not that green because you are using diesel fuel.

Referring to the slides, in terms of green buildings relate to how efficient you are using the site. In this case as highlighted in testimony, from his topographic survey, he is looking to maintain a majority of the existing woodlands. By doing so a lot less dirt is moved, less construction equipment, all relates to the green aspect of building the site. His landscape architect selected native plant species; it requires less irrigation and fertilizer. The engineer highlighted the site lighting is LED lights, and around the rec building is solar lighting.

Recycled engineer lumber, most larger buildings today use trusses or TJI's. If you take dimensional lumber, 2x10 or 2x4, you cut down Douglas fir trees and the tree stays dead. If you take Aspen trees you cut down and they come back the following year because of the root system. It takes about 50% of wood fiber to create this type of wood and is much stronger. It would be done today even if not going green, along with finger joint studs and all sorts of related lumber.

What's green about real stone is a product of the earth. This type of mica stone will last indefinitely.

They use 50 year roof shingles; typically when you have to replace a roof you have to rip off one layer, but by the time this roof needs to be reroofed, in a typical situation, you would be ripping off all the roofs, asphalt and refuse that is not environmentally sound, so it makes sense to use 50 year shingles.

Energy efficiency, they have mechanical equipment typical of luxury apartments. They are not putting a big unit in the wall but doing split systems. The heating and cooling units are not only individual for each unit but allows them to go 95% efficiency on the furnaces and 14.5 SEER on air conditioners. This means if you have an 80 plus furnace, typical for these types of units, about 20% of every dollar you spend is not generating heat but going out the flue. Going to 95 plus you do not need a flue but a piece of plastic pipe. Having 200 units is the equivalent of 30 units with free energy.

The SEER is seasonal energy efficient ratio and that is important. When you go up to 95 SEER you take all the cooling you need in a year and convert it into BTUs and divide it by wattage. It makes a huge difference. If you are a responsible developer you want to have a community that has little impact on the community as possible.

In terms of appliances, like General Electric, they will be energy star rated.

Insulation is evolving with what he does in his company. It can happen one of two ways. They can go ahead with open cell foam, as stated in the Redeveloper's Agreement, where you build a 2 x 4 wall, open or closed cell foam, you go from cell and it has a variety of benefits. What he is starting to do now is go to a 2 x 6 wall and an R21 insulation, which is actually more insulation but done with fiber glass.

He wants to put on the record subject to the Building Department's review, and he is representing that the insulation will be equal or better, to go to a thicker wall. The other reason he is thinking about going to the split system is to allow the engineers to approve if he decides to go that way.

CFL is lighting to be used instead of incandescence lights; it saves 75% of the energy.

The cabinets they use, everything is made in America, a lot of it in Pennsylvania, certified by the Kitchen Cabinet Manufacturers of America, no formaldehyde, no gasses. These are well built cabinets with no issues, like the issues with Chinese built cabinets.

Mr. Mumford says they use different types of flooring and carpeting in the bedrooms. The carpeting is a Type 6 nylon. There is only one plant in America that recycles for a company, so this is completely recycled carpet, very good stuff. It is also done under controls from an engineering standpoint.

In terms of their wood flooring products, they use a flooring that has a core that utilizes 50% less wood fibers than typical wood floors. When they do use the vinyl wood floors which are from Restoration Hardware, called luxury vinyl tile, made out of virgin vinyl, which can also be considered a green application. This is a product from the earth.

The counters they use will likely be pental quartz, which has a zillion attributes, one of which it is certified by a variety of independent research groups and does not generate gasses or anything like that.

It is the same thing with the paints and adhesives. Today the better paint companies offer lower volatile organic paints (VOP), and they will use that type of product.

In terms of sound mitigation designed into the buildings, there are a lot of different ways to do this. In between the units there will be an STC (sound transmission rating) of about 54. They accomplished that by having a double 2 x 4 wall. The walls have space between them, they each have 3-12/ inch fiber glass backs. On the side of one wall they run metal, R 1 channels with two layers of gypsum wall board, and on the other side of the wall they have a layer of gypsum wall board.

Floor to ceilings they have R 19 fiber glass bats. They have a product called acoustic mats under hardwood floors. They have gyp crete, a soft concrete product sound insulation and R channels with double 5 inch sheetrock. That is not the most sophisticated program in America for sound mitigation, but it is an adequate strategy for the project.

Mr Mumford believes he is complying or exceeding the initiatives required in the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Malman calls Philip Grealy, who is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein and states he is a principal and department manager employed by Maser Consulting in Red Bank, NJ, and is a licensed Professional Engineer in the State of New Jersey. He is Department Manager of the Traffic and Transportation Group, and he also manages the office in Hawthorne, NY. He has done traffic studies for major residential, commercial and institutional developments.

Under questioning by Mr. Malman, Mr. Grealy states that under his supervision a traffic report was prepared by Maser Consulting. The Traffic Impact Study dated September 10, 2014, was prepared in accordance with requirements of NJDOT. Pointing to the previously marked exhibit, he shows Route 34, with two access points for this development; the northerly is a right turn in/out, making it convenient going north on Route 34. The other access is opposite Woodcliff Boulevard and is a full traffic movement that has a traffic signal to be upgraded to a four way signalized intersection.

In terms of the traffic study, standard procedures documenting traffic volumes, surveys were conducted in May and June last year, and included automatic traffic recorders during the course of a week, looking at variations of daily and hourly variations and hourly counts observed manually to see where vehicles are turning to and from for a capacity analysis.

Again referring to the exhibit, they are located opposite Woodcliff Boulevard, which has two exiting lanes, one heading north bound, so traffic coming from the south would be a left turn into Woodcliff Boulevard. They will be restriping the roadway to provide a right turn lane into the applicant's project. The traffic signal will be modified. The setbacks and State Right of Way was previously described by Mr. Busch.

Again referring to the exhibit, Route 34 is shown on the left, their site access where their gate entrance is, and Woodcliff across the street. The picture depicts the lane utilization. They will be restriping Route 34 to provide a separate left turn for traffic southbound and eastbound into their project. New signal heads will be installed and upgraded traffic signal, cross walks and pedestrian signals will be installed. They currently have a complete application with the NJDOT; they are waiting for their technical review comments on the application, and there are comments from the Board engineer to get the input from the DOT and show the circulation plans to show how emergency and other vehicles will circulate thru the site. This is already shown on Page 26 of their submitted plans. Since Aberdeen and Marlboro share a line, when they receive the technical comments from the DOT they will be shared with both towns.

Answering Mr. Malman's question is it fair to say in Mr. Grealy's opinion that when these improvements are installed the traffic will efficiently enter and exit the applicant's site, and Mr. Grealy says that is correct.

David Roberts is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein and states he is employed by Masur Consulting, Red Bank, NJ, and is a licensed planner in the State of New Jersey since 1985. He is also a licensed landscape architect in the State of New Jersey. His concentration has been redevelopment over the past number of years, has coauthored a text book being used throughout the State for redevelopment. For Masur he does planning services for Central and Southern New Jersey.

Under questioning by Mr. Malman, Mr. Roberts says this Board because of the structure of New Jersey's Redevelopment Housing Law, has been a partner from the beginning, when it considered whether this area was one in need of redevelopment, and made a favorable recommendation to the Governing body of the Township almost two years ago, based on the report done by Anthony Rodriguez, Board Planner, of T&M Associates,

The next step was development of the Redevelopment Plan, based on Section 7 of the Statute, which called for a similar project. The concept plan was close to what is being shown this evening. The concept plan was based on a site analysis, something landscape architects are trained to do to read the site and get a feel for areas that can be developed and preserved. When that was done, the nature of the site being previously disturbed, and the issues that have occurred on the site over time, became under utilized and buildings run down and neglected. All the criteria found met the requirements of the statute. The approach of the site in the Redevelopment Plan was to focus and place the new development on the already disturbed areas, and that has been shown tonight how closely the plans fit into the already disturbed areas.

The Redevelopment Plan was a combination of a Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance for one specific site, one specific area. In this case the Redevelopment Plan has specific requirements of the Statute lays out; the Plan was adopted with certain development requirements in it.

There is a table in the Redevelopment Plan that lays out the bulk requirements;; it almost treats it like a planned development in that you are looking at an overall tract, you lay out your setbacks around the tract perimeter, and in this case the Redevelopment Plan focused on Route 34 as one perimeter, and then the rest of the boundaries of the other perimeters. Within that area you effectively lay out the development. There are building separation standards, front to front, 60 ft., side to side, end to end and back to side. You arrange your buildings within those parameters; in this case the focus based on the concept plan, which is important, because it is a link appendage to the Redevelopment Plan that has to be followed. The concept plan identified the areas of the site where development was appropriate. A project is laid out in accordance with those standards.

There are also a number of design standards in the Redevelopment Plan that deal with landscaping, fences and walls, parking, and a whole separate section on green initiatives that Mr. Mumford discussed how this project will be green compliant.

Mr. Roberts says this project is compliant with all of that, however, when you go from a study of the area to the plan and from the plan to the redevelopment agreements, which have occurred over the past year, then you go from the agreement to the site plan, you get to each level of detail, you draw down, and you start getting more analysis of the site, almost inevitably there are some parts of the redevelopment plan that you run into.

The first thing for an area of relief is the fact that when the redevelopment plan was written, it was based on the tax map because there was no survey. The tax map showed the parcel to be 28 acres, and the plan was written for a tract of 28 acres. A survey's level of accuracy is greater than a tax map, so when the survey was done, it turns out the site is 27.72 acres, not 28 acres.

Normally in that situation you would round down, to be conservative, and a typical size for a redevelopment would be 25 acres. The relief they need is the difference between 28 acres and 27.72 acres. Without that relief they could not do anything on this project because nothing would conform to the redevelopment plan, and the site is specific to the redevelopment plan.

The statute talks about the relationship of the redevelopment plan and a zoning ordinance. The statute requires it states its relationship of the zoning ordinance. It gives you two choices: it can either supersede, which means the zoning there before goes away, or an overlay, meaning the zoning stays in place and you drop redevelopment on top of it. The reval plan says it supersedes all aspects of the zoning including bulk and design standards except where otherwise noted. The plan then goes in and identifies sections of the Ordinance, such as 25-8, which talks about fences and walls. Instead of repeating everything in the Ordinance it references the Ordinance. There could be references to parking amongst other things.

Looking to the professionals in this situation, where there was a question, they advertised for the relief and presented a response to the relief. One of the things not in the Redevelopment Plan and not cited as a reference is the steep slopes section. In his opinion that was probably deliberate because of the nature of the disturbed section of the site. In the interest of full disclosure, they provided a detailed explanation by Mr. Busch of the slope issues on the site and why the applicant feels if you were to take away the manmade pieces or portions of the slope that are 15% or more, you would end up with an area they have effectively created with the development. The applicant feels they have complied with the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. Even if you look at the performance standards in the steep slope section of the Ordinance, the testimony you heard about how carefully the site was planned, they meet those performance standards protection in the Ordinance.

He believes they do not need the relief from steep slopes but are respectful of the concerns of the Board's professionals, so they addressed it. He further believes they meet the performance standards for areas they do disturb slopes 15% or more.

Referring to the Exhibit 1-A, Mr. Roberts says the area of the site where the entrance is, Mr. Busch showed the outline of the site, the configuration of the lot line that jogs in significantly at that point. Locating the driveway opposite an existing street that has a traffic light is good planning and where you would want your driveway to be. That intersection and the DOT right of way is extremely wide compared to the rest of the site, for whatever reason.

Referring to the slide in Exhibit 1-A that Mr. Busch pointed out there are issues. One is, pointing to the slide, a gatehouse location, a gate way treatment for the entrance. Even though the gateway house is small, it is an accessory building. There is a tract setback of 50 ft. required from Route 34, and that is suppose to be clear of all buildings, whether principle or accessory. The rationale for the gatehouse, it is an accessory building, and because of the extreme configuration of the setback at that location, it is basically right on the line. Functionally how it will appear from Route 34, it will appear to be a normal gateway treatment as seen in other area developments.

As Mr. Busch explained, the sign, in order to be functional, how to be in the right of way. He testified that he used DOT standards for a typical design section as to where you would normally have a sign;; from that point of view it complies with the spirit of the sign setbacks in the Redevelopment Plan. One of the things you read about laid out are the sizes of signs and location of signs, but because the entrance of the road is oriented to a traffic light, that happens to be

where there is an extreme setback of 70 plus ft. from the curb, the sign has to be in that location to be seen as you drive up and down Highway 34.

A minor area of relief being sought is the walls, part of the gateway treatment, which would be considered fences, rise from 4 to 6 ft. in order to give the architectural effect of a decorative wall. The applicant is asking for relief of the 2 ft. difference, where 4 ft. is permitted in the fence section of the Ordinance, to allow the 6 ft. articulation of the wall. This is a specific design for the entrance as a gateway they feel meets all of the intent of the statute for creative design and desirable visual body in terms of an entrance.

Mr. Roberts says he is use to getting arguments when you talk about positive and negative criteria in regard to variances and site plans. The Redevelopment Plan says the Board's ability to grant relief, it references the Board is able to grant relief for any bulk or design standards at their discretion, based on the standards of 40:55a70c, basically c1 and c2. It does not actually require a variance but it says to use the standards. In order to use the standards for that kind of relief for setbacks and size of the parcel, the first purpose of zoning, under Section A, talks about ***encouraging municipal action to guide appropriate use of development in a manner that promotes health, safety and welfare.*** When you went thru the redevelopment process, it can only go forward to advance the health, safety and welfare, so it was adopted as a municipal action, so the site plan itself is promoting the health, safety and welfare. In terms of the deviations that deal with specific details of the site, are really just to promote the purposes of zoning.

Additional ones would be subsection "I" to promote and create development techniques, good civic design arrangements, which is what this community represents, and to encourage coordination of various public and private procedures. When you listen to the purpose in the MLUL, it says to encourage coordination of the various public and private procedures, which suggest a public and private cooperation and activities shaping land development for the view of lessening the cost of such development, and to the more efficient use of land.

Obviously there was an inefficient use of land, currently and that has existed for many years, it was an extraction operation, a repair operation, and just marginal uses going on on the property for many years; not a very efficient use of the site. It will be replaced with a brand new community, tastefully designed, made in an environmentally sensible way. You think about some of the sustainable standards, the LEAD, rating systems such as neighborhood development, where you look to minimize the disturbance of undisturbed portions of the site, you look to capture rain water and treat it, not just hold it in a basin and let it drain out to a pipe, but actually allow plant materials to take up the nutrients of the storm water, so the water that leaves that area is cleaner. Basically the site is being remediated, a brown field condition, another credit for LEAD for both new construction and for neighborhood development.

Mr. Roberts says all the things happening on this site are advancing the ideas of sustainable development.

Subsection "N" talks about promoting utilization of renewable energy resources. You have a property where you have a developer who is using solar energy where he can, around the clubhouse, he is using LED lighting to reduce the use of electricity, and all of the energy efficient things going into the design of the buildings to reduce energy consumption are all in advance of that.

To promote the maximum recovery and recycling of recyclable materials, as stated in Subsection "O." The purpose of zoning, you heard Mr. Mumford say even the wood going into the project is a newer, recyclable wood.

For all of these reasons, looking at the overall scope of the project and how closely it matches the Redevelopment Plan, and then look at the minimal and di minimus nature of the deviations being requested and the reasons for them due to the odd configuration of the site, Mr. Roberts feel there is plenty reasons for both the negative and positive criteria, using that section of the statute to grant the relief.

Mr Abbonizio says there was a comment in their report that the applicant agreed to, and should be put on the record; there was a technical issue with the bioretention basin that will, if the Board approves the application, their engineer has agreed to do additional tests and test pits. Mr. Malman says the applicant will agree to this.

Mr. Shenton asks about the comment regarding the garage by the pool house; Mr. Truscott says in his letter is a question about a garage door in the clubhouse, which he believes is for storage. Mr. Mumford says it is for general storage in the maintenance area for items you don't want to have freeze.

Mr. Hirsch says looking at the design layout of the development, on the tail end of the cul de sac, there is no direct access in or out for fire vehicles for emergencies, and if that is not part of the plan, did the fire marshal approve such plan, and can a fire truck make a U Turn and get out of there, and what is the reaction time from Point A to Point B.

Mr. Malman replies that the fire department did give comments, and they have agreed to comply with them, including signage and striping.

Mr. Busch responds that Sheet 26 of the plans shows a fire truck circulating throughout the site and can turn around within the cul de sac at the very end. He will not attempt to try to respond to the question of response time as he is not an expert in fire operations.

Mr. Hirsch says it is an issue in town where you need to have the proper clearance to get in and out, but as long as the fire marshal commented on the plan, he trusts his expertise.

Mr. Busch says the comments they did receive from the fire marshal were simple in the sense of fire lane signage and fire lane striping, and they were given the same plan the Board has.

Mr. Hirsch says there may be some environmental remediation as part of the testimony will be done; how will, if any, that environmental impact have any impact on neighboring landowners. Mr. Busch says "no" is the answer to that question.

Mr. Hirsch asks what steps will be taken during construction to limit disturbance to the surrounding homes. Mr. Busch responds there are comments from the Environmental Commission regarding this. He suggests the exact clearing limits be staked out with an orange construction fence. Mr. Leckstein says there has to be a developer's agreement where all will be detailed. Mr. Busch says the application has to go thru Freehold Soils, which will request and require the limit of disturbance indicated on the plans and followed throughout the project. With this type of development, there is a site inspector from Freehold Soils who routinely does inspections to be sure everything is being complied with.

Mr. Hirsch is concerned about any lighting on the back of the buildings not disturb adjacent properties; is this in the developer's agreement. Mr. Busch assures him there will be no disturbance.

Mr. Hirsch asks about the community center the pool, and will there be any outdoor seating, picnic areas, bbq areas behind the pool. He does not see anything in the plans that provide protection for the people from Highway 34. Mr. Mumford replies in terms of amenities around the pool, the intention is to create an attractive landscape area. They have not reached the level of detail to plan a bbq area.

Mr. Hirsch says it may all be covered in agreements and with attorneys, but the area that concerns him is the area in the front by the right of way. He hopes there is some agreement in the redeveloper's agreement that the owners will maintain the grounds outside of their property line. Mr. Malman responds the driveway entrance and the landscaping within that will be maintained by the developer. Mr. Hirsch says he is not concerned within the development, but rather outside area. Mr. Mumford says it would be crazy for him not to treat that part of the property with the same care and maintenance that could detrimentally impact...Mr. Hirsch says down the road in the future, should Mr. Mumford sell off to another management firm, he wants to be sure the Township will not be stuck with the maintenance of the property but rather there is something that legally says the developer or owner is responsible. Mr. Mumford says he sees this in many upscale communities; the property stops and no one does anything beyond it. He assures on the record that will not be the case with him.

Mr. Mirabal questions if the highway needs to expand, what happens to the signage in the right of way. Mr. Malman says if the DOT approved expanding the highway they will tell them to move their sign, because it is in the right of way. Even if they were doing improvements to Highway 34, the sign is still set back at least 25 ft. from the proposed pavement, so there is quite a bit of cushion in there, and they do think it is the proper location for the sign for visibility for the motorists.

Mr. Mirabal asks about the wall, which Mr. Malman says the wall is actually on the applicant's property. The wall and gate are close to the DOT line but still on the applicant's property.

After a short break the public meeting resumes, with all Board members present at the start of the hearing present now.

Mr. Shenton calls on the Environmental and Shade Tree Board for comments, but they have none.

Frank Huza, 43 Beacon Lane, Aberdeen, NJ, asks the applicant where they would put the parking. There is no on street parking, every single slot seems to be full of an automobile, so when it snows, does it go in the bushes. Mr. Huza further says they seem to have done their marketing and demand analysis for this project to make sure it is viable and you will have customers come in, based on the income levels of the proposed clients, what is the average ownership of that particular income group.

Mr. Busch, answering Mr. Huza's question on snow removal, says one of the areas is adjacent to their bioretention basin and there are several pockets throughout the site. Mr. Leckstein asks how many parking spaces; Mr. Busch replies there are 429 parking spaces where 389 spaces are required, so there is an excess of 39 plus spaces. He says they do have areas in the vicinity of the

clubhouse, the bioretention basin and areas at the ends of the building, and you can pile it on the sides of the building. Mr. Leckstein asks how many units, and Mr. Busch replies there are 200 units. Mr. Hirsch asks if those spaces include the garages; Mr. Busch replies it counts the garages.

Mr. Mumford, addressing Mr. Huza asking for clarification, Mr. Huza replies based on the upscale nature of the development do upscale residents have more or fewer cars than the average American, do you know if all these households would have two cars or not. Could an upscale neighborhood have three cars instead of two. Mr. Mumford says in terms of scale, it is relative. Incomes will range from \$50 or \$60,000 to he is sure very substantial incomes with people who just prefer this kind of living. Typically they find with a two bedroom unit 1.5 cars per unit. In a number of locations people have started using less cars, so he cannot answer specifically. He can say based on his experience in this business, along with that of the associates present tonight, they are not concerned they will have a parking issue. With 200 units, the likelihood you are going to have the 90 exterior spaces other than the ones in front of the individual apartments utilized at all times. It is highly unlikely.

Mr. Leckstein says regardless if there is an issue or not, they meet and exceed the standards from what the Ordinance requires.

At this point Mr. Leckstein swears in Mr. Huza.

Tony Jackson is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein and states he lives at 4 White Oak Lane, Aberdeen, NJ, also known as the Villages at Aberdeen. He states there are quite a few residents of the Villages here this evening with questions, of which Mr. Huza asked about 50% of their questions.

Mr. Jackson says he heard testimony about a traffic study, and the testimony was they were going to add some more traffic lights and things of that nature, and in conclusion he said it would be adequate for folks coming in and out of the applicant's project, their community. As an Aberdeen resident and homeowner, has is it going to impact his development. He heard how it is going to impact the applicant's project, but he is very concerned how it will impact his community.

Philip Grealy of Masur Consulting, their traffic expert previously sworn, says a development of this type in terms of traffic generation, they have to look at a one hour period to analyze traffic conditions based on DOT standards . A development of this type in a one hour period would generate in the area of 130 trips. Based on what occurs on the roadway system today, Route 34 is a roadway that has in excess of 15,000 vehicles per day. In terms of the peak hours, there are over 1,000 vehicles in both directions on this section of Highway 34, in the a.m. peak hour and over 1,200 vehicles per hour in the afternoon hour.

Mr. Grealy says their traffic will disperse onto Highway 34, it is not all one directional. They will have two points of access. There will be increased traffic along the corridor. From the level of service stand point, they maintain levels of service. At the intersection with Woodcliff Boulevard they made some recommendations on signal timing adjustments to reduce delays for people leaving that development. The ultimate decision is up to NJDOT.

Mr. Grealy says the overall intersections will operate at Level of Service "B" and during peak hours, even without this project, leaving Woodcliff Boulevard would be Level of Service "D."

However, with the signal timing adjustments they could actually improve the average vehicle delay. Mr. Grealy agrees with Mr. Malman's statement that this would be a benefit for the residents.

Answering Mr. Shenton, Mr. Grealy says the entrance to the north is a right turn in, right turn out, and that traffic will operate at a Level of Service "B." It has good sight distance, right turns in, right turns out, so it will get some benefits from the signal being in place to get additional gaps. It will operate at good levels of service and has good sight distance.

Mr. Leckstein advises this property is zoned for this use, so the Board cannot say "no" because of any type of traffic concerns.

Mr. Jackson does not know about levels of service for traffic, but he has a lot of questions, but he feels this is already done, the Board is just going thru the exercise. He says they are entitled to the opportunity to speak to the Board, give them some ideas, that he hopes will be taken into consideration and maybe make some adjustments so it doesn't impact the Villages and everyone is in a win win situation when this is concluded.

Mr. Jackson says there is a professional building next door to the Villages, and every day at 3 or 4 a.m. the garbage man comes to empty the dumpster, and it wakes him up and he is sure other residents of the Villages as well. Could there possibly be a time change for pick ups. Prior to the development being built he could understand early pick ups, but now that people are living next door, the residents have to be taken into consideration so they are not woken up so early in the morning by a garbage truck.

At the request of Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Jackson says the business he refers to is Dr. Moskowitz's office. Mayor Tagliarini says we will put a stop to that because we do have a sound ordinance and a garbage pick up ordinance, and the Mayor thanks Mr. Jackson for bringing that up and the issue will be addressed immediately.

Mr. Jackson confirms there will be 200 units; he says whoever is going to own it and manage it, from a professional side how are they going to bring people in, screen them, is it affordable housing, is it market rate. Mr. Malman says it is all market rate, no affordable housing,

Mr. Jackson asks if the project needs a tax abatement to come to fruition, is there a PILOT. Mr. Malman says "no" tax abatement. He asks this question because in the beginning it is great, but when the tax abatement is over, the money is not the same and the management is different.

Mr. Malman confirms to Mr. Jackson there are 435 parking spots, including garage space,

Mr. Jackson says he thinks the applicant has done a fine job, and the negative attitude is because they are going to affect the Villages, they have not been informed until tonight, and he was very impressed with the presentation.

Mayor Tagliarini thanks Mr. Jackson for informing us about the garbage pick up issue at the dental office next to the Villages, that he will see to it it comes to an end.

Mayor Tagliarini says they chose this type of project because the town did not want another strip mall, more garbage, more noise; he thinks the type of quality you see here tonight, though the impact will be there, but we have studied this hard enough to know, especially when coming

north into our town, what do you want to see. He sees an old dilapidated horrible site when he comes into Aberdeen northbound, and they met with the Board's engineer and planner sporadically and said this cannot be anymore. He thanks Mr. Jackson for his questions because the entrance into Aberdeen is very important to him.

Robert DiMartino, 5 White Oak Lane, Aberdeen, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and says the site is beautiful, but what does this do to his taxes. Will this applicant pay the same taxes that he pays for his unit in the Villages; he pays \$12,000 a unit. Mr. Leckstein says "yes." He says they will pay taxes on the market value of the entire complex, 200 apartment units.

Mr. DiMartino says he agrees it is an eye sore piece of property.

Mr. DiMartino asks what this development will do to their home values. He paid almost half a million dollars for a town home, and he is concerned what happens to the value of his home, what if this doesn't stay a truly high end rental units in five or seven years, and the value of his home now goes from \$500 to \$300,000.

Laurie Williams, 4 White Oak Lane, Aberdeen, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and asks when maintenance comes in to do repairs, will everyone be licensed to do the work that comes in because she does not want the same thing to happen here that happened in West New York where you can get someone who has a license and someone who doesn't comes in to do repairs and then there is a problem.

Mr. Mumford replies he is a building company and they manage what they do, and in terms of licensed professionals, the people who make repairs will either by people they have had long standing trade relationships with that are excellent, or their own full time people who are very capable at what they do. They do not want anyone near the buildings who are not completely qualified.

Scott Wolf, 14 White Oak Lane, Aberdeen, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein and says he understands traffic studies were done by the DOT but have they done any traffic studies for the intersection of Route 34 and Lloyd Road being there is a lot of congestion there as we speak. Two hundred vehicles will definitely create a lot more congestion.

His second question is have any studies been done to see how this development will impact the school system being they are already over capacity to begin with.

His third question is being this was Manzo's old property, and there is a lot of contamination of the land, what testing has been done to the soil to see if it is even viable to be built on.

Mr. Grealy responds to the traffic question, saying he testified this project would generate about 120 trips during the peak hour. When you analyze traffic you look at a one hour period, morning peak hours and afternoon peak hours. You may have that amount of volume for more than one hour.

In terms of the Lloyd Road intersection, Mr Grealy says his traffic is not all destined to that intersection, but someone between 50 and 60% of those trips would be generated toward the Lloyd Road and Route 34 intersection.

In terms of percentage increase, it is a relatively small increase, but it is something that would be discussed with the DOT, and they may come back and ask them to look at it in more detail, but right now percentage wise they would not be impacting that intersection based on the traffic generation.

Mr. Mumford addresses the question regarding impact to the school system, saying a lot of municipalities today have the opposite problem in that schools are gradually not being occupied. Rutgers University has studies that relate to rental housing in terms of school age children, although most people do not believe them. The number is roughly .2 for apartment homes, which would equate to 40 school age children. They do not have a study here tonight, but he is comfortable representing the Rutgers analysis would demonstrate that, and it may be less. He finds that the kind of people with children generally do not go to this type of housing but rather move to another type of housing, in his experience.

Mr. Busch, answering the environmental question, says two studies have been done; one was Phase 1 done in 2012 at the time of the Redevelopment Plan. That identified around 20 areas of concern, nine of which were recommended for subsequent testing. They did soil borings and tested those nine locations, and of those nine, two came back with elevated levels. The two areas are some soil stockpile on the surface of the ground and the old fuel tank from the old asphalt operation. The areas are relatively confined. When the tank gets removed, there will be soil that gets excavated with stockpile on site. The stock piles that have elevated levels will be mixed with that stockpile, classified, which means they take additional samples at that point in time, and then it will be exported off site. Answering Mr. Malman, Mr. Busch agrees that during construction these issues get addressed and attended to. This is all done by outside licensed professionals within the DEP regulations.

Myles Weinstein, 6 Imaginary Place, Aberdeen, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and his father lives at 42 Juniper Place in Aberdeen. He states there are people here from Juniper Place whose homes are directly affected by the construction of this site. Behind Juniper Place there is a hill that plateaus at the top; there was no talk about how encroaching the site will be on the wooded area behind Juniper Place.

Mr. Busch, pointing to his exhibit, shows Juniper Place and presumes Mr. Weinstein is referring to the units in the back left corner, which is confirmed. Mr. Busch says about 50 ft. of the existing trees will be maintained. Trees are deciduous so this time of year they only provide filtered screening. They are to provide a series of evergreen trees that will be planted at the rear of the buildings to provide a year round screen, so they will be evergreens not deciduous trees as currently there, to supplement what is there. They will be about 30 ft. higher on Juniper than where Mr. Weinstein is talking about, and Mr. Busch shows the slope it will be on.

Mr. Weinstein says some will be market value and there was talk of the upscale nature of this construction, yet he heard income levels of \$50 to \$60,000. He does not include that income with being able to afford an upscale unit, so he wants to know what these rentals are starting at, what is the range.

Mr. Mumford respond that on the lower end of the income scale, you are talking two people, and \$50 or \$60,000 income translates to about a low of \$100,000 to \$120,000 because typically people are working with two income apartments. When you talk about the context of values, you drive along Route 34, there are apartments in the area along with other structures that are not part

of the Villages at Aberdeen, not part of Juniper Place and not part of Woodcliff that are not in great shape. A new property built with significant detail and attractive finishes is less likely to get the income up and impact property values. If that were the case they are already be impacted.

In terms of rents, Mr. Mumford says they are not going to establish rentals amounts until they are ready to open, but in general terms a two bedroom apartment would be in the neighborhood of \$2,000 a month, and the one bedroom would be somewhat less than that.

Kristi Patlo, 1615 Wellington Place, Aberdeen, NJ is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and says she does not want to beat up the traffic issue but 200 units, and if each unit has 1.5 or 2 cars, that is 400 cars. There is no light at Wellington Place, the traffic in and out of there is horrendous every day, and it will impact. Mr. Leckstein says he does not believe anyone in this room believes traffic will not have an impact.

Ms. Patlo asks if these will be family units, two people with children. She says hypothetically a couple could have one or two kids, so that could be 200 to 400 kids.

Mr. Leckstein says it is unlikely that the one bedroom units will have two children. Ms. Patlo says she lives in a condo and a single mom just moved in with two kids, so it is possible. Ms Patlo says she has a one bedroom unit.

Councilwoman Montone says there are studies out that averages it out, and we have not seen that type of population out of these complexes.

Mr. Leckstein says you cannot zone on the basis of people having children. Ms. Patlo says though she does not have children, you have to a lot for that in a community. Her sister is a teacher and she has heard stories.

Mayor Tagliarini, saying he is sorry Mr. Clemente, developer of the Villages at Aberdeen, left, but he has told him that his community, which is a one, two and three bedroom community, has hardly any children. He told him at one time that of the children in his community, a lot of them went to private school. The impact was nil, and while anything can happen, the one and two bedroom units he would seriously doubt they would get many school aged children.

Ms. Patlo says Mr. Jackson pointed out about the noise; in the White Oak, Villages development next to her, she hears it 3 or 4 in the morning,

Mayor Tagliarini says at the end of the meeting he wants to know who exactly is making this noise; this is the first time it is being brought to our attention. We have ordinances that can address the issues.

Ms. Patlo, addressing Mayor Tagliarini, says he mentioned the eyesore coming 34 north, she bought her property in Wellington, and the property next to her wasn't developed yet, which is why she bought. If the building of themselves are eyesores, get rid of them; you do not have to destroy the environment, which to her is more valuable than development. Mayor Tagliarini responds that every community built in Aberdeen, long before him, and to follow after he is done, always wants to be the last one in. But Wellington was not the last one in, we don't know who the last one will be, and he appreciates her comments, but the Council and this Board is very sensitive to the delicate balance of preservation and development. Ms. Patlo says she sees more development than preservation. Mayor Tagliarini says to pick up the *Asbury Park Press* or the

Star Ledger and read where we just preserved 300 acres of land. He says that after Mr. Mumford takes off his developer's hat, he will be there as rental agent, he will be in ear shot of the Mayor at all times, he has a real vested interest to make sure this community could be a model for the State some day with its green initiatives. He believes it will work out real well, and thanks Ms. Patlo for her time.

Michael Bart, Freehold, NJ, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states he is the property manager for various developments in the Township. Mr. Leckstein says he cannot represent other people since he is not an attorney. He is not a property owner in Aberdeen.

Responding to Mr. Bart, Mr. Grealy says the applicant has a complete application in front of NJDOT. The next step would be a permit, and typically there will be comments on the plans; add another head here, give another lane length on the left turn lane, that type of thing.

Answering Mr. Bart's question about a concept plan, Mr. Malman says the concept plan is part of the Redevelopment Plan, it was always laid out this way.

April Glowgower, Juniper Place, Aberdeen, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and says while they mentioned environmental studies, has anyone done a noise pollution study. Juniper Place is a secluded, quiet street, with hills and trees. Route 34 is a heavily traveled road as a State highway. Did anyone do a study to determine if the amount of trees to be left up is sufficient for a natural sound barrier so they can continue to live in the same environment they are currently living in.

Mr. Busch replies there was not a noise study done. The buildings themselves actually act as a sound barrier, and there are State statutes that address noise at property lines, and they are required to comply with them. He cannot say a sound you hear from Route 34 is going to be better or worse with the project, but he does believe the buildings form a fairly substantial sound barrier to Juniper Place.

Ms. Glowgower says at the top of Juniper Place, near where the Villages development was built, there were a lot of trees that were torn down, and just the other day she could clearly hear Route 34 and the trucks going by all the time. She can guarantee if the trees are taken down they will be hearing a lot of vehicles. If there are regulations, she asks they put in more evergreen trees between Juniper and Route 34 for minimal impact to the residents of Juniper Place.

Mr. Busch, referring to Exhibit A-1, says Ms. Glowgower is describing an area that is basically a noise tunnel straight to Route 34. There are no evergreens, only deciduous that you can see right thru. The difference between this project and what the resident is talking about is the road is somewhat curb linear, there are physical buildings that are between the end (point to the Exhibit A-1), so you have a building, a new evergreen screen to be planted, and then the remaining deciduous trees. This is substantially more significant than what is there. He sees what Ms. Glowgower is talking about and doesn't doubt the noise comes thru there.

Mrs. Glowgower asks if a setback is a bulk requirement; Mr. Malman says the Ordinance has setback requirements they comply with except for gatehouse. Mr. Malman says it is a bulk requirement. Mrs. Glowgower says she was looking at the plan that says there should be a setback of 50 ft. from residential property line, and the Township's Ordinance says there should be a 50 ft. buffer, which should not be included, yet they are bulk requirements.

Mr. Malman says that is not how the Ordinance is interpreted, not the intention. Mrs. Glowgower read...the buffer area shall be provided in addition to all other bulk requirements. Mr. Malman says it doesn't mean you add it to the setback. Mr. Roberts says the main setback in the Redevelopment Plan is the tract separation, which is 50 ft. from Route 34 and he believes 50 ft. from other boundaries. That is the setback for buildings. The Redevelopment Plan anticipated that because the concept plan that was part of the Redevelopment Plan that said there were going to be substantial buffers all around the perimeter. It made that a setback for buildings, so that would be a way to lay out the project.

Answering Mrs. Glowgower, Mr Roberts say there are separate landscape requirements in the Redevelopment Plan, which anticipated a buffer all around the perimeter from the existing natural vegetation. It is different than the original Ordinance.

Mrs. Glowgower asks if the buffer in the Ordinance applies to this development or the purpose of a buffer to preserve the character of the different developments and prevent view, noise and light, does that apply in the Ordinance, the buffer zone. Mr. Truscott says there are no specific buffer requirements in the Redevelopment Plan; there are setback requirements as testified to. It is not over and above what is required. There are Ordinance provisions for buffers but do not apply in this instance.

Mrs. Glowgower feels this is being built rather close to Juniper; she knows the maximum was for 200 units, but she does not know why there has to be 200 units, especially with Building "O," and the slope. She just moved here in January because of the ambiance and the hills; once this is built she will look out the window at these townhouses that are built on a slope with only a 50 ft. setback and a terrace in their backyard, so they will have a nice pretty view, and now I, as a homeowner, property owner and taxpayer, I am being negatively impacted and will be looking at these rental properties. She feels it needs to be pushed back some from Juniper, put more evergreens up, to try to have the least negative impact on the residents of Juniper, the taxpayers. If you look at any listing for Juniper, everyone points out a positive aspect with the woods and seclusion and lack of noise. There needs to be a bigger barrier between them;; it feels like they are being built right on top of them. There are all the plans for the front entrance to be laid out nice, the pool, and then the units are right on top of the residents' homes that have been there for so long, and on a slope. She says 50 ft. is not going to prevent these rental people who move in from one year to the next come peering into their private backyards, where they have privacy, their children play. Maybe there could be 190 units instead of 200; maybe something could be done to prevent this.

Mike Sullivan, 47 Juniper Place, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, talks about the slope behind the houses, and asks how much of the slope is going to be taken out, and what is the distance from Building "O" to Lots 7, 8, and 9, referring to the plans on file. . Mr Busch replies that from Building "O" to the closet building is about 150 ft.

Mr Sullivan asks if they are going to tear the whole slope down with all the trees on there and replace with the evergreens. Mr. Busch says the short answer is "no." The area where the building is (pointing to Exhibit A-1), they are grading to within about 20 ft. of the back of the building. There will be a retaining wall and evergreen screen plantings between the building and the existing trees that will remain, and there will be a minimum of 50 ft. of existing trees that will remain there.

Jerry Weinstein, 43 Juniper Place, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, says all questions have been answered, but he would like to know when they will start building. Mr. Mumford replies that after municipal approval, a variety of permits need to be obtained, some of which have been obtained, such as Department of Environmental Protection transition area, Freehold Soil Conservation District. They also mentioned the DOT process is somewhat complicated, going in hurdles, but is well under way. As a guestimate, his objective would be to start construction by mid to late summer 2015.

Mr. Hirsch says with regard to questions and comments from the public, as well as those from the Board, the concerns and questions were very well put. He would like to suggest to Mr. Mumford to make it easier for residents, the buffer area between Building "O" and Juniper Place, would he be willing to increase the number of evergreens and plantings. Mr. Mumford says the quick answer would be "yes," but understand behind the buildings is a limited amount of clearing, and then there is a retaining wall and it is done so they do not have to take a lot of trees out on the down slope. What they need to do is to put some substantial evergreens at the top of the retaining wall, so that they are actually elevated by the wall and then the trees. That is the meaningful way of doing something that isn't just words here tonight but will make an improvement for anyone looking up slope. The answer is "yes," but he added the comments because it is easy to just say yes, but they will do something that is attractive and meaningful.

Mr. Gillen states if the application is reviewed, the applicant will have to submit revised plans to include all comments and conditions.

Addressing Mr. Shenton's question about a waiver of a landscape plan, Mr. Abbonizio says there was a requirement in the Redevelopment Plan that the shade trees actually had to have a distance of he believes 125 feet, and they only had it as a hundred. The scale was off. Trees will be added to the plan, however.

Mr. Hirsch moves to approve the application with all conditions and comments and requirements, seconded by Mr. Brady.

Mayor Tagliarini thanks Mr. Mumford for an outstanding presentation and asks him for his undivided attention to this project to deliver what he testified to tonight. He believes his trust favor is extremely high. This is a very important project to us, it is the entrance to Aberdeen, and we have thought about this hard and long, so he can only hope that the relationship will continue and they will have great dialogue as they go along with this.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Hirsch, Mr. Mirabal, Councilwoman Montone, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Vena, Mr. Shenton

No: None

Abstain: None

Meeting adjourned.

