

WHARTON PLANNING BOARD  
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING  
May 11, 2021

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Wharton Planning Board was held 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, Mr. Roger Steele, Mr. Marc Harris, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Peter Rathjens, Mr. Brian Bosworth, Mr. Christopher Fleischman and Ms. Chiappa. Also, present were Attorney Alan Zakin, Planner Jessica Caldwell, Engineer Christopher Borinski and Secretary Patricia Craven. Excused were Mayor Chegwiddden and Councilwoman Wickenheiser. Ms. Charlotte Kelly arrived after roll call.

The Pledge of Allegiance was next.

The reading of the bills was next. A Motion was made by Barb Chiappa and Seconded by Marc Harris to approve the bills as read.

YEA – 8    NAY – 0

The Minutes of the March 9, 2021 Regular Scheduled Planning Board Meeting was next. A Motion was made by Roger Steele and Seconded by Christopher Fleischman to approve the Minutes.

YEA -8    NAY- 0

Board member Charlotte Kelly arrived on the zoom call.

Next, under Old Business was the approval of the Resolution for Klein Outdoor Advertising After some changes and corrections were made by the applicants Attorney Peter Wolfson and various Board member, a motion was made by Barb Chiappa and Seconded by Christopher Fleischman to approve the resolution as corrected. YEA – 7    NAY – 2 (Rathjens & Bosworth)

The Application for Wharton Woods LLC was next. John Wyciskala, Attorney for the applicant, addressed the Board. Wharton Woods is the owner of the irregularly shaped, 9 ½ acre subject property located on Old Irondale Rd., Block 1603, Lot 14. It has a north and south parcel located in the AH2 multi family, residential zone. This parcel was previously approved for a 67-unit inclusionary townhouse development back in 2014. They received approvals from all the outside agencies such as M.C. Planning Board, M.C. Soil, DEP and other municipal land use agencies. In 2015-2016 they started work on the northern phase 1 parcel and southern phase 2 parcel which included mine remediation. All the retaining walls were installed as well as the storm water management system, water mains and most of the sanitary sewer system. At that time a 3<sup>rd</sup> party was going to purchase this development but it fell through due to economic times and the work did not commence.

The owner has now entered into a contract with K. Hovnanian Builders to purchase this property subject to the approval of this application. They intend to construct a community known as Aspire at Morris Woods. The agreement is that they construct within the same footprint that was previously approved. They are proposing a 90 units multi-family development. They will maintain the same entrances, driveway cuts and widths, stormwater management system, water

system and sanitary sewers system. There may be some modifications because of the type and number of units. They are seeking preliminary and final site plan approval as well as subdivision approval. They are seeking a density variance for 90 units, 9.7 units/acre density rather than the 8 units proposed. They are also seeking a height variance for several of the interior units due to topographic conditions. This is also a subdivision application; each townhome will be on their own individual lot which creates a number of bulk variances for side yard and front yard.

One of the changes which has to do with affordable housing is that they are proposing off site affordable housing rather than the on-site that had been part of the previous approval. The off-site location is at 57 S. Main St. in Wharton. They will be donating or selling for dollar or two the property to Pillar Care Continuum which is the new name for Cerebral Palsy of N.J. Pillar Care will be constructing a housing project for special needs adults on this site which will include a mix of a group home type project and a number of additional units. The Borough will get 24 affordable housing credits.

The following witnesses were sworn in by Attorney Alan Zakin.

John Hansen – original Engineer on the project

Marvin Blethen – original Mining Engineer on the project and also he designed the storm water management system

Rich Culp – Architect

Corey Chase – Traffic Engineer

John McDonough

Chairman Loury explained to the public the process of this meeting. Attorney Zakin stated that for questions during the hearing the public does not have to be on video but at the end if any of the public is going to give testimony they have to be on video.

Engineer John Hansen was qualified as an expert in Civil Engineering. He prepared the plans for this project. Mr. Hansen started with Sheet 3 of the site plans – existing conditions dated 3/1/21. He described the property and the surrounding area to the Board. The property is 9.3 acres and consists of a north and south joined by a strip of land in between.

Marked into evidence were – all dated 10-26-15

A-1 – 5/11/21 - Sheet 3 of 37 dated overall site plan,

A-2, 5/11/21 Sheet 4 of 37 North Phase 1

A-3, 5/11/21 Sheet 5 of 37 South Phase 2

They show the original 67 units, 31 on the north side, 36 on the south side, 52 market value and 15 affordable units. The market value units were much bigger than what they are proposing which is the reason they are proposing 90 units. The footprints ranged from 832 sq. ft to 1163 sq. ft. Some of the walls have been installed along with the stormwater management system, sanitary sewer main and water meter pits.

Marked into evidence as

A-4- 5/11/21 – Colorized version of the Site Plan- dated 4-29-21- this shows the access and circulation is the same as the old site plan. He pointed out the proposed units, pavement and walls. The infrastructure is the same as the old site plan. Their goal is to break up the buildings and add some open space, light and air to the project.

A-5 – 5/11/21 – Colorized version of the North Phase 1 dated 4-29-21 – this shows the 36 units on the north side and also shows the landscaping. They are proposing 2 types of units, 25 are the

Paton units, which will be 24' x 40', 800 sq. ft and 9 will be the Garfield units, 20' x 34', 680 sq. ft. All of the units are 3 bedrooms. Most of them will be on grade units except for the units on the east side whose foundations will be visible from the rear of these units. They are utilizing the same roadway configuration and the same access points. They will be enhancing the sidewalks on both sides of the entrance on the North side. Because they were able to break up some of the buildings you will see more grass and trees and less building. They will be adding 5 more retaining walls which he pointed out on the site. 2 of the walls will need a design waiver because the height is 10 feet. The walls will be modular block type walls.

He pointed out the 2-solid waste/recycling areas which will be 18' x 18' made of split face block construction with wooden gates and side access. The sizing is sufficient for the size of the new development.

The parking complies with the parking regulations. Each unit will have a 1 car garage with a 1 car parking spot in front of the garage. There will also be on grade parking and 2 handicap stalls on each site for overflow and guest parking.

There is a minor reduction in building and impervious coverage as well as a minor increase in units from 67 to 90 units. Mr. Harris stated that a 34% increase is not minor. Mr. Steele agreed. Attorney Wyciskala and Mr. Hansen both stated they understood.

Mr. Hansen stated that they will be adding a tasteful monument sign at the entrance to Phase 1. It will be made of composite wood materials with stainless metal letters. The sign area is 50 sq. ft. and does not include the 2 ft. concrete monument with cultured stone, that it will sit on. It will have ground mounted lighting.

Marked into evidence was:

A-6 – 5/11/21 – Colorized version of the South Phase 2 dated 4-29-21 – this shows the 54 units on the south side, Phase 2 of the property. 29 units will be Peyton style and 25 will be the Garfield style. They will appear from the street as 3 story units, 29 of the units are garage under type units which means that the back of the unit, the one story is actually built into the hill. In the previous approval the majority of the units were all garage under. Because these units are smaller, they were able to have less garage under units and more on grade type units where you can walk out the back on the same elevation as essentially the garage. They are keeping the same access off of Bartek Lane. They are also keeping and adding some retaining walls which he pointed out on the plans. They comply with the RSIS for parking. Each unit has a one car garage, one car in front of them and then you have the space out in front. The roadways are 22 feet wide, curbed and consistent with RSIS requirements and actually exceed RSIS by 2 ft. For both the north and south sides they took into account the circulation for emergency vehicles and the current Borough fire truck, that was referenced in the Fire Dept. letter.

Mr. Hansen spoke about the landscaping. They buffered and screened where necessary and sprinkled some shade trees along the frontage consistent with the last design.

Mr. Hansen explained that the foundation plan is a design consistent with K. Hovnanian standards. Each unit is designed so that they can either have a deck, and optional deck or an optional patio. The Garfield decks are 10 x 15.33 and the Peyton decks are 10 x 16. The patios are 10 x 12. The buildings have been broken up to give a more light, air and open space between

the buildings which he feels is a good feature. They were also able to separate some of the parking and sprinkle in some of the on-grade parking as individual stalls between the units.

Ken Lory asked Mr. Hansen about the size of the smallest and largest units. The Garfield is 680 sq. ft. footprint. and the Peyton is 800 sq. ft footprint. Mr. Lory asked if there were going to be one HOA over both or two. Mr. Hansen stated that he thought there would be one and Mr. Wyciskala agreed and stated that the one HOA would be responsible for maintenance, management, costs, et cetera of the entire project. Mr. Lory believed there was a condition in the original application that the Board would be able to review the condo documents. Mr. Wyciskala agreed and stated that the condo documents would include provisions that relate to the common areas. Mr. Lory would like to see included in the HOA documents fully funded reserves for refurbishments. Mr. Zakin stated that the Board has approval over that and that it in the 2014 approval.

Mr. Hansen brought up the Grading Plan Phase 1, Sheet 9 of 42 dated 3/1/21, which was part of the plan set. He pointed out the high retaining block type wall made by Verti-Block. This wall will remain. They are proposing to put a black aluminum safety fence on top as was proposed in the previous approval. Mr. Lory just wanted to make sure they were putting up a fence. Mr. Hansen also pointed out the stairs between Buildings 6 & 7 for access to the rear of the building.

Mr. Hansen stated that they will plow over the curbs for small snow storms but for larger storms they will have loaders remove the snow.

Mr. Hansen explained that the garage is counted as a parking spot.

Mr., Lory asked Mr. Hansen if he was familiar with the Borough's trail system. Mr. Hansen was not. Mr. Lory asked Jon Rheinhardt, the Borough Administrator to speak about it. Mr. Hansen brought up Exhibit A-4. Mr. Rheinhardt pointed out a haul road behind Building 8 which was envisioned to become part of the trail system. Now, the trail system goes from the canal by our public works building and it's eventually going to wrap all the way up by Robert Street, the park and then a walkway around the park. They had envisioned connecting to this development as an access point for those residents and anyone else who want to get to the trail through there. It follows behind Building 8 and that property line. The gateway to the trail is on Borough property and the Borough want to make sure access to the trail is maintained and that it is not blocked in any way for the residents of this development and anyone else. Mr. Wyciskala foresees no issues in that regard. Mr. Lory would like this to be a condition of approval, Mr. Zakin agreed. Mr. Lory also stated that this would be a really great trail system for kids to get to the park.

Mr. Lory stated that they are going to have 90 units and there will be kids. There is no on-site recreation for the kids and adults. Mr. Wyciskala asked that they come back to this because they have a couple of ideas.

Marked into evidence was A-9– Emergency Vehicle Circulation Plan – which is the same as the one in the packed – Sheet 21 of 42 – 3/1/21 - with the exception of the fire truck detail in the box. Mr. Hansen went over the plan to show that the fire truck in the Fire Dept letter will be able to navigate this site. Mr. Hansen will correct the date on the revised plan to read 5/10/21 which is the date this was revised.

Mr. Hansen stated that there is a minor change in the type of lighting. He pointed out on the lighting plan, Page 38 of 42 of the plan set, the Acorn Post light fixture detail which is what they are proposing for this project. It is the light that K. Hovnanian feels is more of a country feel and more compatible with their architecture. What was previously proposed was a 20 ft. high gooseneck or swing light with 2 luminaries hanging off of it. The LED light they are proposing is a little bit lower. They are asking for relief on some of the light for the maximum illumination of 1.0 ft. candles. These lights are located at the intersections and the curbs of the roadway that need a little more light for safety. They will not be shining onto any of the neighbors. They can try to reduce that nonconformity to some degree. Mr. Loury liked the proposed lighting style; they are very similar to the lights along Main Street.

Mr. Bosworth stated that some of the retaining walls are pretty hefty, 6 and 10 ft. walls. What are the requirements for railing and such on the 10 ft. walls? Mr. Hansen stated the same requirements as a 4 ft wall. It's just fall protection, suitable so that a child or adult can't fall over the wall.

Mr. Hansen brought up Sheet 33 of 42 titled Landscape Plan North Phase 1 to show Mr. Harris. He stated they have bigger circles of shade trees or your ornamental trees. You'll see a consistent landscaping in front of each building, you'll have a bit of lawn between the street and the buildings as well as foundation plantings and accent plantings. There is a potential to add more plants. They were sensitive to what they planted near the intersection because of site distance. They will work with our professionals to add more trees or change some of the species. On the north side landscaping, Sheet 34 of 42, they tried to buffer the adjacent property owners. He also pointed out the shade trees on the plan as well as the foundation plantings that will be consistent with every building. The foundation plantings will be a mix of shrubs and perennials.

Mr. Hansen stated that the units in both Phase 1 & 2 have the option of a deck or patio. They will be the same dimensions on both phases. Chairman Loury wondered how they were going to manage that because typically anything on the exterior is a common element of a condo. Mr. Wyciskala stated that they are doing a subdivision with each unit having its own ownership. The homeowner documents will talk about consistency and maintenance. He will confirm all of this. Mr. Loury would like to see the verbiage on that because they are privately owned. Mr. Wyciskala stated that the facades will be dictated by the site plans and condo documents.

Planner Caldwell asked if the patios, decks and appurtenances are going to meet the setbacks that they put forward on the site plan or are they going to encroach on those or are they in the common area? How is this going to work. Mr. Hansen shared Sheet 6 of 42 of the overall site plans. They meet the setbacks to the tract boundary, the individual lots. They don't meet them to the individual property lines. They would have to be wrapped up into any type of approving resolution so that it's controlled and quantified when someone comes in for their deck permit. Ms. Caldwell suggested they come up with some way of doing that because you're asking for variances for each of the lots for setbacks and if there's no way to quantify what's going on with the setbacks your variances aren't necessarily going to hold through construction. Mr. Hansen will work through that and provide an outline of the setbacks for each of the 90 lots.

Mr. Hansen went over the Engineer's May 5<sup>th</sup> 2021 Report.

Page 1 – agree with all

Mr. Borinski stated that Main Street redevelopment is wrong, it should refer to the Wharton Land Use.

Page 2 –Item 6 – requesting the same relief for the right of way of Old Irondale Rd.

Item 14 – approved with the prior approval

Page 3 – Item 17 – they need relief for the terracing for 8 ft. walls or higher.

Item 23 – they think it will work but will look at it in a little more detail. Mr. Hansen will reach out to Mr. Borinski on this.

Item 26 – Mr. Wyciskala stated that as far as trees, landscaping and recreational space they can add some trees and they have some ideas for recreational space which they will cover in the future.

Page 4 – Item 29 – 36 – ok

Mr. Blethen will speak to the storm water management.

The traffic engineer will cover Items 45-52.

Mr. Loury asked if the retaining wall between Bldgs. 4 & 5 was a new wall. Also isn't there a mine shaft right there. Mr. Hansen stated that the wall is new and it's there to make grade changes between the units. The mine shaft is right in the middle of the retaining wall. Mr. Hansen stated that Hovnanian is comfortable that they can construct these buildings in this location. Mr. Blethen will talk about this later.

Mr. Wyciskala stated that the Police Chief's memo suggested that there be no parking on any of the internal roadways. Mr. Hansen stated that there will be no parking on the interior roadways. Mr. Wyciskala stated that they will have signage and also agree to Title 39.

The meeting was now open to the public for question.

Mr. Chavez – 4 Bartek Lane, asked if there was going to be a wall or fence along the walkway for recreational purpose, to keep people from trespassing onto the property as well as privacy along that section. Mr. Hansen stated that they do have a fence behind Building 8 which he pointed out on Sheet 6 of 42. They will look at that area again to address Mr. Chavez concerns. Mr. Chavez asked how tall are the trees between the sidewalk and the buildings. Mr. Hansen stated that they are generally 2 ½" caliper trees. For a shade tree about 8 to 10 feet. Depending on the species of the tree, depends on how high they grow.

Ana Jones, 124 Old Irondale Rd., stated that since it does not look like there is enough parking on site, and there are no on-site parking spots where are the overflow cars going to park. Mr. Hansen stated that they do meet RSIS requirements. He feels they have enough on-site parking so that if people do have a party there will be enough on-site parking for them. Some discussion followed. Ms. Jones is concerned that if they have to park on Bartek or Old Irondale both roads are not big enough to accommodate on street parking and traffic in both directions. Mr. Hansen stated that people would then have to carpool.

Ms. Jones is also concerned with the access points. You have Mill St., Bartek Lane and Old Irondale Rd. which are tiny. Her concern is that it's a lot of units going in this very small area coming in from 2 small roads, especially since they increased the number of units.

Ms. Caldwell stated that because the streets are narrow the applicant is proposing the off-street parking site areas which would be for guest parking. She feels the off-street parking is adequate as well as the parking for the units. The Police Chief did bring up valid concerns in his memo with the no parking on the streets in the development.

Mr. Hansen spoke about the road widths on site is 22 ft. The fire truck can circulate the site with no problem. They showed that a bigger truck than what Wharton has can circulate the site as well so they feel the 22 ft. strikes the right balance for this site. With Bartek and Old Irondale Rd. they haven't proposed any widening of either road which was discussed at the previous approval. Their plan is consistent with the previous approval in regards to this.

Sheet 9 of 42 – shows Old Irondale Rd and Mill St. Mr. Hansen stated that the right of way is 40 ft. existing and they are proposing the same thing so they will need a variance. Chief Young asked if they can extend the road based on the project to make that a minimum 20 ft. Mr. Hansen will check and get back to us. Mr. Loury stated that the road up there is in pretty bad condition. Mr. Hansen explained in more detail that the proposed roads within the development are all 22 ft wide and the required width is 20 ft for the Residential Site Improvement Standards. They chose 22 ft because it gives more width for the fire truck to circulate.

Bryan Lance, 113 Old Irondale Rd whose property is in the middle of this project asked for some tall landscaping trees on both sides of his property. Sheet 33 of 42 was pulled up on the screen showing the landscaping on both sides of the property. On the north side they will be putting a fence on top of the wall and the landscaping next to it on Mr. Lance's property. Mr. Hansen stated that they are proposing to leave the 40 ft right of way as it is on Old Irondale and they do not intend to disturb the wall that runs in front of Mr. Lances' property. Mr. Hansen stated that they will work with Mr. Lance and the Board Engineer on the lower curbing for his 2 driveways.

Mr. Hansen stated that they are not proposing any decks on the top floor of any of the units only the middle and bottom floors. Mr. Lance asked that they keep the FC lighting as low as possible, 1.0 would be nice because the LED lights can be intrusive. Mr. Hansen will work to try and minimize the lighting. Mr. Lance stated that they have a problem with quad usage on the proposed trails and wants the Board and the proposed HOA to be aware of this problem. Mr. Hansen explained to Mr. Lance the design waiver they are seeking for the stormwater filtration and the radius of 100 feet to 37 proposed which was approved exactly the same in the previous application.

Mr. Harris likes the new light design and suggested they place small screens internally on one side to diminish the light. He also asked if there was an easement for Mr. Lance to be able to cross the strip of land in front of his home that connects the 2 phases. Mr. Wyciskala stated that he thought the easements already exist to allow access to that property.

Michael Bezney, 1 Bartek Ln. is the owner of the empty lot in front of his property along Old Irondale Rd. Mr. Bezney did not feel the public received enough notice on this application. Mr. Loury stated that notices were mailed in accordance with the law. Mr. Wyciskala stated that Engineer Hansen will be back at the next meeting and he can go back and rehash at that time any of the earlier testimony. Mr. Hansen is also available now for any questions. Mr. Wyciskala stated that this site is in the AH-2 zone. Mr. Bezney asked if the whole lot area was a water preservation area according to the old Master Plan? Mr. Hansen was not aware of that and the Borough Planner was not aware but would look into it for our next meeting. Mr. Bezney stated at the meeting for the prior approval he had pointed out to the Board that they were violating the water preservation area because it showed clearly on the Master Plan that that was there. So, he asked the Board to review this because of their asking for higher density. Mr. Bezney asked if they were doing anything in the gray areas of the overall site exhibit. Mr. Hansen stated that there will be some milling and paving along Old Irondale because of the curbing that is going to

be installed. They will also be coming back with plans for a recreation area on the site. He also stated that they will not be changing the walls along Mill St. but will be adding fencing along the top. There are trees on the high side of the wall as well. Mr. Loury stated that they previously stated that they will be coming back with plans showing the improvements. Mr. Bezney stated that there are going to be about 42 more cars accessing this site with the additional units. Mr. Hansen stated that there will be a slightly increase in traffic and that the traffic engineer will address that.

Mr. Hansen pointed out to Mr. Bezney where the ground mounted, internally illuminated sign would be located.

Licensed Architect Mr. Richard Culp was qualified as an expert Architect.

Marked into Evidence was Exhibit A-7, Color Rendering of Proposed Building 5. Prepared by K. Hovnanian which shows the only 7-unit building on the site. They are 3 story town houses with the garage on the first level. They have 17 building strings on the site and only 2 of them are the same, the rest all have slightly different variations in how they step side to side. There are offsets in the roofs and the buildings step down from left to right. The fronts are not flush, there are setbacks every two units which breaks up the plane of the front of the buildings. The setbacks are 2 ft. offsets which breaks up the mass of the building. They are using a palette that is very popular and is more of a Joanna Gaines kind of popular aesthetic which is to have grays and whites rather than the traditional earth tones. This is more of a contemporary approach geared to be starter homes for a new generation of home owners. Mr. Culp went on to describe the interior of the Peyton and the Garfield. He also stated that the roofs are standard composition shingles, they are proposing a mix of vertical and horizontal siding in different colors with band board in between, which he explained to the Board. Some of the building look to be 2 story from the rear and 3 story from the front because of the elevations.

Buildings 6 & 7 are unique and will both need a variance for height. The 3 stories sit upon a slab that is supported by the exposed area of foundation which would be approximately an additional 10 ft. Building 6 is approximately 38 ft to the mean height of the roof where 35 ft. is allowed.

Mr. Wyciskala stated that they are looking for feedback from the Board.

Mr. Loury doesn't mind the grey and white but would like more delineation. He feels the project is being value engineered and that makes his concern with reserves and the HOA responsibility and everything else be more important. When you value engineer, you make it look good in the beginning so you can sell it and then it's not the best quality. Then it becomes the HOA's fault when everything is wearing down earlier that it should be and is not up to the standards. Mr. Culp stated that they are not intending on using inferior quality materials. They want it to look good as well as affordable. The Aspire series looks good and has the same basic materials that they use but some of the embellishments aren't there. It's in a situation like this that they probably don't need to be there because the variation within the building adds a little bit of complexity to it which adds some of the visual interest to the building. They are not going to use any inferior materials at all, it's all the materials they use everywhere else. He can provide the Board with the materials they will be using. Mr. Loury understands that this is entry level, but entry level should still be visually pleasing. They could certainly make 3 of the buildings with a stone or brick façade just to break it up. Mr. Loury feels that these units do not look like town homes but look more like apartments. The beauty of a town house is that you get that nice look, a



delineation between the two. Mr. Rathjens agreed with Mr. Loury and felt that they could do more with the garage doors, make them 2 tone or change the color of the trim. He would also like to see a rendering of the rear of the building with the staggering of the decks with maybe one missing since they are optional, to be able to see what it would look like.

Mr. Loury asked about the placement of the air conditioning units. Mr. Culp stated that they would all be at the rear of the buildings probably adjacent to the decks. The meters would be on the side of the buildings and would be run underground around the perimeter of the buildings to the units. Nothing will be located on the roof of any buildings.

Mr. Harris asked if snow removal of sidewalks will be covered by the HOA. Mr. Culp did not know. Mr. Wyciskala thought it was an HOA issue but will confirm before our next meeting. Mr. Harris would like the common areas defined.

Mr. Culp stated that they will meet energy code and that the windows will be double glazed. They will also be built with proper thermal envelope with not a lot of air infiltration. Their homes are very efficient. They build good quality homes and hopes the aesthetics here doesn't make anyone think that this will not be high quality.

Mr. Culp will not be at the next meeting but his colleagues will and there will be a transcript. They will have an architect from K. Hovnanian back at the next meeting.

Mr. Loury stated that if they drive around town and look at the façade of some of the new developments such as 170 N. Main St., they will get an idea of what the Board required.

Mr. Culp asked for a list of new developments that they feel is indicative of what they are looking for that would be helpful. They do intend to keep it an Aspire series and so they will just have to find a way to balance that out. Mr. Loury stated that their profit margin is not something that this Board really takes into consideration.

Mr. Fleischman asked about the deck on Page 13. Mr. Culp stated that that particular deck is on the lowest level, the first-floor level and is going to be standard, because of the nature of the site at that location. They do have the option of a deck above it because the main living areas are on the second floor. Building 6 and 7 are the only two buildings where the deck is going to be standard on the first level. He also stated that they can have more than one deck.

Mr. Zakin stated that the engineer and architect will return for the next meeting. The other 3 witnesses that were sworn in will have to be qualified at our next meeting. The next meeting will be moved from June 8<sup>th</sup> to June 15<sup>th</sup>. It will be a special meeting and will have to be advertised. Mr. Zakin stated that it will be on the website along with the zoom information.

Mr. Wyciskala stated that the next meeting will be June 15<sup>th</sup> at 7pm. There will be no further notice required. The information will be on the Borough website.

A Motion was made by Roger Steele and Seconded by Mr. Harris to carry the meeting to a special meeting date of June 15, 2021. It is a special meeting because the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting date that was originally advertised is election day.

YEA – 9 NAY – 0

A Motion was made by Brian Bosworth and Seconded by Marc Harris to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 10:35 pm YEA – 9 NAY – 0

---

Patricia M. Craven – Secretary

---

Ken Loury - Chairman