

WHARTON PLANNING BOARD
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
July 14, 2020

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Wharton Planning Board was done virtually and was called to order with Chairman Ken Loury reading the Open Meeting Statement as required by law as well as a statement regarding allowing the remote meeting and the Judicial Proceeding Statement.

ROLL CALL was taken and the following members were present: Chairman Ken Loury, Councilwoman Wickenheisser, Mr. Roger Steele, Ms. Charlotte Kelly, Mr. Marc Harris, Mr. Patrick O'Brien. Mr. Peter Rathjens, Mr. Brian Bosworth, Mr. Christopher Fleischman and Ms. Barb Chiappa. Also present were Attorney Alan Zakin, Planner Jessica Caldwell, Engineer Christopher Borinski and Secretary Patricia Craven. Excused was Mayor Chegwiddden.

The pledge allegiance to the American Flag was next.

The reading of the bills was next. A Motion was made by Mr. Harris and Seconded by Ms. Kelly to approve the bills. YEA - 10 NAY - 0

Next, under Old Business was the minutes of the April 14, 2020 Planning Board meeting. Attorney Zakin had a question about the minutes. It was decided to table and approve the minutes at the next meeting.

Engineer Borinski updated the Board on Wharton Industrial. They are moving along with the East driveway; the paving is almost complete. There is still a utility pole that needs to be moved and they are waiting on JCP&L to move it. JCP&L will be raising 2 utility poles near the easement area by Building G. They are working now on Building G. All the trees have been planted and they will replace, in the fall, any trees that may die over the summer. Attorney Zakin stated that Attorney Bill Johnson is satisfied with the progress.

Next, on the agenda, is the application for Wharton CHA Urban Renewal, LLC. Chairman Loury explained the process of the meeting.

Attorney Zakin gave a brief history of the redevelopment. He stated that the Redevelopment area has been approved by the Mayor and Council. The application tonight is the Redevelopment Site Plan showing what is being proposed for the Redevelopment area. Because of the Covid we are required by State Law to have a zoom meeting. The public was properly noticed according to the COVID-19 requirements of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs Division of Local Government Services protocols and the documents were available on the Wharton Borough website and at the Borough hall.

Nicole Wickenheisser excused herself from the meeting because of a conflict of interest. Attorney Zakin stated that Mayor Chegwiddden is also excused because he is within 200 ft of the site.

Attorney Lisa Ann John-Basta of Chiesa Shahinian & Giantomasi addressed the Board. She represents Wharton CHA Urban Renewal LLC. The Borough Engineer is with CHA which is in

no way affiliated with Wharton CHA Urban Renewal. Engineer Borinski confirmed that there is no affiliation.

They are seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for several properties along N. Main and Second Streets, 8 – 14 N. Main St. and 15-29 Second Street. Today there are 6 separate developed lots which they plan on merging into one lot for redevelopment. This applicant was the designated redeveloper of this property by the Council in February 2020. Their concept plan was approved by the Council which is the basis for the site plan tonight. They are proposing mixed use along Main Street with residential on the 1st thru 4th floors and along Second Street 2 story townhomes. They are conforming with the redevelopment plan except for variances for signage. They are also asking for 2 design waiver.

The first witness, Civil Engineer and Planner Robert Freud was sworn in and qualified. He is with Dynamic Engineering.

Attorney Zakin stated that there will be no exhibits and that all the exhibits were available on the town website. It subsequently came to the Board's attention that some of the documents previously submitted and uploaded on the town website were in black and white and the Exhibits displayed at the online hearing were color, thereby necessitating Exhibits to be displayed as detailed below.

Mr. Freud shared on his screen: Exhibit A-1 dated 7-14-20 -Aerial Exhibit, dated June 30, 2020– this exhibit was available on the town website. Mr. Freud explained the exhibit to the Board. It identifies the property in the center of the exhibit. It is on the East side of Main St. North is to the right side of the page. It is Block 1317, lots 1-3, 9,10,12 and is 1.711 acres.

It is located in the Main Street Redevelopment area. He explained the area surrounding the property as far as residential and commercial properties. The property fronts on N. Main Street, East Central Ave and Second Street. Main Street is a County road with 2-way traffic and parking on both sides. There is a bus stop in front of the property on Main Street, north of E. Central Ave. On the property itself there are several existing structures and 2 parking lots. The property is generally flat. Right now, there are multiple access points to the property, which will be removed. They will be merging 6 lots into one lot for this redevelopment.

A-2, 7-14-20 Site Plan Rendering Exhibit dated June 30, 2020 was shown on his screen.

This is a colorized version of the site plan with landscaping. In 2018 these areas were declared an area of redevelopment by the Town Council who adopted a Main Street Redevelopment Plan. The plan was amended in March of 2020. The plans presented here tonight are based upon the guidance provided by the Redevelopment Plan. The plan envisions mixed use along Main Street and Townhomes along Second Street. They would demolish the existing structures on site and merge the lots to a single lot. Mr. Freud represented that they are proposing 2 new structures, one along Main Street which will be a 4-story mixed use building with a footprint of 16,358 sq. ft. comprise of 51 residential units, 20- 1 bedroom, 29 – 2 bedroom and 2 – 3-bedroom units. There will be 7,740 sq. ft of commercial space on the first floor divided into 2 primary spaces. There will be a small patio area at the rear of the building. The setbacks are 2 ½ ft to Main Street and is consistent with the zoning plan and meeting the goal of the redevelopment plan by keeping the parking away from Main Street and the building fronting on Main St. The clock and the gazebo on the property will be given back to the town DPW for use in the Borough. Attorney Lisa John-Basta stated that the number of residential units in this building will be 50 not 51, consequently

there will be only 1, not 2 – 3 bedroom units. There was a discrepancy between the site plan and the architectural plans and the architectural plans are correct with 50. Mr. Freud agreed. The second structure which fronts on Second Street is a 2-story town home style building containing 16 units and is 6,713 sq. ft. It is approximately 3.7ft from the right of way. It will have 8 – 1-bedroom units and 8 – 2-bedroom units.

The buildings were moved closer to the street to make room for parking behind both buildings. They will have 2 access driveways into the property, one from Main Street and one from 2nd Street. He pointed out the trash and recycling enclosure which will be emptied once a day and also the 12 x 35 loading area for the residents and businesses. There is adequate circulation for Fire vehicles and they expect no issues. They are awaiting comments from the Fire Official. Snow removal for small amounts of snow can be kept on site but for larger amounts of snow it will be removed from the site.

They have 83 total parking spaces for both residents and retail spaces, of which 22 are for compact vehicles and explained how they came up with these calculations. They have 4 handicapped accessible spaces. The townhome building has 16 apartment type units. The parking ratio for this building is 1.8 spaces for a 1 bedroom and 2.8 for 2-bedroom units. If they used the calculation for redevelopment the ratio would be 1 space for a 1 bedroom and 2 spaces for a 2 bedroom which would calculate to 72 spaces on site. They are proposing 83 total spaces which gives 11 additional parking spaces. The access points and driveway widths are 24 ft wide with 2-way movement throughout the site. The access points have been reduced by removing the existing driveways on both Main and 2nd Street. They will have 2 access points, one on Main St. and one on Second St.

They are requesting a waiver for driveway separation onto the property where the driveway is located approximately 10 to 12 feet off of the North property line on Second Street. They are significantly reducing the number of turning movements in and out of the site by eliminated the number of driveways and also removing a number of structures that were close to these driveways, therefore improving site lines and separation of turning movements throughout the site. Approving this waiver would not be impactful on the neighboring properties. This would create a better traffic condition.

They are requesting another waiver for the sidewalk on the west side of the building facing Second St. Between the parking and the building they have a 5 ft. sidewalk and a 3 ft landscaped island. Per the ordinance they have to have curb stops or allow for a 2 ½ ft overhang on a 4 ft sidewalk which would make it a 6 ½ ft. sidewalk. They are deficient 18 inches. They would prefer to not put in curb stops which tend to be a trip hazard and maintenance hazard during snow plowing. The alternate plan would be to shorten the 3 ft landscape island which they would rather not do. They feel the 5 ft sidewalk and 3 ft landscaping is the right balance.

Mr. Freud stated that they are proposing an 8ft. solid vinyl fence around the perimeter of the property on the north, south and south west sides. He pointed out the trees, evergreen trees and shrubs throughout the site. They are proposing 48 trees, 38 evergreens, 88 shrubs, ground covering and perennials. It is all in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

They will have free standing, 20 ft high LED lights in the parking lot which will be supplemented by lights on the building facing 2nd St. They will have lights over each entrance as well as the entrances facing the parking lot of the Main Street building. This would provide a minimum of a ½ ft candle throughout the parking lot. The ordinance calls for no more than .3 ft candles. The plans they submitted deviate slightly from this but they did not model the fencing when they did this design and can submit an amended lighting plan that model the fencing to provide a more accurate depiction of the light levels. They are requesting a waiver from the light standards which request an average of a ½ ft candle throughout the site. According to Mr. Freud, what they are requesting is not a significant amount of light, it is the amount of light from a full moon, but it is enough to provide safe pedestrian traffic throughout the parking lot. They are requesting the deviation so that they can provide the ½ ft candle minimal throughout the parking lot. The lighting will be on from dusk till dawn. Along Main St. there are now 2 street lights and several street trees. They will add 1 more light at the center point of the building. In one of the review letters it was asked that they add more street trees. The ones there now seem to be young and in good health. He will defer to the Board and the Board professionals if more trees are necessary and if so, they would comply.

This site is considered a major development therefore they are required to meet 3 criteria for stormwater management; water quality, water quantity and ground water recharge. Because this is a redevelopment plan in a planning area of an existing site development, they are not required to meet recharge. They have to review for storm water quality and quantity, which means reducing the total suspended solids throughout the stormwater runoff and reducing the peak flows to fractions or percentages of what exists today. They are proposing an underground stormwater system underneath the parking lot. This will also provide the water quality needed to satisfy all the requirements. They have reviewed the comments from the Borough Engineer and find them to be technical and they will be able to address any comments.

They can comply with all of the comments and recommendations set forth in the July 8, 2020 letter from the Borough Engineer aside from what was previously discussed for the waiver for the sidewalks. Mr. Freud will work with our Engineer on those issues.

They have no issues with the letter from J Caldwell dated July 2, 2020.

Questions from the Board followed:

Ken Loury – What is the side yard setback on the south east side of the Second St. Building? What is the distance between their building and the neighbor's home? Any curb stops in the back of the Main Street building.

Mr. Freud - The setback is little over 10 feet – doesn't know how close the home is but their driveway is on the property line. There are no curb stops on the site at all.

Engineer Borinski added that he agreed that curb stops are a tripping hazard – the landscaping along the sidewalk is better than the curbing – Planner Caldwell agreed.

Ken Loury- was happy with the 11 extra parking spaces. He asked about the parking and enforcement.

Mr. Freud – no assigned spaces, 60% are available for public parking during day business hours. Lisa John-Basta –the hours were not defined in the redevelopment plan; they will have signage for the day use of parking. They can coordinate that with our professionals. Enforcement – they

will be giving every tenant 1 parking space and it will be in their lease. There should be some open spaces. Enforcement might be an issue but the management can let the tenants know that they are not guaranteed a parking spot during the day. She will agree that as a condition of approval the Board Planner and Engineer would approve the parking hours and terms of residential and tenant parking.

Mr. Freud – pointed out, in the front of the building, the no parking area because of the bus stop.

Ken Loury – add a condition that snow removal for a major snow storm be moved off site.

Ken Loury – how are they going to enforce deliveries and moving trucks parking in front of the building. Is there a Super on the site?

Lisa John-Basta – They will schedule all move ins as well as coordinate deliveries. All loading is on site and not along Main St. The super is not living on site but will be there during the day and on call 24 hours a day.

Attorney Zakin – asked about the Bulk Variances and Waivers being on the plans

Mr. Freud - they are both listed on the plan – the waiver for the sidewalk might not be and if not it will be added to the plan

Roger Steele – Is the retail access only from Main Street. Roger had a safety concerned with the sidewalk on the north side of the Main Street building. The Pedestrians walking from the rear parking lot would have to cross the driveway twice to get to the retail stores in the front of the building. There is also a crosswalk in the middle of that driveway. What do they anticipate for street parking? Would they allow Title 39.

Lisa John-Basta – they would agree to Title 39

Mr. Freud – access to the stores would be from Main Street. There is parking on Main St and along Second Street. Because of the reduction of driveways there will be more parking spaces along those streets. He suggested that they can add additional striping for the crosswalk in the north driveway. The striping shown on that driveway now, is to show there is an emergency egress door on the end of the building at that location.

Planner Caldwell suggested signage directing pedestrian where to walk and a striped area for pedestrian.

Peter Rathjens – asked for clarification of the 60% set aside for municipal parking. He feels it should be 7 days a week.

Planner Caldwell stated that it was intended to be 7 days a week.

Lisa John-Basta – they will comply with the 7 days a week. They also agree to any striping on the plans and will work with our professionals on that to have safe pedestrian flow.

Engineer Borinski in the review letter from the Morris County Planning Board there was a comment about the right of way. Have they looked into that? Will it affect the site plan?

Mr. Freud - they have been in contact with the MCPB and road widening is not anticipated here, so there will not be a request for right of way. They are agreeable to a condition of approval from the MCPB

The meeting was now open to the public.

Ernie and Amy Palazzolo, 10 High St. – Will there be winter parking in this lot when street parking is not allowed because of snow covered streets.

Lisa John-Basta – it will not be available now – they will need the spaces for their tenants.

Dharmesh 22 N. Main St., Wharton Pharmacy owners – his property is next door to this site. They were concerned with any damage to her property during construction. They would like some type of agreement with the attorney.

Lisa John-Basta – they will comply with the requirements of demolition in accordance with the construction code and UCC regulations.

Carlos Rivera – is the parking in the rear for the retail businesses

Mr. Freud – Yes – for retail and residential

Melissa Martinez, Church Street – what is the plan for public parking during snow fall.

Lisa John – Basta – already answered that question – not available for public winter parking

Cindy Voorhees – 26 Second St.- going from 6 family to 16 family on Second St., concerned about traffic – no traffic study done for 2nd St.

Keith Rolandelli had questions for the traffic engineer.

Lisa John-Basta – defer both questions to traffic engineer

Dave Marx, 9 Garden Ave. – handicapped parking only for the large building.

Mr. Freud – 4 spaces for the whole site which they located closer to the retail and the public.

Mr. Freud addressed a question about little sunlight for the trees in the front of the building.

They will have south and west exposure to the sun.

James Christian – How many children will enter the school system from this development. How with this impact our emergency services?

Lisa John-Basta – for 1-bedroom units you normally find small amount of school children. This redevelopment was adopted by the Council and when they permitted the uses allowed on this site it is assumed that they took this into consideration.

Dave Marx – will residents be allowed or prohibited parking on Second St. Is there a visitor section of the parking area?

Lisa John-Basta – that is up to the Borough. The parking on the site is 1st come, 1st serve

Mr. Freud – there are no designated parking spaces.

Chairman Loury would like that to be a condition of approval.

Michael Salmon – asked about the impact to the public schools.

James Christian, 30 Hance St.- increase or decrease in student population

Lisa John-Basta – both already answered.

Dave Marx – does anyone else have a problem with a 4 story building here.

Marco Gonzalez – excellent question Mr. Steele.

James Christian – asked about increase in tax revenues compared to current ratables

Lisa John-Basta – she has no answer for that question

Dave Marx – asked about the emergency door opening into active driveway. Is there designated handicap parking.

Lisa John-Basta – architect will answer the question about the emergency door.

Mr. Freud – no designated handicapped spaces.

Dharmesh 22 N. Main St. – concerned about property damage

Lisa John-Basta - same question that they called in.

Marco Gonzalez – question about traffic study

Lisa John-Basta – referred to the traffic engineer

Mrs. C, Baker Ave. - is there any questions or concerns from the Fire Dept.

Lisa John-Basta - the fire dept should have received copies of this plan.

Police Chief Young stated that the cross walk by the egress door gives a false impression of safety coming into a door that you can't access. Would like them to look at putting a crosswalk somewhere else. He would also like to request a Title 39. At the exits onto Main St. and Second Streets he would like to look at the site distance at both of those locations and also looking at some striping around those areas to make for easy egress off of the property. Is there a fire hydrant on the property? He will work with them on signage.

Mr. Freud did not think there would be a fire hydrant on site, he thinks the building will be equipped for fire dept connections. They will work with the Fire Dept. on that to provide what is appropriate.

Lisa John-Basta – she is agreeable with approval from both the Fire Dept and Police Dept on stripping and signage on the property to ensure the safety of the public.

Rita Parikh- this was forwarded by email to Attorney Zakin who forwarded it to Ms. John-Basta, Jon Rheinhardt and Chairman Loury. Ms. John-Basta went over the questions.

Property and personal damage- this question was answered already they will comply with UCC and requirements for demolition.

Interference with her business – a statement from Ms. Parikh – Mr. Freud – no, all construction would occur on site. Attorney Zakin stated that the construction officials and professionals are very good about making sure that the work is being done properly.

New construction will block air and light to the south side of her property and will devalue her property value – a statement from Ms. Parikh

Noise and dust control – they will comply with all requirements.

Hours of operation – don't know at this time but they will comply with Borough code.

Water and sewer infrastructure – already addressed – Mr. Freud stated that they have been in contact with the professionals. Engineer Borinski stated that there are water and sewer mains in both Main St. and Second Street that have adequate capacity for this development. They will work with the developer to get the connections in.

Attorney Zakin stated that the Parikh's were concerned about a water line and they did not want any flooding. on their property. Mr. Freud stated that all the disconnects and connections would be done under the oversight of the water company and licensed contractors.

Are they shutting off electric, gas and water during construction? Mr. Freud stated no.

DMV regulations needs to apply on our parking lot – not sure if they meant Title 39 on the applicant's property

Precautions taken during construction - yes

EPA report – they would have to comply

Sound proof walls for a restaurant/bar and proper exhaust systems – yes, proper exhaust. Not sure if the soundproof walls will be needed – they will comply if needed.

24 ft. from curb line - the drive aisle is 24ft and they are compliant with that

To many blade signs – architect will address this

Boundary issue by Ivan's garage – they are constructing within the boundaries of the site.

Mr. Freud stated that they had done a full survey of the property.

Cindy Voorhees – where is the off-site affordable housing going to be built.

Lisa John-Basta – some will be on site, off site will be identified and constructed prior to a c/o for this project. No answer to where it will be. It can be a group home.

Some Board discussion followed about standards of the off-site affordable housing.

Lisa John-Basta stated that it is this applicant's intent that the off-site housing will be new construction. If it is more than a 2 family they would have to come before the Board.

Planner Caldwell stated that a group home of any size would not come before the Board for site plan. Even though they are permitted they function as a single-family home. She doesn't think the Board needs to know where the group home would go because they are allowed anywhere in the Borough. If it's not a group home and more than a 2 family then it will have to come before the Board. They can make it a condition that the Board Professionals review the materials and make sure it is something that fits well in the neighborhood.

Lisa John-Basta is fine with making that a condition and until that is satisfied, they will not get a CO for this project.

Cindy Voorhees – would developer consider buying houses on the opposite side of Second St. to comply with requirements

Lisa John- Basta – if she is talking about affordable housing that is not part of this application but would entertain a discussion if need be.

Rita Parikh – this building will decrease the value of her property

Lisa John-Basta – they are not real estate appraisers so they cannot answer that question.

David Marx – any do diligence related to environmental investigations (preliminary assessments) initiated or completed?

Lisa John-Basta – she would assume that they were and they would have to comply with environmental protection and remediation requirements. It is not part of their application.

Marc Harris – their environmental impact report does address this. If they do disturb the ground then a Phase 1 may be necessary.

Mr. Freud – he did do the environmental impact report which addressed more the ecological environmental issues which is what they were requested to review as part of the Planning Board application process. The question is about Phase I environmental questions and that he is not privy to whether that was done. It is not uncommon to have that done during demolition.

Anything expose would be handles in the proper fashion.

Question – the destiny of the clock and the gazebo

Mr. Freud – they will be turned over to the DPW

Question – how many units will be set aside for low income

Lisa John-Basta – the architect will address that.

Chairman Loury asked, based on the 66 units, how many school age children will there be.

Planner Caldwell stated that there is not likely to be a lot of school children, especially for apartments. For 1- and 2-bedroom town houses they tend to not have a lot of school children.

Chairman Loury stated that he would agree with that, of the 250 units in Avalon Bay there are only 5 children who attend the Wharton Schools.

Rita Parikh – concerned about property damage.

Chairman Loury – they have addressed this concern.

Lisa John-Basta – already addressed and answered – they will comply with the demolition requirements as far as DCC and local code. She is apposed to having this as a condition.

Marc Harris suggested pre and post construction pictures.

Attorney Zakin – stated that the conditions would be that the applicant will comply with the demolitions and insurance requirements.

Lisa John-Bast would agree with that and a condition that the applicant will take current photo's and share them with the property owner. They would also need permission from the adjacent property owner to go on their property to take pictures.

The meeting was closed to the public.

Corey Chase, Traffic Engineer from Dynamic Traffic was sworn in and qualified.

He went over his 11/20/2019 Traffic Report that he prepared. There are 2 access driveways to the property, one on N. Main St and one on Second St. They reduced the curb cuts from 6 to 2. Because of the curb cuts, they may be able to pick up 1 to 2 parallel parking spots along the frontage on Main St. They did a traffic impact analysis which does a pre and post development analysis on the adjacent roadway network to determine if there are any traffic impacts from this development. He went over Table III on page 5 which summarizes the projected traffic volumes for the residential and retail portions of the development. It shows a combined total of the impact that would be generated by this development. They did traffic counts at the corner of N. Main and Central Ave. during the weekday am and pm peak hours as well as Saturday midday peak hours.

Conservatively they oriented all the traffic out of the Main Street driveway and the intersection of Main and Central and found there are no impacts at that intersection then the impacts at Second and Central would have a lower volume of traffic. That is why they did not do a traffic study on the Second Street access. The people utilizing Second Street is going to be very limited. Conservatively they assume that most of the traffic will be utilizing the Main Street access.

Table 4 Summarizes that pre and post development analysis. There are no degradations in levels of service because of the increase in traffic. The adjacent intersection will continue to operate in the same manner as it does today. It will continue to operate at a Level of Service C or better during peak hours.

They do meet the Redevelopment requirement as far as parking. They are proposing 88 spaces. 50 spaces during business hours are for the public. They will work with the Board professionals on adequate signage.

Planner Caldwell spoke about a C level of service. It is about traffic delay; how long do you have to wait. It is not uncommon on Main Street that you would have a little more delay compared to Second Street. Canal House, which is set back off of Main Street is A & B. She is not surprised or concerned with a C level. People leave at different times of the day.

Mr. Chase stated that C is more than acceptable; it is less than 30 seconds of delay. The pre and post showed no detriment. You don't see an influx because people will leave and return at different times. With more people working from home you may see a reduction in traffic. Shared parking for residential and retail uses are very complimentary and provides adequate parking. There should be no significant increase in traffic with no more than 100 new trips during any of the peak hours.

Peter Rathjens questioned the February 5th information. He stated that the number is very low and that there are usually kids walking to school. What was the weather like that day?

Mr. Chase stated that they do not do counts on rainy or snowy days, it may have just been a cold day.

Engineer Borinski stated that the gross floor area in the retail increased from what was on the site plan that was submitted, by almost 1000 sq. ft., does that have any impact on Table 3.

Mr. Chase stated that it is based on the square footage of the retail so it would change it by not significantly. The differential would be 7 trips in the peak hour which would still be under 100 new trips.

The meeting was now open to the public.

Anonymous - Why wasn't a study done on the Second Street access? Also, there is a choke hold on Main Street south of Central – this should be included in the study.

Mr. Chase stated that since the study done on the Main Street access it was assumed that given the lower volume on Second St. it would operate at a better level of service than the Main Street Access. The volume south of Central Ave. is 31 trips or 1 vehicle every minute which would have no impact on traffic in that area.

Ms. John-Basta answered an anonymous question about taxes going up and when will the project start. Also, another about road closures and safety measures for children walking to school Ms. John Basta cannot speak for the taxes but stated that it would be about 18-24 months. Mr. Chase stated that there will be no road closures and they will have a pre-construction meeting with the Borough to make sure there are adequate safety conditions during construction.

The meeting was now closed to the public.

Christine D. Bartolo, Project Architect from Donnelly Architecture, LLC., 79 Mt. Rascal Rd., Hackettstown, N.J. was sworn in and qualified. She described the floor plan of the mixed-use building. It is 16,358 sq. ft. The first floor is 7740 sq. ft. of retail. There are 50 residential units, 20 – 1 bedroom, 29 – 2 bedroom and 1 – 3-bedroom unit. Tenant #1 has 3,125 sq. ft. and could potentially have 2 tenants in it. They are trying to target 1 tenant. Tenant #2 has 4,615 sq. ft. and is anticipated to be a restaurant. In the middle is for amenities for the residential component and can be accessed by the Main Street side and the parking lot side. The elevator is located there as well. The upper floors consist of 1 and 2 bedrooms with some units having balconies. She described the Main Street Elevation with a combination of brick veneer, gray horizontal siding and stucco like finish. Being an old mill town, they tried to mimic some of the articulation of some of the homes, businesses and buildings in the area as well as the color of 195 N. Main St. There is a continuous flat roof with some angulation to break up the façade which was part of the redevelopment plan.

Ms. Bartolo went over the signage and sign plan. Sign #1 is the main project sign located at the corners of the building and the main amenity entrance. Sign #2 is the tenant signs, which might vary depending on the number of tenants. The blade signs are appropriate given the fact that the building is close to the street. Sign #3 are the tenant signs located over the tenant entrances. Sign #4 ABC are smaller signs over the amenities space. Sign #5 is at the corner for an anchor tenant. Sign #6 is on the north façade facing the pharmacy for traffic traveling south on N. Main St. There is the 2 story townhome units on Second Street which is 6713 sq. ft. and has 8 one bedroom units and 8 two bedroom units. They tried to mimic some of the articulation of the homes on Second Street. They picked up on the gables, covered entries and double hung window that are already on that street. This will also have a brick veneer, horizontal siding and stucco look. She showed the view from the parking lot of the building. They simplified it as far as

materials and roof line but did project the windows out a little bit more. They feel that this project will enhance and invigorate this corner.

Secretary Craven stated that the plans that Ms. Bartolo presented, pages A-2, A-3 and A-5 were in color and what the Board received were not color versions. Should they be marked into evidence? Chairman Loury stated that they should be marked A -3 - 7-14-20 – colorized versions of pages A-2, A-3 and A-5. Ms. Bartolo will resubmit these and send copies.

Chairman Loury - are there going to be 8 blade signs on Main Street as shown on the front elevation plan.

Ms. Bartolo stated that the ones he is referring to are the tenant signs. This was the worst-case scenario is contingent on how many tenants there are. Ms. Caldwell said that one blade sign or wall sign is permitted per tenant. After some discussion they were agreeable to 1 blade sign per tenant. Mr. Harris stated that there are large and small blades signs on the façade, there are more than 8 blade signs. Mr. Rathjens stated that they are asking for 3 wall signs and 10 blade signs on their application which is a lot.

Ms. Bartolo stated that the project signs are located to articulate the ends of the building and the entrance to the amenities space. The building is designed with symmetry in mind. Removing some might make it look awkward. With this in mind they would propose to keep 2 in the center and remove 1 from each end. The building is large in size and smaller signs won't pop out.

Chairman Loury stated that it is a lot of blade signs and he doesn't feel they need that many. Some discussion followed.

Ms. John-Basta stated that after listening to the Board's concerns they could have as allowed 1 tenant sign on the façade, 1 sign on each end of the building facing Central and on the North side, on the front façade elevation remove some of the 10 Main project identification signs, maybe 1 or 2 and leave the tenant blade signs there, if the Board is amenable to this. The applicant is agreeable to removing 2 of the large Main Street blade signs.

Ms. Bartolo stated that these size signs are appropriate for the large building. After another discussion about the number of blade signs it was decided the they would reduce the Large blade project identification signs (10 N. Main St.) from 8 to 5 and Small blade tenant signs from 10 to 6. They want to keep it symmetrical on either side of the archway.

Chairman Loury asked why they need 6 blade signs for 2 tenants plus the 2 wall signs. The restaurant would have 5 signs. That would be 8 signs for 2 tenants.

Ms. Bartolo stated that the restaurant fronts on Main Street and Central Ave.

Chairman Loury stated it still would be 12 signs on the building.

Planner Caldwell asked for revised drawing plan because it does seem like a lot of signage.

Mr. Rathjens feels the lower blade signs will be an attractive nuisance for kids running by and does not flow with the rest of Main Street. He thought this was a general plan for the redevelopment of all of Main Street. He does not like the small blade signs that low.

Ms. John-Basta thought the Board was ok with the reduction of the large blade signs from 8 to 5 and asked to withdraw the small tenant blade signs.

Ms. Bartolo stated that they feel strongly that it is an appropriate solution because from Main St. you do not see the sign that is parallel with the façade. It's much more prominent to see a sign that is perpendicular with the façade. Chairman Loury get that.

Mr. Harris was concerned with ice build up on the signs. Ms. Bartolo was not sure if ice would build up on these signs. They could also make them out of something more solid than the banner material. Chairman Loury stated that we can leave that up to our professionals.

Attorney Zakin state it 10:33, Ms. John-Basta would like to continue, Chairman Loury stated that there would be a hard stop at 11:00.

Chairman Loury asked about the roof and all the mechanicals. Ms. Bartolo stated that there are no roof top units. The units will be in the front façade, which she pointed out on the plans. Some elevator equipment will be on the roof but will not be visible.

Chairman Loury asked about the balconies and how they will enforce what is on or hanging from the balconies.

Owners Glen Domenick and William Colgan were sworn in at this time. Mr. Domenick stated that they will provide provisions in the leases. They will have their maintenance address how they keep their individual areas on the balconies. That will be an ongoing activity of the operations team.

There will be a number that residents off and on site can call.

Chairman Loury asked about the stairs going into tenant #1 and #2. Ms. Bartolo stated that there would be hardware to prevent tenant going into the businesses.

Chairman Loury stated that he likes the front of the Second Street building but why is the back facing the parking lot so sterile and looks like a row house. Ms. Bartolo stated that all of the windows pop out as well as the overhang over the doors.

Chief David Young asked if the electric is underground and if there is any fire suppression inside the apartments and retail spaces. Ms. Bartolo stated the electric is underground and the fire suppression has to be compliant with NFPA.

Ms. Bartolo explained the door on the north side of the building as an emergency exit from the stairwell. The door is recessed and the door doesn't open into the driveway. The exits to the building are in the middle where the elevator is located and the south side stairs. The north side stairs are for emergency exit only.

Marco Gonzalez – will there be lights on Main Street and will they impact the units above the retail. Ms. Bartolo stated that the lights along Main Street are decorative lighting which gives off very little light. The civil engineer confirmed that.

Rita Parikh asked how many elevators are in the building and will the blade signs block her Wharton Pharmacy sign. Ms. John-Basta stated that there are 2 elevators. Ms. Bartolo stated it depends on where you are standing it would have to be in a very specific location for her signage to be blocked.

Chairman Loury answered a question - there are 2 retail units. Also, applicant represented that construction would start as soon as appropriate if this application is approved.

Ms. Bartolo explained how you enter the Main Street building. There are double doors that lead out to the parking lot. Deliveries such as Fed Ex, would be like a normal home delivery. There is a loading zone on site for box truck deliveries. There is also an onsite loading zone for the retail businesses. Tenant #2 has an entrance in the rear. Tenant #1 has no back-door entrance – their deliveries would have to be brought around to their front door. This was a concern that deliveries and pedestrians would have to cross over the north driveway twice to get to the Tenant #1 space or they would park on Main Street to make deliveries to Tenant #1.

Secretary Craven asked if there were 2 tenants in the Tenant #1 space and they wanted another sign wouldn't they have to come back before the Board for a variance. Ms. John-Basta stated that they would have to come back before the Board. Chairman Loury asked if it was their long term goal, with the 2 blade signs for each tenant, to have 4 tenants? Ms. John-Basta stated that their goal is to have a restaurant tenant.

Ms. Bartolo stated that the snow load is calculated into the structural engineering of the project and is part of the code requirements and will be designed according to the area that Wharton falls under.

Anonymous asked if they think 50 additional units will significantly impact traffic in the area. How will it affect the parking if we are still in the Covid crisis?

Ms. John-Basta stated that this was thought about when the Council was zoning this property. Their traffic engineer did address this and did not feel there would be a significant impact to traffic in the area. They do not build for a crisis; you have to build for the norm. They are complying with the redevelopment parking.

Ms. John-Basta asked if they could have a special meeting. Attorney Zakin asked that all of these professionals be at the next meeting. Ms. John-Basta agreed.

A Motion was made by Roger Steele and Seconded by Marc Harris to carry this to a special meeting with notice or the regularly scheduled meeting. YEA – 9 NAY – 0

A Motion was made by Marc Harris and Seconded by Barb Chiappa to adjourn.
YEA – 9 NAY – 0

Meeting adjourned 11:02 pm