

MINUTES OF THE
EAST BRUNSWICK TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD

January 13, 2021

STATEMENT - Open Public Meetings Act

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL -

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

Shawn Taylor, Chairman

Laurence Reiss

Brad Cohen, Mayor

Laurence Bravman

Charles Heppel

Joseph Criscuolo

James Wendell

Steve Philips

Julie Clarke

Muhammad Hashmi

Rachel Cohen

ALSO PRESENT:

Lawrence B. Sachs, Esquire

Loren Morace, Secretary

Keith Kipp, Director

John Kriskowski, Engineer

James Lambert, Engineer

Malvika Apte, Planner

MINUTES

December 16, 2020 - Motion to approve by Mayor
Cohen, second by Mr. Bravman. Minutes approved.

PLANNING BOARD REORGANIZATION

Chairman - Shawn Taylor nominated by Mr. Wendell,
second by Mayor Cohen. All in favor; Mr. Taylor
abstained.

Vice Chairman - Laurence Bravman nominated by Mayor
Cohen, second by Mr. Criscuolo. All in favor.

Secretary - Charles Heppel nominated by Mr. Wendell, second by Mr. Bravman. All in favor; Mr. Heppel abstained.

Recording Secretary - Deborah Masterton nominated by Mr. Philips, second by Mr. Wendell. All in favor.

Attorney - Lawrence B. Sachs, Esquire, nominated by Mr. Taylor, second by Mr. Heppel. All in favor.

Engineer - CME Associates nominated by Mayor Cohen, second by Mr. Wendell. All in favor.

Conflict Engineer - Remington & Vernick Engineers nominated by Mr. Philips, second by Mayor Cohen. All in favor.

Conflict Attorney - Shamy, Shipers & Lonski, P.C., nominated by Mr. Wendell, second by Mr. Criscuolo. All in favor.

NEW BUSINESS

Application #20-11 - 888 Old Bridge Turnpike - Proposed subdivision of property into seven single-family lots located at 888 Old Bridge Turnpike, block 133.28, lot 5.29, in the R-3 zone. Mandatory date February 15, 2021. Taxes paid to date. Motion to approve by Mayor Cohen, second by Mr. Taylor. Application approved with conditions.

Application #20-14 - Beth Abraham Cemetery Association - Proposed demolition and replacement of existing cemetery office building located at 617 Cranbury Road, block 319, lot 18.09, in the R-2 zone. Mandatory date January 13, 2021. Taxes paid to date. Application approved with conditions.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Wendell. Meeting adjourned at 11:37 p.m.

MR. SACHS: Good evening, everyone. This is the January 13, 2021, East Brunswick Township Planning Board meeting. In accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law, on December 14, 2020, notice of this meeting stating the time, date, and location was sent to the Home News Tribune, filed with the township clerk, and posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of the municipal building. A copy of this notice will be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting.

The Chair reserves the right to call any application in an order different from that appearing on the agenda. On each application, the Chair will give the public an opportunity to comment.

The planning board will entertain no new business after 10 p.m. and will close all proceedings at 10:30 p.m.

Keith, can you please put the flag on for the pledge of allegiance. Or not.

MAYOR COHEN: I got a flag.

MR. SACHS: We can use -- there you go. (Flag salute)

MR. WENDELL: That's one of the worst that I've been involved with since this, you know. Other boards I'm on, we seem to be a little bit closer coordinated.

MR. SACHS: Loren, can you please call the roll.

MS. MORACE: Yes. Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Here.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Here.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Here.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Reiss. Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Here.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Here.

MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: Here.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.

MR. HEPPEL: Here.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Here.

MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Here.

MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here.

MR. SACHS: Okay. The first order of

business before we do our reorganization will be adopting the minutes of December 16, 2020. Can somebody please move those minutes.

MAYOR COHEN: So moved.

MR. SACHS: So moved by the mayor. Is there a second?

MR. BRAVMAN: I'll second.

MS. MORACE: Who seconded first?

MR. CRISCUOLO: Doesn't matter.

MR. SACHS: Mr. Bravman seconded.

Loren, please call the roll.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Reiss. He's not here.

Sorry. Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: I'll abstain.

MR. SACHS: Okay.

MS. MORACE: Yes.

MR. SACHS: Now we're going to start with our 2021 planning board reorganization. For the record, my name is Lawrence Sachs. I am going to request and accept a nomination for chairman for the 2021 planning board. Is there any nomination, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WENDELL: This is Councilman Wendell. I'd like to nominate Shawn Taylor.

MR. SACHS: Okay. Is there a second?

MAYOR COHEN: Second.

MR. SACHS: Seconded by the mayor. Are there any other nominations for chairman?

Hearing none, I'm going to close the nominations for chairman.

Loren, can you please call the roll on Mr. Taylor for chairman.

MS. MORACE: Yes. Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.
 MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.
 MR. WENDELL: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.
 MR. SACHS: I think he said yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.
 MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.
 MAYOR COHEN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: And Chairman Taylor.
 MR. SACHS: All right, Chairman.

Congratulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll abstain. Thank you. Thank you all very much. It's my great honor to serve on this wonderful board and a double honor to chair it. I also want to thank Mayor Cohen for asking me to serve once again. My term ended at the end of last year, and thank you, Mayor, for having the confidence in me to ask me to serve again. I will, you know, I love to talk, so -- but I will -- I just want to thank you all. I'll be brief.

I think we're doing wonderful things here in East Brunswick. We have such a great team between this board, the town council, the mayor, the redevelopment agency. We are really taking big steps in kind of reshaping East Brunswick for the next generation.

I just want to say quickly that I wanted to thank now Council President Sharon Sullivan for her contributions on the board last year, and I'm pleased to have back a familiar face on the planning board and one of the guys really driving -- driving the bus in redevelopment. Councilman Wendell, it will be -- it's a pleasure to know you on a whole lot of levels and happy to see you and serve with you on the planning board.

MR. WENDELL: Thank you. I'd like to thank everybody just for this --

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we proceed with the reorganization. Do I have a nomination for vice chairman?

Mr. Bravman, are you willing to serve again, because I would be honored to nominate you. Mayor?

MR. BRAVMAN: And it would be my honor to serve again if the nomination is made.

MAYOR COHEN: Like to nominate Mr. Bravman, who served so distinguishedly last year. We would certainly, if he wants to, oblige him with

that honor again this year.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I'll second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Terrific. Are there any other nominations?

Hearing none, I will close nominations, and, Loren, I would ask you to call the roll for vice chair.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Council Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.

MR. HEPPEL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: I will say yes and support myself, as well.

MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Congratulations, Larry.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're a real asset to the board and to the town.

May I entertain nominations for secretary. Currently, it's Mr. Heppel.

MR. WENDELL: I'll nominate Charlie Heppel for secretary.

MR. BRAVMAN: And I would second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good. Any other nominations?

Hearing none, I will close nominations, and, Loren, please call the roll for Mr. Charlie Heppel for secretary.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.
 MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.
 MR. WENDELL: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.
 MR. HEPPEL: Abstain.
 MS. MORACE: Congratulations. Mr.

Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.
 MAYOR COHEN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Charlie, congratulations, and thank you again for agreeing to serve. If we were in person, I could just lean over and pat you on the back, but since we're not, I'll just give you a little wave.

MR. HEPPEL: Thank you, Shawn. Thank you, everybody.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next is recording secretary. Mr. Sachs, this is -- we normally have Loren as our recording secretary, correct?

MR. SACHS: Yeah, that is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MS. MORACE: No, it's actually Debbie Masterton. She's the one that does the minutes.

MR. SACHS: Oh, Debbie Masterton, correct, correct, correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, okay. All right.

MR. SACHS: We do this -- we run into this problem every year. So it's Deborah Masterton.

MR. PHILIPS: I'll move Debbie Masterton.

MR. WENDELL: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

MR. WENDELL: Yeah, Councilman Wendell, second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, great. Any other nominations?

Hearing none, I move to close. I will close nominations, and, Loren, please call the roll for secretary, for recording secretary.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.
 MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.
 MR. WENDELL: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.
 MR. HEPPEL: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.
 MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.
 MAYOR COHEN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.
 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Next is the appointment for attorney.

I'm going to use a point of personal privilege here and nominate my long-time friend, Larry Sachs. We've known each other since the 8th grade I think, and he has served us well on this board, and it is my pleasure to appoint Larry Sachs -- or to nominate Larry Sachs for planning board attorney. Do I have a second?

MR. HEPPEL: I'll second.

MR. BRAVMAN: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded. Any further nominations?

Hearing none, I close nominations, and, Loren, please call the roll for the appointment of Larry Sachs for attorney.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel. I saw him say
 yes.

Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Congratulations,
 Larry.

MR. SACHS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman;
 thank you, members of the board. Look forward to

serving this year.

THE CHAIRMAN: Next is nominations for engineer. Currently, CME is in that capacity. What is the board's pleasure.

MAYOR COHEN: -- CME as our engineer.

MR. WENDELL: Second, Councilman Wendell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Been moved and seconded. Any further nominations?

Seeing none, I'll close nominations, and, Loren, please call the roll for engineer.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.

MR. HEPPEL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Congratulations to CME. We have John Kriskowski and Jim Lambert on. Look forward to working with you both guys, and once again, another squeaker for CME.

MR. LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, all board members.

MR. KRISKOWSKI: On behalf of CME Associates, we appreciate it, and we look forward to working with the board, and I just want to say that, you know, I've worked -- been doing board work for over 30 years, and this is one of the best boards. This is one of the most professional and well organized and well run, and it's been an honor over the past years, and we look forward to this coming year to a lot of good things happening. Thank you.

MAYOR COHEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, John.

Who's currently our conflict engineers?

MS. MORACE: Remington Vernick.

MR. SACHS: Remington Vernick.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are they interested in serving again, Mayor? Do we know?

MAYOR COHEN: I know that they turned in an RFQ so I believe so, and they've been qualified, so I think we should --

THE CHAIRMAN: Good, so what is the board's pleasure for conflict engineer.

MR. WENDELL: I'll move.

MAYOR COHEN: You can go ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's been moved. Do we have a second?

MAYOR COHEN: Second.

MS. COHEN: I'll second.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's been moved and seconded. Any further nominations?

Seeing none, I'll close nominations. Loren, please call the roll for Remington Vernick for conflict engineer.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.

MR. HEPPEL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

And last but not least is our conflict attorney. I don't recall. Who's serving in that capacity now?

MR. SACHS: Shamy, Shipers & Lonski.

MR. WENDELL: I make a motion to nominate Dave Lonski and his firm to be conflict attorney.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I'll second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded. Any further nominations?

Seeing none, I'll close nominations. Loren, please call the roll --

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.
 THE CHAIRMAN: -- for Lonski and
 associates for conflict --
 MS. COHEN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.
 MR. HASHMI: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.
 MS. CLARKE: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.
 MR. PHILIPS: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.
 MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. -- Councilman Wendell.
 MR. WENDELL: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.
 MR. HEPPEL: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.
 MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.
 MAYOR COHEN: Yes.
 MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor. Yes.

So moving on to new business, Mr. Pape, you're listed first on the agenda. Do you have everyone here who you need, because I thought you weren't going to be ready to go until 8 o'clock.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chair, good evening. Yes, I -- it's Jeffrey Carr, and me making the presentation. So if you're ready for us, when you're ready, we are ready. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Then the first order of new business would be application 20-11, 888 Old Bridge Turnpike. Mr. Pape, you are here on that application.

MR. PAPE: Yes, Mr. Chair, board members, Mayor, Councilman, board professionals, good evening, all, Kenneth Pape of the firm Heilbrunn Pape on behalf of your applicant. This is a request for subdivision approval of lands that are known as lot 5.29, block 133.28, property that is located on Old Bridge Turnpike. The request is to create six residential building lots and one stormwater management lot. The applicant will be asking this board to consider two variances, one for a unique opportunity to provide a driveway through a panhandle to avoid using the portion of Rues Lane immediately adjacent to the -- portion of Old Bridge Turnpike immediately adjacent to Rues Lane, and the second is a variance to level out some gullies that are in the area, gullies that are in the area of the cul-de-sac bulb that's proposed, and before we begin

a substantive presentation, may I ask that the board acknowledge receipt of our notices and confirm jurisdiction.

MR. SACHS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity to review the affidavit of service, proof of publication, notice of publication, and the board does have jurisdiction for the application this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank you. Please -- Mr. Pape, please continue.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of the board, this is an application, as I indicated, for six residential lots. The properties are designed to be equal to or greater than that which is required, and, in fact, this is an area that was previously the subject of an application, this and a little bit of lands that were alongside of it, for 10 lots that were approved years ago but was never developed.

The presentation will be made by Jeffrey Carr. Jeffrey Carr is both a professional engineer and a professional planner. I'm going to ask if we could have him sworn, take a few moments to share his credentials with you before he begins his substantive presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Mr. Carr, while I can't see you on my screen, please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, so help you God?

MR. CARR: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please give us your name, spell your last name, and give us a bit of your CV, please.

MR. CARR: All right. My name is Jeffrey Carr, C-a-r-r. I'm a principal in the firm of Lindstrom, Diessner & Carr. I am a licensed professional engineer and licensed professional planner in the State of New Jersey. I have a bachelor of science and master of science degree from New Jersey Institute of Technology. I'm a certified municipal engineer and a certified floodplain manager. I have been practicing both of these professions for over 40 years. I have appeared before East Brunswick in the past, though not recently, and I've appeared before numerous boards throughout the State of New Jersey on similar types of applications as well as commercial applications, industrial applications, and the like.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're happy to accept you as an expert. Welcome.

MR. CARR: Thank you.

MR. PAPE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Carr has prepared exhibits to assist in the presentation. We forwarded those exhibits to the township electronically prior to the meeting. What is the procedure for screen sharing, Mr. Chair?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, Keith, you want to take that one.

MR. KIPP: Sure. Yeah, Jeff, if you can, we'll give you the capabilities to share your screen, and just make sure you announce which exhibit you're showing, and take your time because our EBTV is paying attention, and as you switch your shared screen, they're going to switch, too. So anytime you change your exhibit, just announce you're going to change your exhibit and they'll switch with you.

MR. CARR: Okay. All right. If you can share the screen, that will be great.

MR. KIPP: You're good to go, Jeff.

MR. CARR: All right. Excellent. The first exhibit that I have placed up -- and I'm assuming everybody can see this.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MR. CARR: This is a color rendering of the site. It is simply the landscape and lighting plan.

MAYOR COHEN: I don't see anything yet, do you?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't see anything yet, either.

MR. KIPP: Double click on it.

MR. PHILIPS: Hasn't opened.

MS. COHEN: You just need to change what you're sharing. All we see is --

MR. CARR: What do you see on your screen?

MR. KIPP: We see your file system.

MR. SACHS: Double click on it and it should show up.

MR. CARR: Okay. Now?

MS. COHEN: No. I think you have to just stop sharing your screen and reshare it with the file that you want to show.

MR. CARR: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: There you go, Rachel. Walk him through it.

MR. CARR: Is it showing it now?

MR. SACHS: We need a millennial on -- we need a millennial on this board.

MR. KIPP: You have to share your screen.

MR. CARR: This is --

MS. COHEN: When you hit the little green button, there's, like, another box that opens, and it shows you, like, all the different screens that are open that you have.

MR. CARR: Okay.

MS. COHEN: Probably going to hit the one that's all the way on the top left.

MR. CARR: All right. Now I'm all over the place.

MR. KIPP: Jeff, which exhibit were you going to share? I'll share.

MR. CARR: The color rendering.

MR. KIPP: Okay. Okay. There you go.

MR. CARR: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CARR: All right. This is simply the sheet -- this is simply the landscape plan that has been rendered up just for visibility. It is sheet number 8 of 13 of your set that was submitted. There is no changes, and it's just to kind of for ease show -- show the layout of the project. On the left side of the plan is Old Bridge Turnpike running sort of diagonal vertically on the plan. Pamela Road comes in from the top of the plan, and you can see the colored area of the site, which is approximately 3 acres. Currently, Pamela Road comes in and terminates at the end, and you'll see those two dwellings. It just ends abruptly at the property line. We are proposing to extend it into the property and terminate it with the cul-de-sac.

There is an existing dwelling located with frontage on Old Bridge Turnpike. There's also a detached garage on here. So the site is currently developed, and there is, as Mr. Pape had explained, there is a gully that runs basically to the left of the cul-de-sac and then drops appreciably to the right or to the east through the site. So there's some grading in that area that requires some adjustment to critical slopes.

There are six proposed homes. The existing house will be razed and the new one placed in its -- constructed in its place, and then one lot -- and you can see to the right of the cul-de-sac a large lot there, which is as large or larger than any of the single-family homes. That will contain a stormwater management basin that will be on a separate lot, and that would be owned and

maintained by the homeowners association.

For the most part, this is pretty straightforward as far as a subdivision goes. It's in the R-3 residential zone requirements. All lots meet the requirements as far as bulk criteria, meets the lot area. The minimum lot area is 15,000 square feet, which we meet. All frontages, lot depths, lot setbacks, impervious coverages are all met.

There's one variance that we're asking for on lot -- one second -- on proposed lot 5.32, which is a lot in the lower left-hand corner of the plan, and that's located directly at the intersection of Old Bridge Turnpike with Rues Lane. Originally, we had proposed a conforming lot in that area. We submitted to the county, and we got responses back from the county, and we've had several Zoom meetings with their engineers and their planners with regard to some changes on the plan here based on a proposed traffic light at that intersection. That traffic light and intersection improvements are proposed. They have not received complete funding yet so I can't tell you when that would be constructed or when that would be started, but it is in the design phases, so this subdivision will address those items.

Some simple things that you would normally do here on frontage, curbs, sidewalks. We have handicapped ramps proposed here for when they improve the intersection there.

But one of the things that they had talked about was the impact of driveways at that intersection, and while we were proposing a driveway for the most part exactly where they were proposing the driveway, their concern was that, well, the driveway that they were accommodating was an existing one. We are now proposing it, even though in the same place, was there something we can do. So we talked to staff, your staff as well as the county staff, and we came up with what we thought was a win-win situation. We are providing essentially a tail on the back of that proposed lot -- again, it's lot 5.32 -- and we would construct the driveway on its own -- which -- on a portion or a strip of land that would be owned by that lot, so it wouldn't be an easement, and that would connect directly to Pamela Road and the extended cul-de-sac. So it would be separate lot. The main (inaudible) would ride with that lot. And that would eliminate and we would deed restrict that lot from having a driveway at that intersection.

That would eliminate that concern by the county.

With regard to the adjacent lot on Old Bridge Turnpike, lot 5.31, we simply would just construct the driveway far removed from the intersection, and you can see it would be a T-shaped driveway so nobody would back out onto Old Bridge Turnpike, and that would be on the left or the north side furthest removed, and again, we can deed restrict it so that the driveway would always be placed in that location.

As to the remaining portions of the development, it's pretty straightforward. You can see we constructed street trees, grading through here.

Keith, if you can flip to perhaps the subdivision plan set. If I could -- if you could pull up the -- I guess the grading plan, I'll --

MR. KIPP: Okay. Give me a minute. That wasn't something you submitted as an exhibit, right?

MR. PAPE: Mr. Carr, I think --

MR. CARR: It's not a separate exhibit. It's the plan set that was sent in.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Carr, I think we can work from the rendering. If --

MR. CARR: Okay.

MR. PAPE: Have you answer some questions on the record --

MR. CARR: Sure.

MR. PAPE: -- while this is in front of the board. I'm going to ask if we can just go through some of the -- I indicated there's a residence on the property, a freestanding garage on the property, and we'll confirm all of those improvements, Mr. Chair and board members, everything that's on the property currently is -- it's our client's intention to remove. There's none of that that's going to be saved or repurposed. And I appreciate the care of the description of the activities out onto the county road.

If you could identify the approximate distance of the driveway that is -- I'm going to say north because it's up -- the driveway that's furthest away from the intersection, what is the separation of that driveway from Rues Lane intersection?

MR. CARR: Bear with me one second. That is from center line of the driveway to center line of Rues Lane is approximately 140 feet.

MR. PAPE: As a design engineer, are you

comfortable advising the board that that is a safe location for a driveway and that is a safe --

MR. CARR: Yes, yes, I am.

MR. PAPE: And where there's currently one driveway coming out of this property onto Rues Lane, that driveway, as you've indicated, is right at the Rues Lane intersection.

MR. CARR: That is correct. That is currently at the intersection.

MR. PAPE: I'm going to ask if you just for the record, if you would, share your opinion. Is eliminating that driveway and replacing it with one that is 150 feet -- 140 feet away from the intersection a superior and safer design?

MR. CARR: Absolutely.

MR. PAPE: The county planning board, as I'm sure all of the planning board members are familiar from years of experience, when you have a house on a county road, they require you -- that you have a turnaround driveway as mandatory element of your design, and it's that turnaround driveway that you were describing to the board members just a few moments ago that is a part of this design.

MR. CARR: Yes, it is, yes.

MR. PAPE: And the driveway that would go to -- down onto Pamela Road is intended to be the only driveway to service the lot that's benefited by that, but the home would be oriented -- if you could just confirm, the home would be oriented towards Rues Lane so that it would be consistent with the neighborhood on Rues Lane, and the driveway would be accommodated through a side entry as designed.

MR. CARR: That's correct. As you can see on this plan here, the driveway, instead of coming out of the side car entry driveway, you would just go to Pamela Road. Anybody heading into Rues Lane looking at it would see the frontage of the house. So it wouldn't be reverse frontage. It would still look and feel and smell like a house on Old Bridge Turnpike, so aesthetically, we think that's very pleasing, as well as for the neighborhood internally, they would be back yard to back yard as you would expect it to be.

MR. PAPE: As far as to the property a little more than 3 acres in the R-3 zone, to accommodate this development plan, could you -- none of us are technicians, but if you could describe in general terms how will the property be graded?

MR. CARR: The site along Old Bridge Turnpike is gently sloping from -- roughly from Old

Bridge Turnpike into the property or easterly. When you get to about where the cul-de-sac is or to the left side, the west side of the cul-de-sac it was under existing conditions, the site has a significant gully in the site, and it drops off significantly from that point heading east, and then, of course, all the properties in the neighborhood significantly drop off and fall off in that area, as well, and then from north to south, from the property line where the two houses are on Pamela Road now, they basically pitch into this gully, as does the properties from the south fall into the properties to the north somewhat, but the in general, the property, itself, is the drainage area. There's not a significant amount of off-site water that comes into here.

But that gully creates basically a little challenge for us in that we are fixed with a grade on Pamela Road. Pamela Road slopes from our property down all the way to the next intersection, and we must maintain certain slopes coming into that. We basically have picked up that point and created a high point at our property line roughly, and then it drops into our property, into the cul-de-sac we are -- where we are constructing a couple of drainage inlets on either side of the cul-de-sac, and the purpose of that was to eliminate any runoff from our development leaving the site into Pamela Road so that we can control all of our runoff on our own.

In order to maintain acceptable road grades, that necessitates the spilling of that gully in the area of the cul-de-sac and a little bit beyond that to construct the stormwater basin, but one of the advantages of that gully is we can take advantage of that gully for our storm water management system. So we are effectively not creating a hole in there as much as we are just regrading to create a berm in there so that we can control the runoff, and as you can see along that easterly boundary, we have saved a quite a bit of wooded area on there so that would remain all natural.

MR. PAPE: With regard to grading leads to stormwater management, so currently, there's a sheet flow from the Rues -- from Old Bridge Turnpike through the property, and there's no stormwater management system. Would you describe very briefly your stormwater management system and where the basin that's part of the management system is

located.

MR. CARR: Yes. As I indicated, it's relatively straightforward. We are basically following the natural drainage patterns. We will construct, as I indicated, a small system of stormwater that will have an inlet on either side of the cul-de-sac to collect stormwater from the roadway, and then we will have a detention -- a detention basin on this lot on the most easterly side of the property, and that will be a -- basically an open stormwater management system that will control runoff.

Another feature that we've added onto this project is that each of the roof systems will have a -- basically a dry well system for the roof leaders so that we will collect runoff from the roofs that's effectively clean water, and we will recharge that back into the soils, and that will reduce the amount of runoff from the site as well as promote recharge on the site.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Carr, I've got four very important questions to ask of you. The first is, will you confirm for the board members that this -- that you will design this system to be fully compliant with all of the NJDEP stormwater requirements.

MR. CARR: Yes, we will.

MR. PAPE: I'm going to ask if you'll make the same statement. Will you make certain that this is designed to be fully compliant with all of the East Brunswick Township stormwater requirements.

MR. CARR: Yes, we will.

MR. PAPE: I know that you have reviewed the stormwater comments that have appeared in Mr. Kriskowski's report. I know that you've had time to go over them with John. Would you confirm that you can and you will address all of those requirements to John's satisfaction.

MR. CARR: That is correct; we will do so.

MR. PAPE: My fourth question is, this system that you've designed, this stormwater collection system that you've designed is intended to be a privately owned system owned and maintained by the homeowners association and not one that would create a burden on the Township of East Brunswick.

MR. CARR: Yes, that is correct.

MR. PAPE: I think that's enough of the description of the stormwater management system. There's limited landscaping that's

associated with a residential subdivision. I trust that you have landscaped the street trees in a manner that's consistent with the ordinance?

MR. CARR: We have.

MR. PAPE: And there are comments, brief comments. I think there were four under landscaping and four under forestry. Have you had an opportunity to review those comments that appear in the staff's report?

MR. CARR: Yes, I have.

MR. PAPE: And I know that we've conferred together and with our client. Would you make the representation that all of the recommendations under landscaping and forestry will be addressed by the applicant.

MR. CARR: Yes, we would.

MR. PAPE: As far as lighting, we have a street lighting plan, and I know that you -- we relied on JCP&L providing us with the lighting system. Looking at the details, it appears that you have the colonial lamp fixture as the design on the extension of the roadway.

MR. CARR: Yes, that's correct.

MR. PAPE: And I know that there was a question about LED lighting, and, Mr. Chair, members of the board, I can tell you that if JCP&L makes LED lighting available, it is our preference, and that's what would be installed in those -- in that light system.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I believe that's in the PSE&G service area.

MR. PAPE: PSE&G. Thank you. I make that mistake all too frequently.

Mr. Carr, if you could confirm that the driveway that is -- to service the -- the tail driveway, I think that you said it, but I'd just like the record to be clear on it -- it is a fee simple ownership driveway. It is a single-owner driveway. It's not a shared driveway, and it would be owned -- owned and maintained by the homeowner who is benefited by the driveway.

MR. CARR: That is correct, and only for the fact that that tail piece, being that it's fee simple, is 25 feet wide, that creates the variance. Other than that, even without that tail, that lot would be fully conforming in all other regards, as well as the two adjoining lots to the driveway, they are fully conforming in all regards.

MR. PAPE: I think -- I think, Mr. Carr, that we have concluded our direct presentation of

the subdivision elements. Is there anything further that you feel that we should place on the record?

MR. CARR: No, except I would just say that I think looking at the plan, you can see it's fairly straightforward. If you look at the area of the neighborhood, it is conforming with regard to size, size of dwellings, types of dwellings to the neighborhood. It is designed to provide safe and efficient traffic movements on there. We've maintained to the best of our ability with the exceptions of the gully area that I talked about the natural drainage patterns, and reviewing Mr. Kriskowski's letter, I have no problem addressing all of the points within that letter to his satisfaction should the board grant approval.

MR. PAPE: There's one other letter that I think you should speak to in the same voice, and that is there's the water service and sewer service review letter that was delivered to Colleen McGurk to Dan Losik. It was dated August 31. Would you confirm that you're familiar with those requirements and you will address those requirements to the satisfaction.

MR. CARR: Yes, that is correct. In fact, the plans that you have in front of you have been revised to address those. Those have been resubmitted. We did not receive an updated letter from Mr. Losik, but we would agree to all of his original comments as set forth in his review letter.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, that concludes your applicant's direct presentation of the proposed subdivision of this property. Mr. Carr is available for examination to the board, the board professionals at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pape. If you can take the shared screen down because I can't see anybody if it's still up.

MR. KIPP: Okay, I'm going to take it down.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any -- let's start. Are there any staff questions for this witness? Let's do staff first.

MR. KIPP: I have none.

THE CHAIRMAN: No staff questions.
Okay.

MR. SACHS: I have a few, but I'll let John and Jim go first.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see -- I see --

MR. SACHS: Shawn, I was going to go through -- before we get to the board questions --

THE CHAIRMAN: Larry.

MR. SACHS: Before you get to board questions, I don't know if John or Jim have any questions, and I just have a few, but go ahead. I'll let John and Jim go first if they have any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't think they had any. John or Jim?

MR. LAMBERT: No questions.

MS. APTE: Mr. Chairman, this is Mika Apte. If I may, I do have a couple follow-up questions from our report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. I'm sorry. I didn't know you were on because I don't see you on my screen. Okay. Sure.

MS. APTE: I switched off the camera because there were too many screens on so I just switched it off.

Mr. Carr, just a follow-up to a couple of questions that I had -- we had in our memo. As you've stated, because of that one lot which is creating the flag lot situation, it was recommended that there should be -- if you would look into adding some kind of plantings or anything between the lot with the driveway and the adjacent lot that it is in front. Is that something that you or your -- or the applicant would agree to providing?

MR. CARR: Sure. I don't see any problem with that. We didn't show anything specific. A lot of times that's something that may be chosen by the homeowner, what types of shrubs or planting or plant beds, but as I indicated, we have a driveway there with a 25-foot-wide easement, so there's sufficient room for that property owner to put in landscaping on either side of their driveway if they chose to do so.

MR. PAPE: Jeff, it's not an easement. Take the word back.

MR. CARR: I'm sorry. It's a 25-foot strip of parcel that's owned, and there's sufficient room on either side of the driveway for that particular property owner to landscape. We would be glad to propose some landscaping there, and that could be either enhanced by the homeowner or modified by the homeowner.

MR. KRISKOWSKI: And just to be clear, Mr. Pape and Mr. Carr, I believe that there is still an easement required, although the entire easement is on lot 5.32, because you have your looping water, your 8-inch-diameter water main, which is connecting

through that property.

MR. CARR: Correct, the easement --

MR. KRISKOWSKI: So there is an easement, but it's part of all in lot --

MR. CARR: It's a water line. It's a water line easement to provide a looped water main system, which is preferred, so that easement is for the water, not for the driveway, yes. Thank you.

MR. PAPE: Right, and I'm going to drive the point. Fee simple ownership of the land where the driveway is located happens to be coincidental where the utility looping will occur, so there will be an underground utility easement that's for the benefit of the township in the fee simple area of the driveway. I think I've said that enough times to make certain --

MR. CARR: Correct.

MS. APTE: Thank you. And just two more questions. In terms of steep slopes, I believe you have provided a (audio distortion) sorry -- a critical steep slope plan. If you could, is that creating any kind of noncompliance or variances? If you can just briefly talk to the board about that.

MR. CARR: Yes. We did submit an exhibit, which is a requirement, technical requirement, which is a slope analysis map. It shows the areas of steep slopes on the site, and as I indicated in the testimony is that it's very limited to the gully area, and while we are disturbing some of the steep slope areas, it's somewhat unique. Typically, you like to protect steep slopes when you have large hills, softer slopes, larger slopes. This is something that because of erosion and stormwater over the years, it created basically a side of embankment. So actually, we're improving it by getting rid of some of those, but to the extent that there are areas, as I indicated, on the easterly side of the site, we are maintaining those, and if you look at the critical slope areas, they're very limited areas, so it's really rather de minimus I would think, and it's for the safety of the project and the homeowners.

MS. APTE: Okay. Thank you. And the last question -- it's just more of just to put on record. You did -- and this might be for Mr. Pape. The applicant is aware of the mandatory development fees requirement, and the applicant is willing to comply with that?

MR. PAPE: They are mandatory, and yes,

they'll be full compliance.

MS. APTE: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SACHS: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, Larry.

MR. SACHS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Larry.

MR. SACHS: Mr. Carr, just a couple questions from -- on the staff report. On the environmental comments, are there any underground storage tanks on this property?

MR. CARR: I am not aware of any, but an environmental consultant has been retained to investigate that, and to the extent that if there is any, they will be removed in compliance with the NJDEP requirements.

MR. PAPE: And I can add to it, Mr. Sachs, if I may because I had the opportunity to interview the client pretty extensively on the point. The existing residence on the property has an HVAC system that has a gas supply. There is no -- there appears to be no history of oil being used on the site. But as a condition of any approval, the applicant is -- has engaged an environmental scientist and will provide the phase 1 environmental to the town.

MR. SACHS: Very good. All right. My second question on environmental comments, any freshwater wetlands determined on site?

MR. CARR: No, there are not, and previously, we had an LOI on the site that stipulated that. That has since expired, but the same environmental consultant is in the process of renewing that.

MR. SACHS: Okay. All right. And in terms of traffic circulation comments, obviously, if there's anything that needs to be complied with, I'm assuming the applicant will comply with that; is that correct?

MR. CARR: That is correct.

MR. SACHS: Okay. And, Mr. Chairman, I think those were the only issues I had so I think I'm fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Sachs. Are there any board questions?
Mr. Heppel, you have your hand up.

MR. HEPPEL: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Charlie, go ahead. You have to unmute yourself. There you go.

MR. HEPPEL: Am I good now, Shawn?

MR. SACHS: Yes.

MR. HEPPEL: Good.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are now, yeah.

MR. HEPPEL: Thank you. I walked the site -- around the site originally when we expected the application to be presented and walked it again prior to this evening, and I'm very glad to hear about the grading because I see how steep it is, but I also had a concern for the next street down from Pamela, which is Carol, and, you know, it sounds like everything is being taken care of the way it should be, but I would like to hear from Mr. Carr that -- again, I understand Pamela shouldn't have flooding, but that Carol, you know, this will take care of a potential flooding situation for them because that's well off of the property, but in a sense not that far. So, Mr. Carr, could you address --

MR. CARR: Yes, and Mr. Kriskowski and his staff, we've had several discussions regarding that. It is both of our concerns whenever you do an upstream development. We have -- or at least I'm assured and I'm working with John's office to make sure that he is assured that not only are we meeting the NJDEP reductions, whenever you do a development, not only do you have to meet pre and post being the same, but the DEP requires that you actually reduce it. We are meeting those, but we are also exceeding those reductions so that not only will they see less, they will see less based on regulations, we are doing better, and that's one of the reasons why we're adding the roof recharge systems. We did not include those in our calculations, but we've discussed it with Mr. Kriskowski that that's an extra measure that we're doing to just make that situation better for people.

MR. HEPPEL: Thank you very much.

MR. CARR: You're welcome.

MR. PHILIPS: Shawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sure, Joe.

MR. PHILIPS: It was me.

MR. SACHS: Steve Philips.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, Steve Philips. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: I had two questions. The first was, we're talking about the steep slope area that's on the eastern side and the measures that are being put in place as they develop and then afterwards. I guess the question is could a

homeowner come in there and cut down a whole bunch of those trees that are on the side of that slope because they don't like them.

MR. PAPE: Those are environmentally sensitive areas. We're prepared to memorialize all of that area in a conservation easement, which would make it legally improper to do that, and it would be part of the chain of title.

MR. PHILIPS: I think that's advisable because of Charlie's question also, about, you know, you start playing with the trees on the slope, and suddenly you've got a lot more issues going downstream. So if you could do that, Ken, that would be great.

And then the other question I had was more along the lines of if anybody had a crystal ball. They're talking about putting in a light at Rues Lane, and so the question I have is, anybody that would be then exiting from the lot that does have access with a car onto Rues Lane, do we know whether or not there would be issue with that person being able to make a left-hand turn. I realize that the right-hand turn is going to be okay because of the light. If the light backs up past their driveway, do we have a -- we can't have that knowledge because we don't know. There's no studies because there is no light.

MR. PAPE: The location of that driveway, Mr. Philips, was chosen with care. Jeffrey, working with a number of professionals at the county, chose the 140-foot separation and chose a design. To say it's the best design for the site and that it's an improvement over that which is currently there, two statements we're comfortably sharing with the board.

MR. PHILIPS: Okay. I just wanted to know because we don't know what the backup, if any, there would be.

MR. PAPE: Yeah, true.

MR. PHILIPS: Okay. Thank you, Shawn.

MR. BRAVMAN: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see Mr. Bravman's hands up. Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you. Mr. Kipp, is there any chance you can put the exhibit back up, the color rendering.

MR. KIPP: Sure. I'm going to share my screen.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you.

MR. KIPP: Okay, Larry.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Carr, just a couple questions. I'll start with the dark green to the right or to the east of the cul-de-sac. I think you said that was existing buffer, existing, what, tree, woodland?

MR. CARR: Those are -- yes, those are wooded areas that would remain natural, they would remain wooded, and you can see a substantial amount of that is on the stormwater management lot that will be owned by the homeowners association, and then if you look at the other two lots -- and I'll start with the one on the top first -- a substantial amount of those trees would stay, but you can see that is an extremely deep lot, and there is sufficient yard area, as well, on that, and then you can see on the bottom right lot the same thing. That lot is a large lot and looks like just by visibility, by inspection, looks like about half the lot is -- would be lawn area and open space, and about half the lot would be wooded areas, but you can see behind both of those houses, there's ample room for construction of a pool or play area, swing sets and the like, so, you know, I would expect that these lots -- and that's the value of these lots, that they are wooded, so I would imagine they'd stay wooded, and I think Mr. Pape had indicated that we would put some type of buffer easements on on at least a portion of these to make sure that the easterly boundary would stay wooded.

MR. BRAVMAN: Right, but that was the question I wanted to make sure I understood Mr. Pape's representation with the -- I'll call it the clearing restrictions. I know are we referring to I guess proposed lot 5.37, which is the lot at the top on the right, as well as the one below the proposed stormwater lot, which is proposed 5.35. I guess, Mr. Pape, is that correct, that those are the two lots that we're talking about that homeowners would not be clearing those wooded areas?

MR. PAPE: Mr. Bravman, correct, we would put --

MR. BRAVMAN: My audio go?

MR. PAPE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. PAPE: You're very --

MR. KIPP: You're good, Larry.

MR. PAPE: Am I coming through,

Mr. Chair?

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine, Ken.

MR. BRAVMAN: You are.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Bravman, that's correct. We would -- I think the best way to figure out where the line should be struck is not to use the -- rely on the choice of two green crayons that Mr. Carr but to get out there and figure out where it should be drawn, but generally, the wooded areas that are in the rear yards of those two lots would be put in a conservation easement that would restrict anything other than -- I think the normal language is dead, dying, diseased, invasive are the only things that could ever be removed.

MR. BRAVMAN: That's fine, because as long as the homeowners when they purchase these lots understand that, because while people like me, I enjoy living in a wooded lot where I live in East Brunswick, and I have no intention of clearing trees, other people buy lots and want to clear it to have the most back yard as they can. So as long as I guess you work with the professional staff and you delineate what they can or more importantly what they cannot clear, that would be great.

The second question I had along the same lines, Mr. Carr, is what is the area between the detention basin proposed lot and the lot just to the north of it, 5.37. It looks like it's actually a cleared area, that the wooded lot sort of opens up there.

MR. CARR: Yes. The lighter green area you're talking about?

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes. In other words, the dark wooded -- it looks like it's there, yeah.

MR. CARR: Right. The open lawn area is area that would have been disturbed for the stormwater management basin for either grading that gully to create the berm there, and then the wooded area would be what was left natural in those areas.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay, and do you happen to know the distance from the -- I'll call it the easternmost portion of the proposed stormwater to the residential home behind, which would be lot 30, block 133.25. Actually, on Pamela, you show the homes, but you don't show the near structures where it (audio disruption) is moving out.

MR. SACHS: You're coming in a little sketchy. I don't know --

MR. BRAVMAN: That's what I was afraid of. That's because everyone in my house is on the internet.

MR. SACHS: Tell them to -- that's why I'm in my office right now.

MR. BRAVMAN: They banished me to the basement. That's where I am.

MR. SACHS: All right.

MR. PAPE: If I can answer Mr. Bravman's question, if we can screen share one of your aerial shots. I know that amongst the exhibits that were presented earlier today are the aerials with subdivision superimposed.

MR. BRAVMAN: If you want -- okay.

MR. PAPE: There you go.

Jeff, could you just kind of describe which one of those is the basin and --

MR. CARR: The -- that one there is where the basin lot is, and the actual basin -- and you saw the -- that lighter green area, which is area that's going to be used for the stormwater management. From the top of the berm to the easterly property line is roughly 70 feet plus or minus. In one area it gets a little closer, but another area gets a little further, but basically the center of the berm is about 70 feet from the property line. So the basin, itself, where water would be held is over 70 feet from that.

MR. BRAVMAN: Right, and then that's the property line, and then I'm assuming I guess that's Edward Street, there's a home there. They have a rear setback probably from there --

MR. SACHS: That's Carol Court I think.

MR. BRAVMAN: Oh, that's Carol?

MR. CARR: Conover Court.

MR. BRAVMAN: Right. I guess that's that house that you're circling there. I was just trying to understand. They have a decent distance to the property line, as well, then.

MR. CARR: Right. They're about 50 feet. I'm scaling about 50 feet. And actually, because of elevation differences, along the easterly property line basically from the -- I'll say from the -- from the detention basin lot, that corner right there, the detention basin lot, and if you follow that to the south, that is a ridge line so that it actually falls off to the right, and they are about -- and I'm going to guess about 15 feet lower than that property line, and our subdivision falls down lower, as well. So there's a significant berm in that -- I'll call it a berm, but that will remain vegetated, so actually, that will have a benefit of screening anything on the two adjoining lots, the existing lot versus our lot.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay. I just have two

more questions, and if I may, Mr. Kipp, could you go back to the other screen, please. Okay. The first one is just to make sure I understood the -- what you're calling I guess the flag lot, which is the driveway that's going to connect to Pamela Road but only provide access to the one dwelling there.

MR. CARR: Correct.

MR. BRAVMAN: I'm just going to ask the question. I may phrase it incorrectly. Is there going to be any signage or anything on Pamela Court like at 9 o'clock where that driveway is saying it's a private drive and not a roadway out to Rues Lane?

MR. CARR: No.

MR. BRAVMAN: Or is that not necessary?

MR. CARR: There won't be, but it will look like any other residential driveway. It will have a driveway apron. It will only be roughly -- not sure of the exact width, but 12 foot wide, so it won't feel like a roadway there.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay. And then finally, the dwelling that does have the driveway access onto Old Stage -- Old Bridge Turnpike, I think we said that was going to be deed restricted so that they could not do anything further or recreate a different type of driveway, that it has to remain that way.

MR. CARR: Correct. We can put that in in any deeds, but even by the fact that any changes to that lot would have to go to the county for approval.

MR. SACHS: Right.

MR. BRAVMAN: I want to take that correlation now to the other dwelling that we talking about with the flag lot. It looks like there's a cement walk or some type of -- it's not -- obviously, I'm just saying there's walkway, yes, showing --

MR. CARR: Yes.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay. Should there also be a deed restriction that that lot shall not have any type of vehicular access constructed in the future to Old Bridge Turnpike?

MR. CARR: Yes, I would agree with that, as well.

MR. PAPE: The form of that is an access restriction easement that would be conveyed to the township. We were just --

MR. BRAVMAN: Because, yeah, I just wouldn't want the homeowner to say, oh, you know what, let's just build something out or apply to

build something out or just -- even just make a gravel road and assume they can drive on it and bring a car out.

MR. CARR: Right, and just as a point of reference, we are constructing curb and sidewalk on Old Bridge Turnpike as part of this application. So they -- anybody in the future, they would have to go to the county to have curb and sidewalk removed, which, of course, the county would deny.

MR. BRAVMAN: Right. I just wouldn't want it to even think that, you know, when the homeowner purchase that lot, let them know up front, and then from there, they'll do what they want to do, but this way it's not a surprise --

MR. CARR: Absolutely.

MR. BRAVMAN: -- they wanted to build it. Thank you, Mr. Carr. I appreciate your testimony.

MR. CARR: Thank you.

MR. KIPP: And I would just like to point out for the board -- Keith Kipp speaking -- is that we had concerns with this lot. We didn't want to have a Pamela Road address for emergency services. We wanted to keep it uniform out on Old Bridge Turnpike, and with the widening proposed by the county, we feel there's ample room for an emergency vehicle to pull in front. The addressing, the mailman will pull in front just like always, and it'll be much simpler for emergency services to locate that property.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Keith. Do we have anymore board questions?

MR. WENDELL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's Councilman Wendell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, Councilman Wendell, go ahead.

MR. WENDELL: All right. The flag lot, the retaining wall that's on there, that's going to be owned by the homeowner.

MR. CARR: Yes.

MR. WENDELL: Or is it going to be --

MR. CARR: That would be owned by the homeowner, and it's a short retaining wall. It's basically a --

MR. WENDELL: Yeah, it's 3 foot high, but --

MR. CARR: Right.

MR. WENDELL: -- my concern is the separation of the water main through the easement from the retaining wall should there ever be a

repair necessary. What's the distance from the retaining wall to the water main? I mean, you know, and what's the depth of the water main proposed? I mean, it's got to be --

MR. CARR: The water main will be about 4 feet deep, 4 feet covered on there. It is a 25-foot easement. The water main will be centered in that easement. Well, it would be roughly 10 feet off. It will be about 8 feet from that wall.

MR. WENDELL: Keith, do you feel that's enough space to properly excavate and make a repair there?

MR. CARR: There would be, yes.

MR. WENDELL: I'm just trying to avoid the case of us having to repair a retaining wall should there be a water main break there.

MR. KIPP: No, I do think that's a very good point.

MR. CARR: That is sufficient distance away for them to do any repairs that might be necessary in the future.

MR. WENDELL: I was just curious how the depth might change as, you know, we're raising up there, you know, whether we, you know, have enough room to bench a trench in that location.

MR. CARR: Certainly, we can work that out with the utility -- the stormwater department to make any adjustments if necessary.

MR. KIPP: And just to follow up on that point, Dan Losik had submitted a memo in addition to the one you addressed in August.

MR. CARR: Yes.

MR. KIPP: With the packet was a memorandum with concerns from Mr. Losik regarding maintenance of, you know, in regards to repairing a water main, and I just want to make sure that's read into the record and addressed.

MR. CARR: Yes. Basically, he had indicated that any repairs to the driveway would not be the responsibility of the township.

MR. WENDELL: Okay. Great. Glad to hear that.

MR. KRISKOWSKI: Councilman Wendell, typically, the water is 4 feet down. It's under pressure so it can be controlled. It's not going to be an excessively deep excavation.

MR. WENDELL: Okay. Thank you. And, Keith, maybe you can address this question. I mean, with all challenging grading on this property, how do we restrict homeowners from adjusting these

grades and affecting the drainage, because, I mean, we basically have sheet flow from Old Bridge Turnpike all the way down. How do we protect that from being changed? I mean, you know, people do work without permits all the time.

MR. KIPP: They do, and by ordinance, they should have -- they should come before the planning board or submit a grading plan if they're doing anything, but I think the conservation easements on the downslope side is really critical. As Mr. Philips pointed out, if you strip the trees, you're losing stabilization on though slopes. I think that's the key areas.

MR. WENDELL: Yeah, I mean, I was more concerned with even the sheet flow from the two adjacent houses on Pamela Road coming onto these certain lots and making certain that, you know, somebody doesn't start adjusting grades on their lot and disrupting the water flow on another adjacent property owner.

The other question I have is for Mr. Carr or maybe Mr. Pape. Between lots 5.34 and 5.35, you have grade change in elevation of 8 feet from the front of these houses to the back of these houses. What's the makeup of these -- the fronts of these houses going to be, because it looks like the driveways are relatively flat, so are these driveways going into a basement and then there's two stories on top of that, or are we burying half the first floor or practically all the first floor?

MR. CARR: Well, the houses, the actual houses haven't been selected yet, but some of these, not the ones on Old Bridge Turnpike, since they are relatively level sites, so to speak, but the lots you were talking about, they could actually be designed so that you pull into the garage from the street, but the backs could be either -- depending on the house design, they could either be walkout basements back there, or they could be basements with windows in the back so that half the basement or three-quarters of the basement wall is exposed so that you'd have windows out there. So there's a couple different things you can do. These are --

MR. WENDELL: I thought that grade goes up, doesn't it?

MR. CARR: Well, depends on which lot. On lot --

MR. WENDELL: Between 5.34 and 5.35 is my question.

MR. CARR: I was talking about 5.37.

MR. WENDELL: Those I understand. They will look like -- they could be a walkout basement or something of that nature, but I'm concerned with these two houses looking like three-story houses from the street.

MR. CARR: Well, we'll be dictated by -- the house design will be dictated by ordinance as far as height restrictions. We don't suspect that any height variances are proposed. So it's just a matter of picking the proper house. Like you said, it might be some type of split level there where you come into the garage and you go up half a level to a floor, but they will have to be designed to meet the height requirements.

MR. WENDELL: I mean, basement's classified as, you know, more than 50 percent of it is below grade, and these are going to be more than 50 percent below grade --

MR. CARR: Right.

MR. WENDELL: -- but I'm just thinking about the front, you know. They're going to meet the overall height requirement, but from the street, they're ideally going to look like they're three stories is my thought, and, you know, I have a little bit of a concern with that.

That's all the questions I have. Thank you.

MR. CARR: Thank you.

MR. KIPP: Mr. Criscuolo has had his hand up for a while.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm sorry, Joe. I can't see you. Go ahead.

MR. CRISCUOLO: A couple things that -- Keith, if you can go to the -- back to the color rendering there.

MR. KIPP: Okay, I'm going to share my screen.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Thank you, sir. The lot with the long driveway going to Pamela -- and I want to springboard after Mr. Wendell and concerns about water sheeting from lot to lot. That driveway creates a lot of impervious area. The slope of the driveway from what I can ascertain looks like that driveway is going to slope all the way down to Pamela; is that correct?

MR. CARR: That is correct.

MR. CRISCUOLO: How -- you know, if that water is starting up on the lot that's on Rues Lane, how are you going to guarantee that the slope of that driveway is going to get it to the street and

rather than dumping a tremendous amount of water on the lot -- on the lot, on the adjacent lot. I think it would be proper for the -- if we were to move on this subdivision, especially for that one lot where the -- that long driveway is to require them to put Belgian block curbing for the length of the driveway to get that water to the street so we can get into the detention basin rather than flooding over to adjacent lots, because I know what happens. As soon as these people are in there and that lot starts to get flooding occurring on there, they're going to be calling Mr. Kipp's office and my office and basically saying, what are you going to do about this, you know, you approved this project. So I'm concerned that that water is just going to dump on those -- that adjacent lot.

Keith and John, I ask for your input on that.

MR. KRISKOWSKI: Well, let me just offer my opinion. I'm just looking at the grading that's shown on the plan, Joe, and the way the grading is shown, it's shown that the driveway is actually lower than the adjacent lots, so if anything, water from those two lots would be draining onto the driveway and then out to Pamela Road where there's an inlet very close to that where the driveway comes in. So again, I can only base it on grading that's shown, but it seems to indicate that the water would be directed towards that driveway and not from the driveway to the adjacent properties.

MR. KIPP: Yeah, I also believe at a tech meeting we brought that up with Jeff and asked. We were concerned also with the water barreling down into the street, and we asked for an inlet to be put adjacent to that driveway.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Okay. That's what I was looking for, too, as well. All right. Just as long as we can assure that those property owners that are going to be adjacent to that long driveway aren't going to get the water flow and we have that inlet. You know, is there a possibility of putting an inlet in the driveway, as well, to capture some of that so it doesn't all come down, as Mr. Kipp said? I've seen these happen before. It's just --

MR. WENDELL: Yeah, and to your point, 5.34 is actually lower than the driveway on the adjacent lot.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Right. That's where --

MR. CARR: If that's a question of me, that is possible. When you compare this driveway to

the other driveways, obviously, there's much more impervious coverage, though as Mr. Kriskowski pointed out, the grading is such that we're not getting water onto the other lots. It's coming on here. Even though it is more impervious coverage, it really is relative -- relatively minimal amount, and it's going to go down the driveway, and then there's an inlet right at the bottom of the driveway. I don't see that additional inlet as necessary. I think it just makes more additional maintenance problems and what have you. Certainly, there are -- you know, these will be looked at when plot plans are submitted, as well, and then when houses are constructed before the CO's are issued, the grading will be reviewed. Of course, we don't have any control what happens afterwards, but -- that's between homeowners, but I think there's at least two other steps in the process, the building permit process and the construction process, that the town can be assured that there's not any grading and drainage problems in these areas.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I would just ask that our professionals take a longer and harder look at this because I could see it now, and, you know, be it 10 years, there's going to be a problem there with all this water.

Also, what is the, you know, you're talking about now even snow removal where, you know, where this driveway -- how much space is on either side of the driveway? We talk about snow removal when we talk about multidwelling complexes and so on. It's hard to ascertain how wide -- how much room is on either side of that driveway. It's a lot of shoveling for somebody to do. I just trying to get a grasp on this, and naturally, when there's snow and you berm it up on the sides and then you get a rain storm, that flooding aspect, too, we talked about that a lot on the HD Summerhill application, Hidden Oaks, and various other applications. So I just ask that the -- our professionals take a long, hard look at that and that particular situation because I'm concerned about that, as well.

Now, my second question is, over where they're putting the lot that has the drainage area, it appears that in the back I hear that you're trying to get it so it flows properly. It looks like you're taking down a tremendous amount of trees back there compared to the aerial view that Mr. Kipp just had up on the screen; is that correct?

MR. CARR: There's a fair amount of trees. I think the aerial photograph is a little misleading in that the time of year that was taken, there's a large canopy on there. Yes, there are trees that are going to be taken down. We've shown a large amount of trees to be maintained, but we have to meet the stormwater requirements both of the DEP and the township that necessitates regrading this gully area here.

MR. CRISCUOLO: And it looks like there's a limited amount of replanting of those trees on that particular part of the site; is that correct?

MR. CARR: Yeah, I think that would be a safe statement. What we show, the green circles are the street trees that will be planted around here. We have some trees and shrubs that are going to be planted on the slopes of the basin that you can see in here, but, yes, there's a limited amount of additional trees.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Well, I think in the back portion, I mean, we pride ourself on being Tree City USA and being environmentally friendly. I would like to see more trees planted back in that area. You're taking down I think a tremendous amount of trees back there, and on that lot particularly, I think there's an opportunity to do a nice regrowth of trees back there.

MR. CARR: Okay.

MR. CRISCUOLO: That's all I had, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. PAPE: This is Ken Pape. If I may, along the driveway -- you make an excellent point about the importance of maintaining the grading along the driveway. I have seen and I would offer to the board for their consideration -- I have seen where a 5- or 7-foot drainage easement is created parallel to the driveway for purposes of maintaining the grading within that area. Typically, it would have some form of a swale that made certain water pitched towards the driveway and not towards the neighbors. The drainage easement, because it runs to the township and gives the township enforcement powers, and the drainage easement because it's recorded, puts the property owner on notice, and I think that if it's acceptable to the board, it's an offer that we can make easily, and I think it addresses that point head on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I'll leave that up to

our professionals, and I trust they'll come up with a remedy to the problem, but I think it will be a concern in the future, but I leave it up to Keith and his staff and Mr. Kriskowski to come up with a solution to make -- ensure that that doesn't happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, Larry, if this is indeed approved tonight we can add that easement, not quite as a condition of approval, but make sure that gets on the record so if our staff -- when our staff looks at it further, that's an option that the applicant has already agreed to.

MR. SACHS: Yeah. Actually, Mr. Chairman, I probably recommend that we make it a condition of approval in addition to the conservation easements because it's just -- it's obviously something that would be some type of remedial measure to avoid the problem that the board has raised. So I'd make it a condition of approval. I don't have any problem with that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only reason I said what I said is if our professionals decide that it's not a good idea, I don't --

MR. SACHS: We can eliminate it. We can eliminate it, but I think Mr. Pape's offer is a valid offer.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do, too.

MR. KIPP: I'm going to stop the screen share, and, Larry, if I may, if we can just -- I believe they were dedicating a storm -- a water easement. Can we just make that a water and storm sewer easement?

MR. SACHS: We can do that. So it's a water and drainage easement, stormwater drainage easement. Okay, that's fine, and it can be really in the same location, Keith?

MR. KIPP: Yeah, Ken, and then, as Mr. Carr had referenced, we can -- when they submit an individual grading plan for that lot, we can review that and make sure if we feel additional measures have to put in, we can have them do it.

MR. SACHS: That's fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other board questions? Again, if you do, just kind of yell out because I can't see everyone.

MR. HEPPEL: Charlie.

MR. SACHS: Charlie Heppel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Charlie. Go ahead, Charlie.

MR. HEPPEL: A question to do with the trees, and if the colored rendering could go back up

again, I'd appreciate it. Mr. Carr --

MR. KIPP: I'm going to share the screen. Okay.

MR. HEPPEL: Okay. If you look at the proposed dwelling that would be closest to let's say right by Pamela but the one closer to Old Bridge Turnpike, and you'll see the trees that are near the property line, and when the ground is all leveled off, my concern is, are you going to be able to save the trees, one, because you want to obviously save the trees, and also, you don't want to see a homeowner have a tremendous expense. I believe -- and if I'm incorrect, just tell me -- that if you change the ground level, okay, which these homes are going to be pretty close to -- I think was it like 10 feet or something from the side yard setback, that that might actually end up changing the ground level when you fill in the gully and everything and do this. What is the potential for the loss of trees, or am I totally off base here?

MR. CARR: No, you're not totally off base. Of course, during the plot plan phase when we select the exact house, the house may even be in a slightly different position, but these trees here, I showed them as being retained because they're essentially on the property line, so we really can't change the grade in that area, and this lot for the most part is -- I won't say exactly level, but there's not a substantial amount of grading required on this lot. It's basically from the cul-de-sac area, from the left side of the cul-de-sac, exactly, right in about that area is where the gully begins, and then it's basically in an easterly or left-to-right location. That's where it drops off. But that area where you pointed out the trees and the ones in the back yards here that I show, which are large trees, those would be able to be retained if they're in good condition.

MR. HEPPEL: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, further board questions?

MR. KIPP: I'm going to stop the screen share.

THE CHAIRMAN: Further board or staff questions?

MR. CRISCUOLO: Shawn, one other thing. Those two houses on Old Bridge Turnpike, I've seen this happen to -- I think that the developer I think needs to ensure and make it clear to those two purchasers of those houses that the county is

prospectively going to put a traffic signal there. All I know is the one that's up a little further, you know, he buys that house and they build it and all of a sudden the traffic signal is there -- I don't know if you've ever been in a residence that's near a traffic signal at various times of the day, but, you know, I think it is important that we protect future residents and let them know that that signal could go there because they can be in their dining room eating dinner and it's just changing from red to yellow to green. I think we should require them to make proper notice to those two property owners that that's probably going to happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pape, I assume you'd have a problem with that?

MR. PAPE: No, and, Mr. Sachs, I would suggest that the best way to ensure that that notice is memorialized, there will be a homeowners association, and the master deed declaration of covenants and restrictions, historically, when I've worked in East Brunswick, I needed your approval of the full association documents prior to them being submitted for recording. I can put -- I would suggest that we could put in the special conditions section of the declaration the county's prospective plans to install a traffic signal. So it will be -- special conditions are the conditions that someone's going to -- they're going to look for them. It's the part of the association documents that you typically read.

MR. SACHS: Right. I mean, obviously, we can add some language in the homeowners association documents. As a matter of practicality, we know that no prospective -- a subsequent purchaser, for instance, probably is not going to look that --

MR. CRISCUOLO: They don't read it.

MR. SACHS: Right. You know, the only other way we can do it is -- there's only really two other ways you can do it. One of them is you can put it into the contract of sale for the first property owner, and they'll have notice of it, you know. Then they could -- it could potentially be added into a deed, a deed notification, but I'm not sure that's really necessary. So maybe the solution is you put it in the homeowners association's special section, and maybe for the first -- in the initial contract of sale to that prospective property owner you put some type of notation in

there.

MR. PAPE: That's a reasonable request.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Thank you.

MR. PAPE: No problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. SACHS: And by the way --

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other board questions or staff questions? I'm sorry.

MR. SACHS: I was just going to say, that's similar --

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Larry.

MR. SACHS: Yeah, that's similar to the notice we see in real estate contracts about the location of airports, you know, which to me never made sense, but anyway. Okay. I'm sorry, Shawn.

MR. PHILIPS: Shawn, I have one more question. Shawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then I know I see that Mayor Brees has a question.

MAYOR COHEN: Oh, you're letting me go? My question was --

THE CHAIRMAN: Drew -- yeah, sure.

MAYOR COHEN: -- when the county or when anytime we put in a light, we need to have -- often need to purchase portions of property for the light and for the power source for that. Do you know offhand right now if the county intends to use any of that land for the light and therefore need to purchase right-of-way, or is that going somewhere else?

MR. PAPE: Mayor --

MR. KIPP: I can answer that, Ken. I've been reviewing the plans with Middlesex County for the proposed signal at that intersection, and per our interlocal agreement, the township is required to obtain right-of-way, and since there is some widening and like you had mentioned, there will be some light stanchions and things of that nature and sidewalks that really don't exist right now, there will be right-of-way requirements. So the fact that they're dedicating this right-of-way is an advantage to the town right now instead of us purchasing it.

MAYOR COHEN: Well, that was why I asked it. I didn't want to have to purchase it. So okay, that answers the question.

MR. PHILIPS: Shawn, I had a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: Keith, once again --

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: -- if you could put up

that picture again, hopefully for the last time.

MR. KIPP: I'm sharing the screen.
Anthony is probably having a great time over there.

MR. PHILIPS: Keeping him busy.

MR. KIPP: Okay, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: On the lot we've been discussing for the runoff and for the retention, the large open area that was described by several of the other members of the board, they're taking a bunch of trees out. By their own topography, it looks like approximately 22 feet of down-slope between the area near Pamela and where it looks like it's getting ready to run out in that little section there. Is that supposed to be all open?

MR. CARR: I'm not sure I understand the question, but the cul-de-sac will drop from the northerly property line into our property, but because of slopes -- right, exactly down to the bulb. So that will be filled in for the roadway, but it will still slope down towards the ravine. Then it will start to slope off from the edge of the curb on the easterly side of the cul-de-sac. It will slope down. Then well have a retaining -- retaining wall, and that will have a fence along the top of the retaining wall, and you can see that there's a shrub line proposed there, as well, and this will be a decorative fence. We show a detail on there, something like -- it won't be wrought iron, but something of that nature that looks very ornate and very decorative, and then the basin will be constructed essentially at the bottom of the ravine, so we're taking advantage of the ravine, those slopes you're talking about in there, and then we will berm the lower end of the ravine. So that's why with some of the grading in there, but we'll actually take advantage of the ravine, itself, for the stormwater management system.

MR. PHILIPS: And where does the ravine end? Where do you see the ravine ending before you get to the lot that's -- that backs up to this?

MR. CARR: It basically ends -- the topography keeps -- it keeps falling off as you continue all the way down to -- to Edward Street, it keeps falling off, but it starts -- the ravine starts to I'll say widen out so that the steep slopes are basically at the head of the ravine where erosion has taken place, but once you get off our site, you'll still have a lot of slope area all the way down to Edwards, but it starts to widen out, and they become more lawn areas and sloped areas, and

I'd say it changes -- I'm not sure that I would call it much of a ravine once it gets to the end of our property.

MR. PHILIPS: Okay, well, so your proposal then would not have any replantings in that area; is that what you're saying?

MR. CARR: Well, we have some, and it's been suggested that we add some additional, but as you see on the plan here, there are street trees there. Then as I described along the retaining wall there are a row of shrubs and then scattered groupings along the berm area here that we show, and certainly, we can supplement that.

MR. PAPE: Working with your staff to create supplemental infill would not be a problem, and if that was something the board were comfortable with, we would be comfortable agreeing to work with them for that purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank you, Ken. Any other board or staff questions?

MR. KIPP: I'll stop the share.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, any other board or staff questions? Okay. So why don't we then open this application up to the public. Is there any member of the public wishing to be heard on this application? I would remind the public if they do have a question to call the number posted, which is 646-558-8656, and we will wait a minute or two. So you can get in at this time if you like.

MR. SACHS: I see two hands raised, so.

MR. KIPP: Mr. Chairman, the first one is Linda Katz, and I'm going to allow Linda to talk. Go ahead, Linda.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening. Good evening, Linda. Before you speak, I need to swear you in, so if you would please raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the whole truth, so help you God?

MS. KATZ: I do.

MR. KATZ: I do, as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please state your name and let us know where you live, Linda.

MS. KATZ: I'm Linda Katz, and I'm here with my husband, Michael Katz, and we live at 6 Conover Court.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I would ask that one of you speak at a time and then -- so you can give your questions, Linda, and then we can turn it over to your husband.

MS. KATZ: Okay. Some of the things are

things you've discussed, but as we border that eastern side of the development, we're the house that's directly behind, so we have concerns about drainage. We know that the lot behind us right now is very, very deep, and we're concerned with the regrading that we're going to end up with water on our property.

We were concerned about the trees. Right now, we obviously border a forest wooded area, and we would like it to remain so and not to be looking into somebody's, you know, window. So we had a concern about that, as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You want to get your answer to those two first?

MS. KATZ: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Carr, can you address those.

MR. CARR: The stormwater, we've talked about that at some length there, and as I indicated, I've also had several discussions with Mr. Kriskowski about that, as well, and first and foremost, we have to meet the NJDEP stormwater regulations. As part of those regulations, we must reduce the amount of runoff from the site, so we have to retain more on our site and release less. So just meeting the NJDEP requirements, we would automatically have a reduction in the amount of runoff that leaves the site.

The second thing that we've done, we've added -- we've done a couple of things. One is we've designed the basin so that it exceeds the minimum requirements of the NJDEP. Our attempt is to maximize the storage on site, minimize the runoff from there, and we had the opportunity to do so, so that's what we did. We managed the stormwater so that we provide further reductions above the NJDEP requirements.

The third thing that we did is we've implemented -- and there's no rules or regulations that require us to do so, but we provided roof recharge systems, and the idea was twofold. One is to promote recharge to the groundwater, and second, to reduce further the amount of runoff from the site, but not only from the site, we minimized the amount of runoff before it even reaches the stormwater management basin.

Now, it's important to know that in our calculations that we provided to Mr. Kriskowski's office, we did not include that, so we didn't take credit for it. It's basically a bonus that we've

implemented in the project, but that provides a further reduction in stormwater runoff.

So I am fully confident that we will not create any additional runoff on to the Katz's property or any other downstream property, and, in fact, we would actually provide a reduction of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kriskowski, would you confirm that? Would you agree with that?

MR. KRISKOWSKI: Yes, Chairman. We have worked closely with Mr. Carr, and we have expressed our concerns with the runoff from the site and understanding the steep slopes, but I do agree with his analysis. You know, he -- I believe at this point I can say that he has gone and they have gone above and beyond what would be the minimum requirements from the state, and we continue to work with them to even reduce the peak rates of runoff further as we fine tune this development and this application.

Also, there's the direction from -- the runoff is going, it actually leads the water, as it does now, where the ravine is, that's where it's going to continue to go, which is actually away from the Katz property, so, you know, I'm comfortable again with what Mr. Carr has testified to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, and as to Miss Katz's question about trees, Mr. Carr, do you want to take that one, and, staff, please listen so you can confirm the accuracy of his statement.

MR. CARR: As we've indicated, along the easterly boundary, to the extent possible, we've maintained or maximized the amount of tree save areas, and as Mr. Pape offered, we would place conservation easements in there so that future homeowners couldn't remove that vegetation. So to that extent, I think we've done what we could. We've also agreed to --

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CARR: -- add additional landscape areas in the stormwater management basin lot. So to the extent possible, we are I think addressing that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mrs. Katz, does that answer your questions?

MS. KATZ: Yeah, I mean, we're not experts so I presume that's sufficient, but, you know, we're just concerned about the edge of our property.

THE CHAIRMAN: Absolutely understood. Any other questions?

MR. KATZ: This is Michael Katz. I just

had a --

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Katz, I just want to remind you that are under oath.

MR. KATZ: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Mr. Katz.

MR. KATZ: So we noticed that you have a fence along the edge of the drainage basin area near the cul-de-sac. I assume that that's for safety reasons. I'm concerned that from our side, will we have any safety hazards created by that basin approaching it from our property?

MR. CARR: No. We will be providing a fence around the entire basin. The fence I described just a moment ago on the cul-de-sac side, that was basically at the retaining wall. That was a decorative fence. But we will be providing a chain link fence around the entire basin.

MR. KATZ: And is that something that's going to be visible from our property?

MR. CARR: For the most part -- and I won't swear that you won't be able to see it. You know, in the winter you may see it with less vegetation depending on where you stand on your property, but as a matter of course, no. The basin, itself -- and I described this earlier -- the basin lot is that entire lot, and that lot touches your property, common property line, but the basin, itself, and the top of berm is roughly -- and it's an average. It comes a little bit closer and it goes a little bit further away, but from the easterly property line, it's about 70 feet away.

MR. KATZ: Okay.

MS. CLARKE: Do you think we can give some more detail to the Katzes as far as what kind of vegetation will plant around the retention wall or in the area for them.

MR. CARR: I would imagine that -- that we would do some evergreen type shrubs that would be an four-season, basically a four-season screening so that we don't plant deciduous trees that in the winter you lose the benefit of that. So I would think that we'd plant some -- mostly evergreen plantings.

MR. PAPE: And on behalf of the applicant, we'd -- Mr. Carr's testimony is accurate, but we would stipulate that the final landscape in that area is pursuant to your professionals' requirements. We made that statement earlier and we'll repeat it here.

MR. SACHS: Mr. Chairman, if I could

just make a comment for the record. I would suggest that the conservation easements that are being provided, you know, the tree save plans and the landscaping plans, be, for lack of a better term, very aggressive plans to make sure that there's enough buffering on these properties and, more importantly, that trees are not cut down based on the fact that a conservation easement is really critical. So, you know, I'm going to just mention to John and our staff that, you know, CME, that we really got to look at this aggressively, but I'm just putting that out there on the record.

MR. KRISKOWSKI: Understood.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly pleased that the applicant so far has been willing to accept these additional ideas, so -- and I saw Mr. Pape nodding his head that he doesn't have a problem with us being aggressive.

MR. PAPE: The interesting thing is that a responsible developer is as interested in these protections as the board and the neighbors are, so we're pleased that they're coming up. The process is very valuable, and we're pleased that these opportunities to add and enhance the plan are coming up during the hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Pape. Mr. and Mrs. Katz, anything else?

MS. KATZ: The last question about the trees, and then we'll leave it go, is a lot of these are very.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know, ask --

MS. KATZ: -- very large, old trees, and I just am concerned that when you start removing some, will others be falling and causing problems, because we've had a number of, you know, big trees come down right behind our property. So that would be our last concern about the trees.

MR. CARR: We'll do everything we can during the construction process to mark trees that will remain and designate the clear areas and to the extent possible save larger trees even if they're not within any conservation easement. I'm in full agreement, and Mr. Pape had said that. It's not like the old days where you go in and clear sites. It's expensive to remove trees. You try to minimize them, and the cost of saving trees is a heck of a lot cheaper than the cost of plantings trees, and the benefit is immediate. So I'm certainly in favor of maximizing that, and we'll look at that in greater detail as each lot is developed.

MS. KATZ: Okay. Great. Thank you.
And my husband had one more.

MR. KATZ: I just had one last question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, Mr. Katz.

MR. KATZ: Roughly 15 years ago, someone was looking at developing the same site, and at that time --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. KATZ: -- at that time, we had entered into a tentative agreement for an easement. Does anybody -- and we've not heard anything about that since. We never received any remuneration for it or anything else. Does anybody have any information about what happened with that? Does that -- has that effectively disappeared, it no longer is a binding agreement, anything like that?

MR. CARR: I can say emphatically that is the case, that is correct. That person is no longer involved or associated with this project or this property whatsoever and has not been for a number of years.

MR. SACHS: Mr. Katz, I was board attorney when that project was approved. What was the nature of the easement that you had entered into with the developer at that time?

MR. KATZ: It was -- it sounds like it was for water and sewage I believe.

MR. SACHS: Oh, okay. All right. Well, obviously, they're not going to be -- they're going to be connecting from a different source. So, you know what, my recollection -- you're right -- is that I think they were going to connect water -- you're a hundred percent right. I think the connection was going to be on Conover for that other development, and this obviously, the water and sewer connection is from a different location. So.

MS. KATZ: Okay great. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And I thank you. And again, are there any other board questions from the public?

MR. KIPP: Shawn, we have one more from Joann Yonchiuk, and I'm going to enable her to speak now. Joann Yonchiuk.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hi, Joann. Before you speak -- and again, I can't see you, so I apologize. Please raise your right hand so I can swear you in.

MS. YONCHIUK: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you swear to tell the truth, so help you God?

MS. YONCHIUK: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And could you just state your name, spell your last name, and let us know where you live, please.

MS. YONCHIUK: Yes, my name is Joann -- good evening -- Joann Yonchiuk, Y-o-n-c-h-i-u-k. I live at 11 Helena Street, East Brunswick, New Jersey, but I am speaking on behalf of my family home for my parents, Julius and Barbara Bode, B-o-d-e. They live at 884 Old Bridge Turnpike. They are the adjacent property to the property that we're speaking about, 888 Old Bridge Turnpike.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gotcha.

MS. YONCHIUK: Three of the proposed lots are adjacent to our property and just -- I have -- I'm actually kind of very excited. This has been -- you just talked about this 15 years ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. YONCHIUK: We're very excited about it, a little bit of concern about it. It used to be they were going to buy -- the last people were buying a piece of my parents' property. That was in part of the development. There was more like eight or ten homes going up.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was a larger development. I think it was at least 10.

MS. YONCHIUK: Correct, correct. So my concern is -- so in the color rendering -- I can see it up here. I have it on another screen so you don't have to pull it up. So, Mr. Carr, this is probably for you. On the color rendering on the -- I guess it's -- looks where we have two dwellings on our property. We have a home and we have a three-car garage. The garage is right on the property line. I mean, I'm talking about maybe -- I can't even tell because I don't know what this scale is. So there is a group of bushes there. It looks like it's green. Oops, did I just -- no, I'm still in the meeting. Okay. So there's a bunch of bushes there, and it looks like I think there might be a fence around it. I know that there is a down slope from that dwelling down. I don't know if you're leaving those -- it's -- they're really not trees. It's really overgrown, not very nice looking brush. I know that the -- if I was the -- if I were the people that were buying that lot, that would be the first thing I would do is pull out that eyesore. I'm concerned about the rooting system right there of those trees being pulled out. Will the engineers put something in there for that? Will they do a

replanting? Will they pull that out? I'm not -- I'm just kind of concerned about there because that is pretty close to the property line and that is a down slope.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and I don't have a perfect answer on that.

MS. YONCHIUK: Okay.

MR. CARR: Typically during construction, you'll look at the various areas of vegetation and determine at that point what the value of them, and oftentimes, as I talked about with the tree canopy, sometimes they're misleading. When you look at aerial photos with the tree canopy, they lead you to believe that something is beautiful and green, and when you -- when you actually walk the site, as you described, it's not always the case. So they'll be field decisions on what to do. The grade is not supposed to change in that area, and that's kind of why we showed that area as an area that would remain vegetated, but if it's not valuable landscaping, it will be removed, and, of course, they'll have to take caution, and they can work with you on making sure that there's no disturbance to the garage area since a portion of it encroaches on both properties. And you're right, your garage is very close, literally maybe 2 to 3 feet off of the property line, but the grade won't change, so your garage structurally will be fine.

MS. YONCHIUK: Okay. Any fencing on that area?

MR. CARR: Not specifically by this developer. That would be a homeowner's choice as to whether or not they wanted to fence in their lot or not.

MS. YONCHIUK: Okay. All right. And my last concern or question is will my parents be getting any type of correspondence from your office, from the engineers or project managers, the law firm about anything that's going to -- they can foresee in the future that they need to be prepared for.

MR. CARR: That your parents would need to be prepared for?

MS. YONCHIUK: Correct.

MR. CARR: I can't think of off the top of my head what they would do. Certainly, when building permits are pulled and, you know, work begins, I mean, the first thing that would happen that would alert you to construction would be the razing, most likely the razing of the existing dwelling, though that may be used for temporary

construction uses, but I don't think there's anything in particular that would require you to be noticed on anything. I can't thinking of anything.

MS. YONCHIUK: Thank you.

MR. KIPP: Joann, I would offer up -- this is Keith Kipp. When county is doing the installation of the signal, there'll certainly be right-of-way impacts, and you'll be notified as to exactly what's going on that point.

MS. YONCHIUK: They've been there for 60 years. So like I've said, we've seen blueprints come and we've seen blueprints go, so we're pretty excited just -- I'm doing my daughterly duty by being here and listening for them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you're a good daughter.

MS. YONCHIUK: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So any other members of the public wishing to be heard on this application?

Keith, do you see anybody else in the queue?

MR. KIPP: No, I don't see any other hands raised, and I don't see any other ones.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then I'll close the public portion.

Mr. Pape, do you have anything further?

MR. PAPE: No, Mr. Chairman, only 60 seconds for a summation when it's appropriate.

MR. SACHS: Probably now, Ken.

MR. PAPE: Okay. Very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, good, Ken. You broke up for a second on my end. Go ahead.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, thank you for the opportunity to present this application. We're very, very pleased to be representing such responsible property owners. Mr. Carr has worked diligently with your professional staff to -- before tonight so that we were prepared to address concerns. I think that the issues that were brought out by the board members all were excellent points, and we were pleased to have the opportunity to address them. All of the offers that were made with regard to the association documents and the easements that are specifically designed for drainage purposes, conservation purposes, buffer maintenance, restriction on access, all of those easements in an association are your applicant's offer. We respectfully ask that the board consider this subdivision application with the two limited

bulk variances favorably this evening. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sachs, do you have anything for Mr. Pape or anything you think we need to -- before we vote on this application?

MR. SACHS: No, no, I think I have everything. Obviously, we're going to make sure that there's aggressive conservation easements on this property, deed restrictions on both the Old Bridge Turnpike lots to prevent new driveways from coming in and relocating driveways, a water and drainage easement on the flag lot, notice in the contract of sale and in the association documents about the traffic signal, and I guess the applicant also agreed to do some supplemental infill on the detention basin lot where possible. So I think those are the conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good. So any final board or staff questions?

Seeing none, what's the board's pleasure with this application?

MAYOR COHEN: Make the move to accept the --

THE CHAIRMAN: I move its adoption. It's been moved and seconded. Loren, please call the roll.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Miss Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.

MR. HEPPEL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. This application is approved. Before I let you go, though, Mr. Pape, a few -- a month or so ago we had a young attorney who shared your last name. Is he any relation by any chance?

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chairman, the first time

I appeared before this austere body was 39 years ago, and during those 39 years, not only did I practice law, but I raised a family, and that young man is my son, he has joined our law firm. Thank you for recognizing him.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I can tell you he was a delight to deal with. I would say that you better keep your eyes on the ball, dad, or your days are going to be numbered. So he was a terrific young man, and congratulations on the wonderful addition to your firm.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chairman, thank you, and to all the board members this evening, thank you and good evening.

MAYOR COHEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening.

MS. CLARKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Loren, we're going to take about a 5-minute break, and then we'll come back for the second application.

MS. MORACE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just to let you know, during that second application, my iPad might die, and then I'll have to call in. So if you lose me temporarily, I'll call back in on the phone number.

MS. MORACE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: But we're recessed for about 5 minutes.

MS. MORACE: All right. Plug it in, Shawn.

(Board recess)

THE CHAIRMAN: We're back. Our next application, the applicant is the Beth Abraham Cemetery. Is there anyone here on that application, and I'm having -- I don't see anybody else on my screen.

MS. CLARKE: Chairman Taylor, I have to recuse myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Julie.

MS. CLARKE: Okay?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yup.

MS. CLARKE: Can I stay and listen this way? Is that okay.

MR. SACHS: You can -- yeah, Julie, why don't you --

THE CHAIRMAN: Larry, what's --

MR. SACHS: That's okay. She can listen. Why don't you turn your video off and mute yourself. That's fine.

MS. CLARKE: Okay. Gotcha. Thanks.

MR. SACHS: And just for the record, I know Miss Clarke is recusing herself because I believe she borders on the Beth Abraham -- her house borders on the Beth Abraham Cemetery.

MS. CLARKE: That is correct. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gotcha.

MS. KASSETTA: Mr. Chairman, just making sure everyone can hear me. That's all.

THE CHAIRMAN: I couldn't hear you. You cut in and out. Allyson.

MS. KASSETTA: Okay. I'm sorry. Was someone else going to say something?

MAYOR COHEN: We can hear you fine.

MS. KASSETTA: Good.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can now hear you fine, Allyson. Is it all right if I call you Allyson?

MS. KASSETTA: Sure. Absolutely. So good evening, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sachs, do we have --

MR. SACHS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The board -- yes, Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the affidavit of publication, proof of service, and the notices provided by Miss Kasetta's office, and, yes, we do have jurisdiction for this application this evening.

So, Miss Kasetta, you can proceed.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you, Mr. Sachs.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Kasetta, please proceed.

MS. KASSETTA: Good evening, everyone. Allyson Kasetta from the firm of Prime & Tuvel appearing on behalf of the Beth Abraham Cemetery Association. This is an application for preliminary and final site plan approval with associated bulk variances for the property located at 617 Cranbury Road. It's block 319, lot 18.09. It's located in the R-2 residential zone and currently developed with a cemetery.

What the applicant's proposing to do by way of this application is to demolish an existing cemetery office building and replace it with a new one, to make some upgrades within the existing maintenance building that is next to the office building, and then to make some associated site improvements, which you'll hear more about from our witnesses.

I want to note that we initially filed this application with the zoning board. We believed at the time that we needed a use variance, but then

the township made the determination that we, in fact, did not need that, and the application was then transferred to you.

So with the use variance not an issue any longer, the variances that we're requesting, again, all bulk variances, several relate to a freestanding sign that the applicant proposes to refurbish. Those are the sign area, sign setback from the right-of-way, sign setback from another freestanding sign, which I note is an existing condition, and sign height, which is also an existing condition.

And then the board engineer identified a couple of other variances that are required, which we will go ahead and request. Those are for a gravel parking area where it's not permitted, concrete wheel stops within that parking area, also not permitted, and then light spillage along the property line, and you'll hear from our witnesses why we believe those conditions are justified and why we believe we can satisfy the criteria for the relief that we're requesting.

Just want to note that the board engineer also identified two more items, but we will agree in testimony to comply, and so we will not require variances for an electric vehicle charging station -- we will stipulate to add one of those -- and then also to add two additional trees along the parking area. That was another nonconformity that the board engineer identified.

With that said, the witnesses that I intend to present are our engineer and planner, who is Jason Fichter, and our architect, who is Stephen Carlidge. We also have with us tonight some representatives of the applicant, who can answer any questions that the professionals aren't able to answer, and our traffic expert, Gary Dean. I don't think at this point that we'll need to provide direct testimony from him, but he can answer any questions that might come up.

So with that said, unless there are any questions for me, I'd like to call on Jason first.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good evening, Mr. Fichter. Would you please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear to tell the whole truth, so help you God?

MR. FICHTER: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Can you state your name, spell your last name, and give us a bit of your CV, please.

MR. FICHTER: Yes, Jason Fichter. Last name is F-i-c-h-t-e-r. I have a bachelor of science in civil engineering from Lehigh University. I'm a co-founder of Insight Engineering dating back to 2003, a licensed engineer, licensed planner, both in the State of New Jersey, and I've been accepted by about 80 boards throughout the state. I've been testifying since -- I don't know, we're coming close to 20 years now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you ever been here in East Brunswick before?

MR. FICHTER: You know, I don't think I have. I've literally been to all corners of the state, so it's always exciting to be able to add one to the list, so I'm happy to be here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you've tried the rest, now you've come to the best, and we're right smack dab in the geographic center of the state.

MR. FICHTER: Your reputation precedes you.

MS. KASSETTA: Mr. Chairman, does that mean the board will accept him as an expert?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we're happy to accept him as an expert.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you.

MR. FICHTER: Thank you very much.

MS. KASSETTA: Jason, so that I don't have to interrupt you, would you just identify the two exhibits that you prepared that were not part of the plans that were previously submitted.

MR. FICHTER: Okay, so these were not submitted to the board ahead of time, correct?

MS. KASSETTA: Yes, the two exhibits for tonight.

MR. FICHTER: Now, am I to share my screen? Is that how it goes?

MR. SACHS: If you can, and let's -- we'll mark it -- if it's not part of the record already, we'll mark it as A-1 with today's date.

MR. FICHTER: Okay. Let me find what we need. Here we go. So you should be seeing an aerial exhibit.

MR. SACHS: Yup, there we go.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are.

MR. FICHTER: Excellent. All right. So this is -- this is an aerial exhibit that we prepared using aerial photography. We outlined the site with a dark black line, and then that blue or cyan line represents the 200-foot radius around the property. The proposed project right off of the

site plan that we submitted is colorized and placed along the frontage of Cranbury Road, and the exhibit is titled Site Exhibit, and I'm going to zoom in to the date, today's date, 1-13-21. That's the first exhibit. The other exhibit that we'll look at, also prepared under my direction, this is basically a zoom-in of the one you saw without the aerial photography. We took the site plan from the plans and colorized it for clarity, and we called it Site Exhibit, also dated 1-13-21.

MR. SACHS: All right, so just for the record then, A-1 is an aerial exhibit prepared by your office, and A-2 is a colorized rendering of the site plan prepared by your office.

MR. FICHTER: Site exhibit, correct.

MR. SACHS: Thank you.

MR. FICHTER: Yup. Okay. So, Allyson, would you like me to run through it all?

MS. KASSETTA: Go ahead. I just wanted to do that first so that I didn't have to interrupt you.

MR. FICHTER: Right. Now I can flip between them. Excellent. Okay. So again, Beth Abraham secretary -- secretary -- Cemetery, this site has been here for many decades, as you all know. The overall site, which I'm showing on the aerial exhibit on the screen, is about 23.75 acres, and then the project area, itself, down by Cranbury Road, as you can see in the exhibit, that's only about 1 acre. We're in the R-2 zone, and that's known as the single-family suburban residence district. Cemeteries are not a permitted use in this zone, but as you heard Allyson mention in her opening that based on some legal criteria, it's been interpreted as a permitted use, and that's really based on the fact that the cemetery has been there for so long and is legally existing.

We have 475 feet of frontage on Cranbury Road. That's also County Route 535, and the improvements that we're proposing are essentially along that frontage.

One of the things we always have to look at, not the case here, the site is not in a flood hazard area.

So the simple summary of the application is that the applicant wishes to provide an indoor area for burial ceremonies where they're occurring outdoors today no matter the weather, so that's really the impetus for filing this application. It's not an expansion of the cemetery; it's simply a

means to provide shelter for the ceremonies that are already occurring.

We're proposing to use two existing driveways. There's a northern driveway. If you guys can see my hand on the screen, there's a northern driveway that's used for ingress, and then there's a southern driveway that is used for egress, and then the proposed development occurs right between those two existing driveways.

I'm going to flip over to the site exhibit now so we can zoom in a little bit. Cranbury Road is on the bottom of the screen. Working back from the road, we have a proposed stormwater basin. Then we have the gravel parking lot with 43 parking spaces and two-way travel. Then we have a decorative paver driveway, and that's mainly for the convenience of the drop-offs at the door of the proposed building, which is right in this area here, and then we have the building, itself. Behind --

THE CHAIRMAN: Jason, is it true that when you get dropped off here, it's a one-way trip?

MR. FICHTER: The downside to the business model is you can only pay once.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry about that.

MR. FICHTER: We're all thinking it.

Behind the proposed building is the existing maintenance garage, and within that building, not an expansion, but within that building, we're proposing to renovate bathrooms and an office, and then the remainder of that building is going to remain as maintenance and storage. The reason the restrooms are being proposed in that building is for use during outdoor ceremonies in good weather, and then the office is for the maintenance personnel that are in that building already anyway.

So in terms of utilities, the -- and by the way, you don't see it here, but generally in the same location of the proposed building is where that existing caretaker building is. So the existing maintenance garage and the proposed-to-be-demolished caretaker building, they are served by utilities, and we're proposing to reuse those utilities for the proposed building.

Once the MEP engineers get into their design -- those are the engineers that really dig into the utilities, and that occurs much later in the process than now, so we don't have that information yet -- they may determine -- we don't

know -- they may determine that upgraded utility services will be required, and if that's the case, then we'll work with each utility company to satisfy their requirements.

Sewer is currently handled by a septic system, and what we're proposing to do is connect the proposed building and the maintenance garage to the public sewer system, and in order to do this, we're proposing to pump the sewer to the public main, which is located in front of the post office, which is just north of the site and across Cranbury Road.

For stormwater management, the project is considered major development, and the stormwater management design here is very simple, and we don't get this opportunity much anymore these days. We had some space. So what we're doing is we're capturing runoff from the project area and we're sending it to a surface infiltration basin, and that's what you see on the site plan here. That basin provides water quality treatment, and then for runoff from the larger storms, it's connected to an existing stormwater pipe that's about 33 feet west of the basin. You could see the outlet structure from the basin in the exhibit on the basin's left side and then a manhole about 33 feet west or to the left of that, which connects it to the existing county drainage pipe, which then flows downstream, and obviously, we're going to have to work with the county for approval to make that connection, but it seems to us that that's the obvious solution, and I'm confident the county will work with us on that.

Our design meets the requirements for water quality treatment and runoff quantity reductions. We also happen to be providing groundwater recharge since this is an infiltration basin, and sometimes that is a requirement for major developments, but in this case, it's not just based on the state planning area that this site is located in, but regardless, because it's an infiltration basin, we're providing groundwater recharge.

So there's an existing driveway, as I mentioned before, on the north or east side of the frontage, and that's going to remain as the ingress driveway, and then we also have the driveway on the south or the west side that's going to remain as the egress driveway. So as a vehicle enters the site -- there we go -- as a vehicle enters the site, the driver is going to have the option to either enter the parking lot or proceed to the drop-off at the

front of the proposed building. And then for the drivers that do proceed to the drop-off area, they can then continue to the parking lot, and they can circulate as needed. And then when exiting, vehicles from wherever they're coming from, either the drop-off area or the parking lot, they simply continue along the existing egress drive down to Cranbury Road.

There was a comment --

MS. KASSETTA: Jason, just a quick follow-up on that because there was a question in the board engineer's report. Since we had shown arrows in the parking lot as having only one-way traffic, could you confirm for the board that we have sufficient width to provide for two-way traffic in that parking lot.

MR. FICHTER: Yeah, that was just a simple illustration error that we will fix on the plans. This parking lot is designed for two-way travel. So that's -- yeah, that's no problem.

MR. BRAVMAN: Mr. Fichter, I'm sorry. It's Larry Bravman speaking. If someone comes in, what happens with the conflict if they go all the way -- okay, so they loop or they go through the -- I forgot what you called it, the -- they don't go -- right, they go up there and they now come to the end, make a left, go into the parking area, and there's no parking. They get all the way back. What's the conflict area now with cars coming in and I guess everyone having to do the loop again?

MR. FICHTER: Right, that would be the circulation is that loop as needed, right. That's the intention, that's correct.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay.

MR. FICHTER: All right, so there was a comment in your engineer's review letter that the driveway from Cranbury Road, which I'm going to assume is both, but I think the focus was this south driveway here, has to be paved, you know, back to this area here, and that is our intention. The applicant will comply. The intention is that the ingress drive, the pavers, and then the road back out to Cranbury Road, that would be a paved area.

There was also a comment in the letter about those pavers being able to support all vehicles, for example, an emergency vehicle like a fire truck, and that's no problem. We plan to comply with that, as well.

Now, in terms of parking, your ordinance requires one parking space for every 75 feet of

gross floor area, and we comply by providing 43 parking spaces with those two handicap spots. We're proposing to construct the parking area with gravel, and then wheel stops are proposed to delineate each space, and we did this for a couple of reasons. First, gravel is a good solution for parking lots that are only used intermittently, like this one, and then secondly, there is an environmental benefit because without curbs, stormwater runoff can sheet flow directly onto pervious areas, which is a method that's encouraged by the DEP to improve water quality, and, of course, gravel gives an opportunity for runoff to recharge directly in to the ground. I know that's a controversial subject is gravel in parking areas pervious or impervious. I don't intend to argue that. I'm just offering that no matter the situation, if water is sitting on gravel versus pavement, whatever the quantity may be, there's more opportunity for water to get through into the ground through gravel. So that was the logic behind why we were proposing the gravel parking space.

There was a comment in the review letter that your ordinance requires that electric vehicle charging station, and as Miss Kasetta said, we are happy to comply with that requirement, so we will happily make that change.

There is a refuse container that exists next to the maintenance building between the maintenance building and the proposed building. It's there today, and the intention is that it will remain in that location and serve the proposed building. The good news is collection of refuse is managed by a private hauler so the frequency of pickup can be adjusted if and as needed.

For lighting, we're proposing seven LED lights mounted to the proposed building, and that's all around. So we have light all around the building. They're mounted at 15 feet high, and they're all directed downward. We have two pole mounted LED lights in the parking lot. Those are both at 22 feet high. And then we have one pole mounted LED light in the entrance drive. That's at 22 feet high. And then we have two LED pole mounted lights along the exit drive, one down by the access point and one up closer to the parking lot. One of those lights already exists on the utility pole, and then the second one is proposed to be mounted on an existing utility pole, and those are mounted at 20 and 22 feet high.

All in all, the design lights up the project very nicely. Between the parking area, the paver area, around the building, it's focused on the area of activity that will occur around this building, so that works out very nicely.

There's no spillage to any neighbors except for a neighbor to the west that I'm highlighting that area on the exhibit, basically to the left of the basin, if you will. I don't see an issue with this. I did analyze this, and that's why we put the plan out that way. For one thing, our lighting analysis doesn't account for the existing vegetative buffer along that property line. It doesn't show up on this exhibit, but I believe if we go to the aerial exhibit and I zoom in a little bit, you're going to see there's a pretty substantial vegetative buffer along that property line there, and if you were to look at a street view or a picture from the street, you're going to see there's a very substantial vegetative buffer there and a very tall one.

So with that said, I think limited if any light is going to get through to the neighbor's property to begin with. The maximum -- if there was no trees there, the maximum amount of light along that property line varies and gets up to a maximum of only one and half foot-candles, which is a modest amount of light.

The second thing is that neighboring lot, which you can see -- I'm going to zoom out a little bit -- you can see on the aerial exhibit, that is a commercial lot, and the portion of the property that we're talking about is a parking lot. The building, itself, is about 225 feet away from the property line.

And then third, the third consideration about the spillage is oftentimes when we talk about light spillage onto neighboring commercial property, the neighbors are happy to receive that free light for the safety and convenience of the people on their property.

The landscaping -- the property, itself, is pretty well framed in by an existing vegetative buffer, which we can see on this aerial here, the perimeter all the way around, and if I was to zoom out and look at the whole thing, almost the entire perimeter of the property is surrounded with that vegetative buffer. Our goal with the landscape design was to provide foundation plantings around the building and then provide trees throughout the

parking area. This really isn't so much for aesthetics as viewed from the neighbors and the public. Because of the substantial nature of the perimeter plantings on the property, what we're proposing really isn't going to be visible by anybody else except those on the property, so that was the goal with that design.

There was a comment in the review letter -- I'm going to go back to the site exhibit. There was a comment in the review letter that two more trees are required in the parking lot, and we are -- we are happy to add those trees to comply with that requirement. That's an easy one.

In terms of signs, there's an existing sign near the egress drive, and that identifies the property. Coincidentally, it exists in the county's right of way. If it was any further back into the property, the sign would be hidden by that substantial tree line that's right along the right-of-way line of Cranbury Road. So our initial intention in our initial iteration of the plan when we sent it out was to keep that sign as is. The applicant was happy with it, and it was kind of pinned where it was for visibility. But then the applicant decided that the project is a good opportunity to refresh the sign face, so they plan to install a new face on the sign using the existing supports. Then as the project carried forward, we got a review letter from the county, and they want us to add sidewalk along Cranbury Road so we had to move the sign back about 4 feet. It's still in the right-of-way, but again, if we push it any further back, it's going to be hidden in the trees. It's already under the tree canopy as it is. It's a very low tree canopy. They're evergreen, and it's already below, so it's starting to lose visibility, but we're right on the cusp there of being back about as far as we can go.

And then we're also proposing directional signs on the ingress drive. They both say Beth Abraham Cemetery, and then there's a directional arrow that says entrance. There was a comment in the review letter that those may not be considered directional signs, and clarity was requested. We took a look, and this was a victim of iteration of plans. We have the wrong detail on the plan, which is why I'm telling you now. The signs actually say Beth Abraham Cemetery with a directional arrow, which by the definition of your ordinance makes it a directional sign, and I believe

that no variances would be required for those signs at the entrance drive.

And then the signs last I heard are intended to be internally illuminated, which I believe your ordinance does permit.

So moving on to variances, we have a number of variances that are related to that sign. I'm going to call it the existing sign that's being tweaked that had the evolution of starting out to remain, and then a reface, and now it's moved back, so it's basically a duplicate of the existing sign with new material, 4 feet back from where it is, and there's a number of variances that are associated with that, and I'll run you through them briefly.

So the first is the maximum freestanding sign area permitted in your ordinance is 6 square feet, and we're proposing 8.8 square feet. So again, it's for the existing sign, and we're just moving it back to make way for the sidewalk that's required by the county. It's really an existing condition, as I said, just moving it back and tweaking it.

Then we have the minimum freestanding sign setback from the right-of-way. Your ordinance requires 10 feet, and the sign exists in the right-of-way, and as we push it back, it still happens to be in the right-of-way. It's getting closer to the property, but again, we can't go back any further without that sign losing visibility and becoming somewhat useless and not identifying the property at that drive.

The maximum freestanding sign height is permitted at 5 feet. We're proposing 6 feet, and that's really existing condition being returned to the proposed condition. Just asking to maintain what's already there.

Then there's the minimum freestanding sign setback to an adjacent freestanding sign. Your ordinance requires a hundred feet. We have 73.9 feet from that existing sign to the neighbor's sign, which it shows up on this exhibit right here. So that's an existing condition. Again, our sign is very small at 8.8 square feet. The neighbor's sign is more of a traditional commercial sign. So that will -- that will dominate the visibility of the streetscape.

I would characterize these variances as C-1 hardships due to the existing nature of the sign, but I think relief can be supported under the C-2 criteria, as well.

Next variance we're requesting, which I would categorize as a C-2 or flexible C variance, is for the gravel parking area where your ordinance does not permit gravel parking areas. Again, without fully repeating my earlier testimony, we're proposing the gravel parking area because it's only used intermittently and for the environmental benefits of allowing the runoff to flow to pervious areas.

Now, with that, we're proposing the concrete wheel stops, and their intention is to delineate the parking spaces permanently in the gravel parking lot, and interestingly, your ordinance does not permit concrete wheel stops. This happens to be a design waiver, not a variance, but I mention it here because it's directly related to the gravel parking lot that we're requesting.

And then lastly, we have the variance for light spillage along the property line. Again, that's that western property line along the exit drive. Again, summarizing my earlier testimony, three's -- we have that existing vegetated buffer along the affected property line. The max spillage varies, and the max is only 1 and a half foot candles. The neighboring lot's a commercial lot. The closest portion of that lot is a parking lot. The neighbor's building is 225 feet away from the property line, and I would think that the commercial neighbor would welcome any free light that gets through, although I don't think any will.

So there's a hardship element here due to the close proximity of the existing driveway to the property line, making it difficult to prevent spillage altogether, but I'm going to provide supportive testimony under the C-2 criteria, as well.

So in support of these variances, particularly the C-2's, I have to demonstrate to you that at least one purpose of planning is advantaged if this application was to be approved. I think there's a few that are advanced by this. The first, I think this is an appropriate development which promotes general welfare. I think this project represents a very nice upgrade to the existing cemetery, and it's going to provide an enhanced experience for its visitors during burial ceremonies. I think we're securing safety from flood. This is where the gravel parking lot comes in, allowing the runoff to flow to pervious areas and providing an opportunity for runoff to recharge

into the ground, and, of course, we're also proposing the stormwater management basin, which is going to reduce runoff, period, from the site. We're providing adequate light, air, and open space. The sign variances we're requesting are all related to that existing sign. Again, we just need to move it back to make room for the sidewalk that the county is requiring of us, and the applicant has taken the opportunity to recreate the sign essentially in kind. It's modestly sized, and it's in almost the exact same location. So I don't see any impact by the sign on light, air, and open space.

Going to the negative criteria, I don't anticipate any adverse impacts by the proposed sign. Once the project is built, the new sign I believe is going to appear virtually the same as the existing sign. Even at its modest size, it's been there long enough that it's part of the background of the streetscape I would think. Gravel parking lots are not unique. In this case, I think it's appropriate for the intermittent use, and I don't anticipate any adverse impacts.

Regarding the lighting, I went through some points to consider a couple times, and without repeating them, I think they support the idea that no adverse impacts will be created.

And the relief that we're requesting tonight I believe is very modest. If you take away the variances related to that existing sign, we're only left with light spillage and gravel parking lot being the relief that we're requesting. So with that in mind, I'd say that the project is in substantial conformance with your ordinance and zone plan.

So all those things considered, I think if you were to approve this application, we would not cause a substantial detriment to the public, nor do I believe we would substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan. And as you consider the negative criteria, I always like to highlight the word substantial. You're not evaluating to see if approving this application would cause a detriment to the public or an impairment to the zone plan. You're looking to see if it would cause a substantial detriment or a substantial impairment, and I don't believe that this application rises to the level of substantial in either case. And then on balance, I believe that the benefits of this application substantially

outweigh its detriments, if any, giving you the ability to approve this application with confidence.

That's all I have.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you, Jason. Just two very quick follow-up questions. You mentioned the CME report a few times, but have you had a chance to review the full packet of staff reports that were issued for this application?

MR. FICHTER: I did. I did not see anything in those reports that would cause a substantial change to the design. I think some of the reports had no comment. Some had some minor comments. For the comments that require action, I see no issue complying with those.

MS. KASSETTA: So that was going to be my next question. We can confirm that any technical comments, we can work to satisfy the authors of those reports.

MR. FICHTER: That's correct.

MS. KASSETTA: And then since Cranbury Road is a county roadway, can you just very briefly tell the board about our application and where things stand with them.

MR. FICHTER: We made an application to the county, and we got a very thorough review letter back. Same story. That's part of the review letters I'm referring to. There was a number of comments in there that require action, but generally, I would classify it as a supportive review letter, nothing dramatic in there with the county, so we'll continue to work with the county to secure their approval.

MS. KASSETTA: So I guess we would ask this board if they were to grant approval to just make the county approval a condition, as is typical in this situation.

MR. FICHTER: Yes, please.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good. Are there any board questions for this witness?

MR. BRAVMAN: I have a couple, Shawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, go ahead, Larry.

MR. BRAVMAN: I guess I'm not yet sold on the request for the gravel parking lot. I need to hear a little bit about more of the operations maybe because I guess the testimony was one of the reasons is the intermittently used use of the lot, yet we haven't heard anything about the use. I would almost take it that the lot's going to be used

every time someone's on the property, and anyone coming to the property for any type of funeral, burial, are absolutely going to use it, and I guess it leads me to being concerned that lots such as that tend to have dust, tend to have mud, don't always -- in light of the fact that they're not pervious, there's going to be ponding, there could be mud forming, and I guess it's not as inviting. I could be wrong. I'm just giving you a lay opinion of what I believe when I've gone to places that have a gravel driveway. I think I would like to hear a little more from the applicant on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, Larry, I concur completely. That was my concern. Also, I think we have to factor in that the people who intermittently -- we can define that term -- will be using this lot are there for mourning at a sad time, are frequently older people who are -- and I'm rapidly approaching that category -- who may not be as steady on their feet, and gravel parking lots can be difficult to maneuver. They are often not maintained as much as they should be. So I have real concerns about using a gravel driveway at this location for the intended purpose because I could see, you know, an older person who is there mourning the loss of a loved one or a friend when they're upset as it is trying to navigate a gravel parking lot, hitting a large stone, and having an accident, and I would feel terribly if we approved what I consider creating an unsafe situation.

MR. CRISCUOLO: The handicapped spots can't be gravel.

MR. FICHTER: That's correct.

MR. SACHS: Shawn, can I make a suggestion of counsel. Perhaps you can put on your witness for operations because I have a number of questions. Obviously, I'm familiar with this site. I've been to a number of funerals there. Also familiar with how Jewish cemeteries operate. So I'd like to hear a little bit about the operations of what this building is going to entail and what's going to occur there.

MS. KASSETTA: Understood, Mr. Sachs.

MR. SACHS: Okay.

MR. FICHTER: I was going to say, before I get to that, Allyson, would you like me to address the comments that I've heard so far.

MS. KASSETTA: You know what, I'm thinking it's better to have the architect give his testimony because he will discuss a little bit more

about what's going to be going on in this building, and I think we can just put the parking lot issue aside for the moment. We hear your concerns. Let me confer with my clients a little while our architect is testifying, and then we can come back to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we do this. Why don't we do any questions for Jason not regarding the gravel drive.

MS. KASSETTA: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we try to get those out of the way, and then we can put your architect on.

So are there any board or staff questions?

MR. PHILIPS: Shawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: I have a question. The conflict point as it was described when you go through, drop somebody off or you go back to the parking lot to park. Then you get to the end of the parking lot again, and you really only should be able to make a left-hand turn because the entrance is right in front of you. Is there any intention to have some sort of signage right there to stop people from going in the out or out the in -- excuse me.

MR. FICHTER: That was one of the technical comments that was in the review letter, and that's an easy fix. We're happy to do that.

MR. PHILIPS: Thank you.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Well, I think there's signage that's required in the entire circulation. There's a need for One-Way signs. There's a need for Do Not Enter signs. There's also needs for proper striping in the walkways from the handicapped spots to the buildings and the general parking area to the building. There's -- I didn't see any striping planned, as well, and I share the concern deeply on the gravel parking lot. What are you going to do when it snows? Where is the snow going to go? Where are you going to pile it up, you know.

MR. FICHTER: The snow is an easy one. We don't get to this opportunity very often. More often sites are tighter and more heavily developed. The topography of the site drains from the proposed building down toward Cranbury Road, so any snow that's going to be cleared from the parking lot, for example, would be pushed into this open area over here, which would then just drain into the basin. So that's --

MR. CRISCUOLO: I'm talking of specifically what Mr. Bravman said, plowing of a gravel parking lot. I've seen what has happened. And I share the concerns with our chairman with people coming into the building, as well. I think the handicapped spots -- I think you need a dual van accessible spot there, as well, because I share the chairman's concern that you may have multiple people that have and need handicapped access, and you might even want to increase that, you know, knowing -- dealing with, you know, senior centers and older populations -- and we're already there, Shawn, I hate to tell you, but, you know, I am very concerned about that gravel parking lot, and that is why the ordinance doesn't allow it. That's the specific reason. So let's hear from the remainder of you, but I share Larry's concern and Shawn's concern.

MS. KASSETTA: Understood.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other board -- any other board questions?

MR. WENDELL: Yes, Councilman Wendell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excluding the parking lot.

MR. WENDELL: It's excluding the parking lot. My questions are excluding the parking lot, but I don't know if they're directly related to this witness. It wasn't until I got this application, but I figure if the attorney's going to be contacting the client, get some answers on these. It wasn't until I got this application, and as a councilman, I get around town a lot, but I wasn't aware that this property actually extends to the corner of Buckingham and Winchester. That looks like it's a, you know, if you drive in there, it looks like the retention basin or something that's there, and it just never looks like it's maintained well. The fencing is always, you know, falling apart and things of that nature. So I was hoping with this, you know, that we get some kind of improvement there, too, because I heard from neighbors and residents of Buckingham Estates about this, and, you know, I'm a little concerned. If we've got the money to do these improvements on this property, we should be maintaining the perimeter to our neighbors.

And secondly, it's been brought to my attention by a number of neighbors in Buckingham that there's like a lumber operation going on in this site in the rear of this property. Now, I actually have it up on Google Earth right now.

There's piles and piles of wood almost straight back behind this maintenance building all the way back along the adjacent property line adjacent to Buckingham, and people tell me that they hear chainsaws running there pretty regularly. So if you can find out some information on those two things for me.

MS. KASSETTA: Councilman, on that note, we received a review letter from the code enforcement officer, and the piling of the lumber was one of the items. There were about four items in her letter. And I can confirm to you that all of her comments were addressed, including the removal of that lumber. I can't comment on any sort of ongoing storage, but I can tell you that everything was removed, everything that was mentioned in her letter.

MR. WENDELL: Okay. Great. Thank you. And if you can find out about maintaining the exterior perimeter around the --

MS. KASSETTA: I mean, I think the board would be reasonable to impose a condition, you know, requiring maintenance of the exterior so that it remained clean.

MR. WENDELL: Terrific.

MR. CRISCUOLO: What is the wood operation going on there?

MR. WENDELL: I don't know, but if you go on Google Earth, you can see piles of wood, and it's all the way back, almost straight back behind the maintenance building at the property line adjacent to the Buckingham Estates homeowners, and there's, like, piles of cut wood, piles of looks like tree trunks, and all of that.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Keith, do we know anything about that?

MR. KIPP: No, I don't know about any woodcutting operation, but like Allyson had mentioned, Kristi did bring it up at code enforcement as to existing on the site and something that we wanted to see cleaned up.

I do have an additional comment. I'm definitely not a fan of the gravel parking lot due to -- I wouldn't want my wife in heels getting out and trying to walk across that, but to the point of Jason regarding the storm drainage and the sheet flow, I would prefer to see a small timber guide rail protecting that. That way you can remain to have your sheet flow, yet you don't have to worry about those bumper blocks being knocked around by

snow plows, because they always become extremely disorganized.

MS. KASSETTA: So I think I can put the whole gravel issue to bed so we can move on. I had a chance to confer with my clients, and they are willing to agree to pave the parking lot instead, so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great.

MR. FICHTER: Can I make one request on that or throw something out so we can figure this out, as well. If we're going to pave the parking lot, which it sounds like we're going to do, I'm hopeful that we can do it without curbs so we've done the whole -- we've done away with the pervious nature of gravel and that kind of thing, but I think it would still be very nice because this site accommodates it to allow the runoff to run -- to sheet flow off of the pavement into the pervious area toward the basin rather than curbing it, putting it in a pipe, and sending it to a basin. That would be contrary to what the DEP tries to get us to do. So if you'd be agreeable to that, I think that would be a wonderful compromise.

MR. KIPP: And where do the bumper blocks go in that plan?

MR. FICHTER: Well, if we're going to pave it, we don't need bumper blocks because we can stripe the pavement. That was the purpose of the wheel stops was to delineate the spaces because you're not going to paint gravel, but if we're going to pave it, we'll stripe it. We don't need -- we can do the timber guide rail.

MR. SACHS: Hey, Shawn, maybe we need John and Jim to weigh in on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. LAMBERT: Mr. Chairman, this is Jim speaking.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hey, Jim.

MR. LAMBERT: I don't -- at the discretion of the board, of course, I don't see the timber guide rail being a problem.

MR. SACHS: And what about the issue of water draining just sheet flow into the detention basin; you're comfortable with that?

MR. LAMBERT: Well, provided that there's a slope on the pavement so it doesn't pond. It needs to get off the pavement in some fashion. It could sheet flow at a half a percent or preferably three-quarters of a percent across the lot toward the basin.

MR. SACHS: Okay.

MR. FICHTER: Agreed.

MR. SACHS: All right.

MR. BRAVMAN: I'm sorry, just -- Larry Bravman. I understand the applicant's asking to not do I guess concrete curb around the parking lot, and he indicated so that the water can flow or now sheet flow into the basin area. We can still concrete curb three, you know, the three sides of it and leave the one side by the basin area open. That will allow all the water to direct that way, even with the slope or even with the pinch. There's no reason not to then have the concrete on the other areas. Aesthetically it will be nicer. It will define the area. There won't be overflow if there was to be any, and it will just permit the direction of the water flow.

MR. FICHTER: If that's the pleasure of the board, we can certainly do that. My thought in presenting this idea was to have no curb and just allow all that water just to sheet flow straight across pavement, pervious pavement, pervious right into the basin. If we're going to put curb on that paver driveway up to the front of the building, for example, we're going to get into inlets and pipes, which is what I was hoping to avoid for the environmental benefit of it. It's not very often we get a site that has a nice slope down to a basin and we have a surface basin. Again, pleasure of the board. If that's what you like, it can certainly be done, but I think we have a nice opportunity to avoid that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Jim or John, do you want to weigh in on Mr. Bravman's suggestion.

MR. BRAVMAN: Yeah, I was going to defer to our professionals on that. I'm just trying to think it through whether any part of adding the concrete curb assists, unless, you know, Jim, if you feel that, no, you're confident that the flow's going to all be in the correct direction with enough pitch and water runoff that we don't have to worry about it flowing the other way in any spots, I'll defer to you.

MR. LAMBERT: If the board prefers curbing, we could have some form of depressed curb or depressed in some areas just to allow the water to drain through.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Minimally on the side that's closer to the building so it defers the water away from that area.

MR. KIPP: Typically, we like to have the curb to support the edge of pavement so that that edge doesn't break, but since this isn't a town road that I won't have to fix, I'm okay with there not being curb that would promote sheet flow, but I would -- you know, if that's the case, I would insist on that guide rail around the perimeter.

MR. FICHTER: Of the parking lot.

MR. KIPP: Correct.

MR. FICHTER: Yes, agreed.

MR. SACHS: All right, I think, Mr. Fichter, you're going to have to provide obviously revisions to this plan showing that, and obviously, it's going to have to be acceptable to our staff, but okay.

MR. CRISCUOLO: And also, I'd like to see a signage plan.

MR. FICHTER: The details are on the -- in the plan set that was submitted.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Okay.

MR. FICHTER: I can pull it up now if you like.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Well, as long as it's acceptable to our professionals. I was concerned with --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. CRISCUOLO: -- traffic flow, one-way direction, Do Not Enter signs, proper striping on the pavement. John's nodding his head. He's worked with me way too long to know where I'm talking about.

MR. KRISKOWSKI: Yeah, and, Mr. Criscuolo, there's going to have to be changes to the signage because the original plan showed one-way traffic heading both and parking area, and so there will have to be work, and we will work with the applicant as far as, you know, making sure that we do the best we can to direct the traffic, vehicles with signage on site and also exit and -- ingress and egress.

MR. CRISCUOLO: And striping across the parking lot to the building, as well, John?

MR. KRISKOWSKI: We will work with them on that, yes, absolutely.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Excellent. I trust John will get this correct.

MR. FICHTER: Yeah, and we have no problem working with them on that. The comments, I think they're all in that review letter. I understand them. They're very straightforward and

easy to accommodate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other board or staff questions for this witness?

MR. LAMBERT: I just have one more, Mr. Chairman --

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. LAMBERT: -- for the engineer. As far as the vehicles on site, what is your largest vehicle or what is the largest vehicle you anticipate, a garbage truck, a fire truck?

MR. FICHTER: That's about it. Yeah, I think that's the design vehicle. I mean, if we're talking about the pavers, I'd look at a fire truck.

MR. LAMBERT: Very well. Thank you.

MR. FICHTER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. APTE: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: No other questions for this witness?

MS. APTE: Mr. Chairman, I do have couple of follow-up. This is Mika.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS. APTE: Mr. Fichter, just a couple of follow-up questions. One is to do with the directional sign that you testified to. Thank you for clarifying that the revised direction arrows will be provided. I believe I heard that there would be no requirement for area and sign height for the directional signs; however, the plans --

MR. FICHTER: I was -- I'm sorry. I was more referring to their existence and their location. The -- I'm not recalling off the top of my head all the requirements that go with the directional signs, but I do recall that we look through them and fully comply and intend to fully comply.

MS. KASSETTA: I can help. I think that was an issue with the detail on the plan. As Mr. Fichter mentioned before, it was a holdover from a previous iteration, but the detail on the revised plan will show the directional signs to comply with the area and height requirements. Those will not be variances.

MS. APTE: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that.

The other question, the freestanding sign, is it going to be illuminated in any way?

MR. FICHTER: Yeah, I believe the intention is that it is internally illuminated, which -- correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe your

ordinance permits that.

MS. APTE: Yes; however, when it's in a residential zone, there is a time limitation. It has to be -- it cannot be illuminated between 10 p.m. to 7 a.m., so --

MR. FICHTER: No issue with that.

MS. APTE: -- would you be complying with that?

MR. FICHTER: Yes.

MS. APTE: And the other question following up regarding the type of vehicles, do you anticipate no -- I know garbage truck and fire truck will be the largest vehicle; however, will there be larger vehicles such as limousines or -- and I may mispronounce it -- hearse carriers that might be on site, and if they are, would they be parked along this front parking lot, or will they be maintained in the maintenance garage that's to the rear of the proposed building?

MR. FICHTER: Yeah, the second one. They'd be toward the rear in and near that maintenance building, that's correct.

MS. APTE: Okay. Thank you. And I think that was about it. Thank you.

MR. FICHTER: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any last questions for this witness?

MR. KIPP: I'd just like to add, Shawn, that if we are paving the lot, the striping should be hairpin, hairpin style stripes.

MR. FICHTER: I noticed that in your ordinance. No problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Allyson, your next witness.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you. Our next witness will be our architect, Stephen Carlidge.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Mr. Carlidge, please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, so help you God?

MR. CARLIDGE: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please repeat your name, spell your last name, and give us a bit of your CV, please.

MR. CARLIDGE: Sure. My name is Stephen Carlidge, C-a-r-l-i-d-g-e. I have a bachelor of architecture from Virginia Tech in 1980, and I've been practicing architecture in New Jersey continuously since 1983. I have been a principal in several firms around the state, but since 2001, I've

been the owner and principal architect of Shore Point Architecture located in Ocean Grove. I haven't been accepted in as many municipalities as Jason. I think my last count was closer to 50, but I've also been accepted in several superior courts in the state, and I've also been accepted by the New Jersey State Supreme Court as an expert in architecture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, welcome. Welcome to East Brunswick. We're happy to accept you as an expert, and what a lovely little town Ocean Grove is, too. Must be great. Do you have a great looking little office there?

MR. CARLIDGE: It's a quirky place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Really is.

MR. CARLIDGE: It's a quirky place.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, welcome.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you.

MR. CARLIDGE: So I think I'm going to control the screen; is that what we --

MS. KASSETTA: Perfect.

MR. CARLIDGE: Bear with me for a minute. Let's see if I can get this to come up. Do you all see that?

MR. SACHS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: May take a few seconds.

MR. CARLIDGE: I'm sorry. No?

MR. KIPP: No, we don't see it Stephen. Are you sharing your screen.

MR. CARLIDGE: I am, yeah. I have my screen up. Hold on a second. Let me -- wait one second. Let's try this again. Hold on. I think this will work. How about now?

MR. KIPP: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. CARLIDGE: Oh.

MR. SACHS: Keith, can you share it.

MR. KIPP: Yeah, Stephen, are you sharing something that you submitted?

MR. CARLIDGE: What I wanted to do was just refer initially to the floor plans and elevations that were submitted in the drawing package and then the rendering after that.

MR. KIPP: Okay. Give me a moment to pull them up.

MR. CARLIDGE: Sure.

MS. KASSETTA: While he's pulling those up, the rendering has not been previously submitted, so when he gets to that, Mr. Sachs, we can mark that as A-3.

MR. SACHS: That's fine.

MR. PHILIPS: Miss Kasetta, which one of your witnesses is going to be able to discuss the operations at this particular application?

MS. KASSETTA: I think Mr. Carlidge will be able to tell you a lot about that as he's explaining what will be taking place in this building, and then if you still have more questions, we have representatives of the applicant who can answer them.

MR. CARLIDGE: Back up one sheet to sheet A3.

MR. KIPP: You got it, Stephen.

MR. CARLIDGE: Thank you. Okay. We'll start with the new building. I don't know why, but the architects in my office decided that the renovations to the maintenance building should come first, but we're going to start with the new building, which is what you -- you're looking at the floor plan, proposed floor plan for the new building on sheet A 3. Let me state first that the new building will be located almost in the exact same location as the existing house, which has served as the -- sort of the business office and caretaker's facility for the cemetery for quite some time, and as was stated earlier, that structure will be demolished and replaced with this new building.

The new building is slightly over 3,000 square feet. It's a single-story building. The entrance is right in the center, and you can see you'll enter into a rather large lobby and gathering area. It's sort of a meet-and-greet area. To the west or to the left of the main lobby is a room we call the reflection room. That room is intended to be the primary room where burial services will take place, and the intention here is that most of the services take place at the grave site outdoors but that this facility will provide an opportunity for those type services to take place in inclement weather. So you will enter into the lobby. If you're here to do business, if you're here to buy a grave site or secure a grave site, the business office will be located to the right of the lobby where you'll have a private office for the cemetery manager, a private restroom, and then an office for business transactions to take place. If you're here for a service, you'll be able to go into the left from the lobby into the main reflection room, which will be largely glazed (audio distortion) grave sites. If you have noisy little ones with you, you

can enter into the family room and participate, as well, where we can segregate the noise from the more solemn services. You'll notice also the only other feature in the new building is that we have new restrooms, and I should state that the new building will be entirely ADA accessible, and we have very generous restroom facilities, and the reason for that -- we actually have more fixtures than we would be required to have by code, but the reason for that is that the owner believes that most people when they arrive at a service, they've been driving for quite some time, and there's an immediate need for a large group which arrives at the same time to use the restroom facilities, so rather than have people waiting, we have plenty of fixtures, and the restrooms can serve those needs that occur, both initially as people arrive, and then at the end of a service as people go to leave, there won't be much queuing because we have ample space.

If we could keep -- if you could slide down to sheet A4, which is the elevation sheet, I'm going to go quickly here. I'll need to point out a few things. The building as I said is a single-story building. You enter into the center. The building primary material -- I should say initially that the building height is fully compliant. In fact, the height as defined by your ordinance to the mean of the roof is only 18 foot, 7, and the height to the highest portion of the roof, which occurs at the western eave, which is the eave on the left-hand side of the front elevation there at the top left of the sheet, that height is only the 23 feet, 11 inches, so we're well within the ordinance, and I think the rest of what I'll talk about on the elevations we'll deal with at the rendering.

So maybe we can slide now back up to sheet A1, Keith, and if anyone has any questions as we go, please feel free to fire away. One more.

As you've heard previously, the existing maintenance building is nothing more than a concrete block gable roofed existing maintenance facility. It contains two very small, very tight non-accessible restrooms, which you can see on the left-hand portion of the page, and behind those restrooms, there's an office for the groundskeeper basically to keep his paperwork. We're proposing to provide, again, very ample restrooms. These will be full accessible with considerably more fixtures than currently exist, and the reason for this is the

same. If the people are arriving for a burial service and they all arrive in procession and everybody has driven an hour to get here, which is fairly common apparently, that many people may want to use the restroom immediately before the service begins, so we wanted to have ample restroom facilities for those people before they actually wander out to the grave site and participate in the service.

We're going to take a small portion of one of the maintenance bays just to segregate off a small area for the maintenance director's office just so he has a place that's clean and he can keep his paperwork.

If we can, Keith, scroll down to sheet A2. Changes are very minor to the building. We're not affecting the roofline at all. We're not affecting the height. Again, this is an existing building. We're simply adding two new doors -- three new doors, actually, one for each of the new restrooms and one for the office, and we're putting some outside hand washing stations so that people would be able to wash hands before the services.

And now, Keith, if no one has any questions about that, we can switch to the rendering and I'll describe the building.

MR. SACHS: Is that the document that's got to be marked?

MS. KASSETTA: Yes.

MR. CARLIDGE: Yes, it is.

MR. SACHS: Okay. Let's mark it as A-3.

MR. CARLIDGE: Okay. This is a rendering looking at basically the front of the building from the southwest. This is sort of from the exit or egress drive that Jason just talked about. The entrance to the building is right in the center. You'll notice the dominant feature of the building are the two uplifting sloped roofs. The higher of the two slopes is on the west side, which houses the prayer room. The lower of the two slopes is on the east side, which houses the business office and the restrooms. You'll enter into a covered entry area up the main steps, and then at the right-hand or the eastern side of the building, there's a handicapped ramp, which will provide access up to the floor level.

Again, the primary materials on the building, the white panel that you see on the building are fiber cement panels. They are a geometric panel. They'll be installed as a rain

screen. The gray material that you see will be a thin stacked veneer stone. You'll see some wood material. There will be some cedar cladding on the building, and you'll see some slatting, wood slatting that occurs around the entrance. That's to help break up the scale of the main entrance. Those will be Ipe slats on the building, and you can see that the building, especially on the west side facing the burial sites, has an extensive amount of glass, and that's to facilitate views from the building, from the reflection room out onto the grave site. There is a covered trellis there on the front porch that you can see to the left of the main entrance. That will be an aluminum trellis with Ipe pergola system. You can't actually see the rafters behind it. The glazing that you see there opens right into the main reflection room. As Jason already mentioned, the building will be landscaped on all sides. As I mentioned earlier, the height of the building is only 18 foot, 7. The highest eave on the building is 23 foot, 11, so the building is, you know, single story building. It's fully accessible. And we think it will make a nice uplifting and new, clean, modern -- provide a new, clean, modern aesthetic for the entire operation.

And that pretty much summarizes what I wanted to say, so I'd be happy to take any questions.

MS. KASSETTA: Stephen, if I could ask one follow-up before the board members ask their questions.

MR. CARLIDGE: Sure.

MS. KASSETTA: I think you gave a very good breakdown of what's going to be happening within the two buildings, and it's been mentioned a few times, but I really want to drive it home. The way that you were asked to design these buildings by the owners was as an accommodation to people who are already coming to the site, correct?

MR. CARLIDGE: Yeah, my understanding is that the -- there's not going to be any increase in activity or the operational activity at the site. It's currently functioning. It will continue to function. The old building was completely obsolete and quite frankly not very attractive, didn't make for a very attractive management building or prayer building on the site, didn't accommodate prayer services at all. So the two functions were, number 1, upgrade, provide an appropriate business office, and give the entire cemetery an entirely new

aesthetic, and then to be able to accommodate prayer services and associated with burials inside during inclement weather, and that was the objective.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you.

MR. BRAVMAN: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, are there any -- Mr. Bravman, you have a question for this witness?

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes, please. So you said that the -- there are steps in the center going up to the new proposed structure but that there's also ADA access I guess off to the right --

MR. CARLIDGE: Correct.

MR. BRAVMAN: -- which when I'm looking at the plans, as well, by Insight, the engineers, it looks to be depressed or flush curbs that then cross the paver driveway and line up with the ADA parking. Is the paver driveway ADA accessible or compliant when someone is in a wheelchair, or should that be -- assuming the paver driveway is approved, should there be a solid crosswalk between where the two -- to meet the two flush curbs.

MR. CARLIDGE: Paver driveways can be accessible so long as there is not a vertical edge to any of the pavers that exceeds one-quarter inch. So what you're seeing here is we were actually envisioning -- in an environmentally conscious manner, we were envisioning perhaps using a paver system where you actually had turf (audio distortion) within the pavers, but at the crosswalk, we wouldn't be able to use turf because the joints between pavers would have to be essentially flush in order for it to be accessible.

MR. BRAVMAN: Right. I always just pictures pavers, you know, they settle over time, they adjust over time, they're no longer even, and then I guess I'm questioning how someone who is in a wheelchair or some other mobile device is going to come across from the parking area to the building.

MR. CARLIDGE: Again, we wouldn't be able to have any turf in the joints of the pavers at that crosswalk, but if pavers are installed properly on the proper subbase, they will remain stable for both vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic.

MR. CRISCUOLO: I would suggest a solid surface for the ADA crossing there for people that are in wheelchairs, have canes of varying widths when it hits the ground and/or crutches.

MR. CARLIDGE: We can certainly do that.

MR. BRAVMAN: I think that's something that we should -- the applicant should definitely

consider.

MR. SACHS: Shawn, I have a couple questions if you don't mind.

MR. KIPP: I'm going to stop the screen share.

MR. SACHS: Yeah, that's fine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, Larry.

MR. SACHS: Thank you. All right. So I guess one question I have is -- and I'm just basing it on my own experience of attending too many Jewish funerals in my lifetime -- is that, you know, most Jewish funerals are conducted outside, and it's for a very important reason, that being one of the highest honors you can pay to a deceased is to shovel the dirt onto their grave. So the weather in my opinion really doesn't make a difference when you're attending a Jewish funeral. I've attended Jewish funerals in blazing heat, and I've attended them during blizzards and very inclement weather. So my question -- and I'm not sure if the architect can answer this or if the operator can answer this -- is it almost appears to me that you're building a funeral home here, and I'd like an answer as to that because that's not necessarily what was represented in this application. For instance, is there going to be any embalming that's going to occur on this site. Is there going to be a room for the Jewish tradition of shemira -- and I'll spell that for the record, s-h-e-m-i-r-a -- where just for the board's edification, in the Jewish tradition, a body is not to be left alone from the time of death until the actual burial. Now, that commonly occurs in funeral homes. So I'd like some answers to that question, and I don't know if that has to come from the operator, from the architect, or whomever.

MR. CARLIDGE: I can only tell you that we were -- as far as we know, there is not going to be any funeral home activities on this site, and the building does not provide facilities for that. So the owner can elaborate if they'd like. The operator can elaborate.

MR. SACHS: All right, because, you know, generally -- and again, it's certainly -- the building's a beautiful building, and I think it would be a tremendous upgrade to this facility, but I'm just a little confused as to why there's the need for an indoor facility at a Jewish cemetery. Maybe someone could answer that for me.

MR. CARLIDGE: Well, again, I was only -- as the architect, I was requested to provide

a space for these prayer services when the weather was inclement. As to the actual need, I think the operator might be best to speak to that.

MS. KASSETTA: I think the best person -- was someone else speaking?

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we hold -- Larry, those are great questions. Why don't we hold those until Stephen's testimony is completed, and then we can deal with the operator. Does that make sense?

MR. SACHS: Yeah. I mean, I don't have any other questions of the architect. I'll accept the answer that there will be no embalming services performed here, and I'm assuming the shemira will not be performed here, as well. So maybe.

MR. CARLIDGE: My understanding is that shemira will be performed at the funeral home, not here on site.

MR. SACHS: Okay. All right, so this is not going to be a funeral home. I just want to --

MR. CARLIDGE: It's not a funeral home, correct.

MR. SACHS: I want to make that abundantly clear. Okay. So it would be used -- and again, maybe the operator can answer, but I would imagine that it could be used if the weather is very inclement and people don't want to stand outside, and I guess there could be some type of service performed inside, but the actual burial, itself, has to be performed outside, and -- all right, so maybe the operator can explain to me, you know, what the purpose is of the building.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions for Mr. Carlidge before we move on to the operator. Rachel, you had your hand raised.

MS. COHEN: I want to go back to some of the handicapped questions. As one who normally schleps my 95-year-old grandparents to funerals, I noticed that the handicapped ramp is on the eastern end of the building. Can you just explain more of, like, the actual operation of, you know, physically moving my 95-year-old grandfather up the ramp and going towards the main entrance. It seems like it's -- you're entering from the east side of the building -- like, you're kind of -- it's out of the way almost. You're going further from where the main entrance is.

MR. CARLIDGE: Yeah, the design calls for there to be an entry -- sort of an entry terrace that extends the entire front of the building. On

the left-hand side, you can see that that terrace is under the pergola or the trellis. On the right-hand side, it's open to the sky. But we anticipate people would come to the building. They would gather outside if the weather was nice and meet and greet on that terrace. We happen to have the stairs in the center of the front elevation where you come straight up the terrace in the middle, but if you're in a wheelchair, you're going to use a ramp on the east side of the building. It's going to get you to the same place, and it's connected directly across the entrance walk to the handicapped parking spaces.

MS. COHEN: So I guess my only follow-up to that is would it be marked from a signage perspective, because if you are driving, if you miss the handicap entrance, you're almost backing up and having to walk further. So I just -- would that be marked in some way or if that's needed.

MR. CARLIDGE: I suppose it could be. We could -- maybe we could etch something into one of the -- into the base wall there just to note handicapped entrance just so people know that's where they should get out.

MS. COHEN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Rachel. Any other board questions for Mr. Carlidge?

MR. LAMBERT: I have one, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. LAMBERT: Can you hear me?

MR. CARLIDGE: Yeah.

MR. LAMBERT: Okay. With respect to all of the plumbing fixtures that are being added to all of the buildings, can you give the board an estimation of what you think the increase in your potable water demand may be?

MR. CARLIDGE: Again, that's a question for my MEP engineer, who isn't even onboard yet, but there will obviously, because there are going to be more fixtures, there will be slightly greater plumbing water demand load, but I don't know the exact quantities yet, no.

MR. LAMBERT: Okay. Well, just taking it one step further, and this would have to go back to the engineer for the applicant. We may need to see some kind of a calculation for the -- if there is an increase in potable water, we want to make sure the system that delivers water can convey it, and that also translates to the sanitary flow leaving the site.

MR. FICHTER: No problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions by either staff or the board for Mr. Carlidge?

MR. WENDELL: Shawn, Councilman Wendell. I just have one question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Jim.

MR. WENDELL: It's in regard to the testimony put out about the turf pavers in front of the building. Being in the development business myself, we're required in several locations to add turf pavers. We rarely try to do in the northeast on any drives that need to be plowed or maintained, you know, during the winter months because what ends up happening is you end up scraping off all the turf every time you drop a snowplow blade on there. So how do you guys intend to clean the snow, allow safe egress and all of that, you know, while using a turf paver system?

MR. CARLIDGE: If the turf is a problem, we can just use a standard paver system. We just thought --

MR. WENDELL: Don't get me wrong, I like them, but --

MR. CARLIDGE: The turf paver system is just more environmentally friendly, and in keeping with the original intent to use a gravel drive and allow as much percolation of natural, you know, stormwater back into the ground, we thought that might be appropriate. Now, we're not using -- we're not going to use a gravel drive so maybe it's appropriate to use a nonturf paver system. We can certainly do that.

MR. WENDELL: Keith, I mean, can you follow up on that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think under these circumstances, Councilman, that would be preferable?

MR. WENDELL: It would be to me. I mean, I just, you know, too often seen when you drop a snow plow across a turf paver, you rip all the turf out. So we're kind of not achieving --

MR. CARLIDGE: We'll just use pavers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So then that's a good suggestion, and the applicant's agreed to use regular pavers.

MR. WENDELL: Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for Mr. Carlidge?

MS. APTE: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can't see everybody so --

MS. APTE: This is a follow-up based on

the gravel and the paved discussion, and this question is more for I think Mr. Fichter. I guess we'll have to -- we would have to provide a lot coverage calculation, and if the site meets that, because it's in a residential zone, I believe the requirement is 30 percent or 25 percent, and you would have to -- I don't know at this moment if the site meets that or exceeds the lot coverage.

MR. FICHTER: We actually have that information on the plan. I think your limitation in the ordinance is 25 percent, and in the proposed condition we're at a half a percent. We have almost 24 acres so --

MR. SACHS: You got a big site.

MS. APTE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Great. Any other -- any other questions before we ask the operator to give some testimony? I guess seeing none --

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you. So I'd like to have Daniel Sultan sworn. He is the president of the applicant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Mr. Sultan, please raise your right hand and be sworn. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, so help you God?

MR. SULTAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: And just spell -- say and state your last name and then tell us your connection with the application.

MR. SULTAN: I'm the president of the cemetery. My name is Daniel Sultan, S-u-l-t-a-n.

THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome. So would you like to make any statement or just entertain questions?

MR. SULTAN: Well, I'll let Mr. Sachs's comments about the, you know, his concern about whether it's going to -- sounds like it's going to be a funeral home. In answer to that, it's not going to be a funeral home. I believe it's not even legal to have a cemetery and a funeral home together. We're not interested in that. The shemira part, the part where they wash the body, you know, until the burial is going to be done at the funeral home, wherever the funeral home is done, and, Allyson, you can stipulate that. It's not a problem for us.

Whatever other questions you guys had for me I'm more than happy to answer. As far as the reflection room, you guys mentioned, a few people asked, the -- during inclement weather, a lot of

times we have speakers, eulogies. Sometimes we do them by the grave, sometimes we do it at a funeral home pre -- we get to the cemetery, sometimes we do graveside funerals. This is an opportunity for us to do it in inclement weather instead of doing it graveside, you can go into the building, you can have a small crowd, and they could all, you know, they could do the eulogy, and we could go outside, and people that are not able to participate in a burial, you know, some of the elder people or something like that, they can continue home, stay in the building while we finish the service at the grave. You know, like you mentioned, the highest honor is actually doing the burial, itself. So it's clearly -- the building is -- the reflection room is made to do eulogies in inclement weather pretty much.

THE CHAIRMAN: And my question for you, Mr. Sultan, or you, Mr. Carlidge, what's the capacity that the reflection room can hold?

MR. SULTAN: I don't think that question is for me.

MR. SACHS: Maybe for Mr. Carlidge.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Carlidge.

MR. CARLIDGE: Well, the maximum occupancy of that room per the code would be 84 people maximum, but I don't anticipate we would have that many people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I was just curious.

Any other questions for Mr. Sultan?

MR. HEPPEL: I do, Shawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, I can't see everybody so --

MR. HEPPEL: Charlie.

THE CHAIRMAN: No?

MR. HEPPEL: Charlie.

MR. SACHS: Charlie Heppel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Charlie, go ahead.

MR. HEPPEL: Mr. Sultan, earlier there was mention of large piles of wood extending a good way back on your property and also I guess saws, as well. Is there another business also being operated on your land?

MR. SULTAN: So the wood that was being cut up I think was from storms that we lost trees, but coincidentally, one of our workmen that works for the cemetery happens to have a tree cutting service, and I asked him to stop -- I asked him when we got the letter from you guys from --

MS. KASSETTA: Code enforcement officer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Code enforcement.

MR. SULTAN: I asked him to stop doing all that. We had a couple other issues, maybe like a, I don't know, a fridge was stored there or something. We're cleaning it up. We'll make sure it's beautiful. I mean, we're making a beautification project for the place. We want it to look beautiful. We don't want that stuff there, either.

MR. HEPPEL: Thank you very much.

MR. SULTAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. SULTAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for this witness.

MR. WENDELL: Just one from Councilman Wendell. I mean, can we -- I mentioned about the property on the corner of Buckingham and, what is it, Winchester or whatever. Can we make sure that that gets cleaned up and it's aesthetically appealing to the adjacent -- your adjacent neighbors.

MR. SULTAN: Which property is that, guys? Is that for me?

MR. WENDELL: Yeah. It's all the way in I guess the --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WENDELL: -- you know. I can't describe it, but it's, you know, it's property that immediately abuts Buckingham Estates, and it actually abuts their two roads within there and looks like, you know, I thought it was a retention basin that was for Buckingham Estates, but when I got the application, I saw that, you know, this property owns that property, and it doesn't seem very appealing from the neighbors' side.

MR. SULTAN: Is that when you go straight back -- sorry, sir. Is that when you go straight back all the way to the back, like from where the -- the fence that opens up?

MR. WENDELL: It's off of Fern Road. It's off of Fern Road, and it's --

MR. SULTAN: I think that's the trees. I think that's the tree issue.

MR. WENDELL: No, no, it's the other side from that.

MR. SULTAN: Oh. Well, I'll take a look and I'll make sure of that. I mean, I want the place to be nice. I want it to be beautiful for

everybody within.

MR. WENDELL: I mean, it's not seen too well from your property, but it's seen on the other, you know, on your neighbor's side, and it's right, you know, adjacent to roads. So let's, you know -- okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we make arrangements for, Mr. Sultan, someone from your organization to maybe meet with our code enforcement person to walk the property and show your personnel exactly what they mean. Councilman Wendell, do you think that's a good idea?

MR. WENDELL: I think that's great. You know what, I would, you know, meet with code enforcement to let them know exactly where I'm talking about so that they can represent us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sultan, would that be agreeable to you?

MR. SULTAN: That's fine. I'd be more than happy to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Terrific.

MR. SACHS: Mr. Chairman, just a couple --

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other --

MR. SACHS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a couple --

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, Larry.

MR. SACHS: -- questions of Mr. Sultan and maybe some stipulations and conditions. I heard him already stipulate that no shemira would be conducted on site here, no embalming, and I guess the overall condition is -- I don't think we want this to turn into a funeral home or a funeral facility where you would have much larger, you know, much larger capacity and much larger attendance at the site. I think I can, you know, hearing the testimony of Mr. Sultan -- and I don't want to put words in his mouth, but I would imagine that most of the burials that occur at the cemetery would generally be -- would have their genesis -- no pun intended -- at the funeral home, correct? And then --

MR. SULTAN: Right.

MR. SACHS: -- and then the procession would come to the cemetery for burial, and that really what you're building here is an area where I guess if it was extreme inclement weather, you could conduct, you know, your graveside service inside, and then if people wanted to go outside to the grave site, they could do that, right?

MR. SULTAN: That's exactly it, exactly.

MR. SACHS: Okay, but I think we need those conditions, and I just don't think we want this to turn into a funeral home.

MR. SULTAN: I don't want a funeral home. I do this gratis.

MR. SACHS: Okay. All right. And that no funeral license -- no funeral license would be issued for this site, as well. I think those are important conditions, and I think, Mr. Sultan, you can probably agree to that.

MR. SULTAN: I agree.

MR. SACHS: Am I correct, Counsel?

MS. KASSETTA: Yes. I just want to be careful with the wording that's used in the resolution, though, because I don't want there to be any question that they can maintain any licensing they have to conduct the funerals, themselves, you know, the burials, so --

MR. SACHS: No, no, the burial is fine.

MS. KASSETTA: -- talk offline about that.

MR. SACHS: Yeah, I mean, I'm concerned about the other functions that occur at a funeral home.

MS. KASSETTA: Absolutely, and there's no issue with that. I just want to be careful with how it's worded.

MR. SACHS: Okay. No problem. All right, thank you, Mr. Sultan.

MR. SULTAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for this witness?

MR. PHILIPS: Shawn, I got something I want to ask Larry. It's a --

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Go ahead, Steve.

MR. PHILIPS: Larry, do you think we need to have an additional condition regarding other activities that might arise over the course of the future at this particular facility? In other words, there seem to be an evolution where the guys did come in, they had some trees down, and suddenly expanded something else. They were asked politely to away with it, but do we need a condition that this is strictly a cemetery and all business related to a cemetery and nobody can bring in a bunch of plants and grow -- whatever -- I'm just making something up, but.

MS. KASSETTA: So they can't have a cannabis farm there you're saying?

MR. PHILIPS: I have no idea what they might want to do.

MS. KASSETTA: I'm kidding. I'm kidding.

MR. SACHS: We can clarify that this is a cemetery if that's -- yes, and that's really the only activity that should be conducted there. Okay.

MR. PHILIPS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm on the verge of losing you guys, so if I drop off, Mr. Bravman, you might have to finish, but are there any -- I don't think there are any other questions so could we open this application up to members of the public.

Keith, is there anyone holding on this?

MR. KIPP: There is. The first person is Stacey Lampert. You there, Stacey?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bravman, I would ask could you handle the public session while I try to figure out how to stay on?

MR. BRAVMAN: Sure.

DR. LAMPERT: Can you hear me?

MR. BRAVMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Kipp, what was the first member of the public's name?

MR. KIPP: They're on as Stacey Lampert.

DR. LAMPERT: Can you hear me?

MR. SACHS: Is that Stacey Lampert?

MS. LAMPERT: Yeah.

DR. LAMPERT: This is Craig Lampert, Stacey's husband. We are residents at 17 Winchester Drive. I'm a physician in the community, a local oncologist.

MR. BRAVMAN: Mr. Lampert, one second. I know you introduced yourself with your address. Could you please raise your right hand.

DR. LAMPERT: Sure.

MR. BRAVMAN: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you provide will be the truth?

DR. LAMPERT: I affirm.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you. State your name again and your address.

DR. LAMPERT: My name is Dr. Craig Lampert, 17 Winchester Drive, East Brunswick, New Jersey.

MR. BRAVMAN: Welcome.

DR. LAMPERT: Thank you. So, you know, at the outset, this looks like a lovely little project. Who doesn't want a nice funeral -- situation to be able to bury their bubbe and zayde, but I do have some real -- very real concerns that the cemetery is not really a good faith neighbor. I

hear the discussion about the wood pile. I will tell you that as of fairly recently -- because my house actually borders that wood pile, as of fairly recently, there is still work being done. The work is being done by All County Tree Services of East Brunswick, who has a P.O. box number, doesn't actually have a physical address number. When I actually went into the cemetery to photograph the activities, I was literally chased out by one of the members of the tree service. When I stand on a weekend morning drinking my coffee from my kitchen, I see these God awful piles of wood chip and basically just dead trees, dead cuttings, a total eyesore going for the entire length of my property into the following property. The critters that come out of that is just incredible. There's been snakes on my property. So to say that this activity has ended is absolutely not correct, and no attempt has been made to clear it up. I've written two letters to the cemetery, and I have had no replies, and, you know, I do thank Mr. Wendell for getting involved. That was very helpful.

So I think that if something like this is going to be approved, the cemetery has to be held to the standard of looking after its neighbors because clearly that is not the case. Never mind the fact that at 6 a.m. on a Saturday morning when the Jewish cemetery should not have workers in it, they're busy chipping and cutting away at wood and sawing and cropping and who knows what. So that does need to be taken care of.

I do have a couple of other questions specifically related to all of my neighbors. Just as far as the lighting, do we know how far the visual pollution will go as far as the lighting is concerned? We discussed the commercial the commercial venture, but does the lighting pollution affect the residential neighbors, as well?

MR. FICHTER: Not at all.

MR. BRAVMAN: I was going to say, Mr. Fichter, if you could provide some more insight into that, please.

MR. FICHTER: Not at all. The only -- I mentioned in my testimony, the only spillage we have is very minor and very brief onto a commercial property. The residential properties are well beyond the cast of the lights that are proposed as part of this particular project.

DR. LAMPERT: Watching the funeral kind of come and go, you know, it begs the question again

as to why this upgrade is even needed given the fact that all the cars are not even necessarily parking. They're basically driving graveside, and obviously, that would be important to make sure that if there is increased traffic being anticipated that graveside parking is available and, you know, the facilities will allow that increased traffic.

I'm assuming that the funeral -- that the cemetery is expecting more business, and I think it's, you know, from our point of view, we just want to make sure that that isn't going to increase our noise pollution and some of the, you know, some of the issues that go along with increasing business. We all knew when we moved in that we were moving next to a cemetery, but we were kind of led to believe that this was a cemetery that was very seldom used, and if there is going to be a push towards, you know, increasing business, I think this needs to be taken into account, as well.

MR. BRAVMAN: Ms. Kasetta, addressing that, do you know or does your owner/operator know whether there is going to be parking outside the field of the parking lots and, as Dr. Lampert has indicated, at the grave sites.

MS. KASSETTA: I'm going to do the best I can to answer it, but Mr. Sultan is listening, and he can correct me if I'm wrong, but, you know, an increase in business, will they maybe get more business because they have this building, possibly, because it's an accommodation, but it's not changing the basic service that they're providing, which is these graveside burials, so those cars are still coming predominantly for the burial ceremony at the grave site, but we couldn't provide a building without sufficient parking for people who may be coming to that building. So I think that's the overall point here is that we're not doing it to expand the services provided at this cemetery. It's just a better accommodation for the people that are already coming, and increased business is a possibility because it's a better accommodation, but it's not -- it's not increasing the intensity of the use, itself.

MR. BRAVMAN: So the current operations I assume include parking graveside.

MS. KASSETTA: Mr. Sultan, maybe you can answer that. Typically now, when you have a burial, people I think come right to the grave site and park along the access roads, correct?

MR. SULTAN: A hearse would pull up, and

then a few cars would pull up behind, and people get out and perform the service. I personally thought that there was -- that parking was way too much, but, you know, because of the size of the building, we had to accommodate the size of the building. I don't think we need all that parking at all, and as far as increased volume, you know, increased business, most of the graves are owned already by societies and stuff. It's not -- it's not -- we're not looking for more business. I do -- I did this from my heart. I work gratis. I'm not looking -- I'm not looking to make money, you know. I make money somewhere else.

MR. BRAVMAN: I think, Mr. Sultan, the doctor's concern as the adjoining resident is the impact it's going to have on him and the other residents and whether anything you're looking to do in this application is going to in essence increase the current use of the property.

MR. SULTAN: Right, so I respect the doctor's comments, and I -- and I'm going to address some. I'm unaware of a Saturday morning, because I'm going to -- he might get a call from me when I hang up from here that he's going to stop that Saturday morning. He's got to stop the tree service. You mentioned All County Trees. He happens to be our foreman or our secondary foreman in the place. He's a good guy. I let him use the land. He stored his trucks. I think I have to stop it because I don't like it. I don't like the look of it. I don't like the look of the trucks. I don't like the noise pollution. I don't want that for my neighbors. I wouldn't want my neighbors to do it to me. I don't like if my neighbor puts his garbage pail near me. So I understand, and I'm going to address those issues.

And Mr. Wendell mentioned, you know, we will get together with code enforcement, and we'll go through the property, no problem. I'm not looking for -- I'm looking for to make it easy, easy for the neighbors, make it pleasant for the neighbors. I think next to a cemetery should be pleasant.

DR. LAMPERT: Well, the reality is that historically we were told from the get-go don't even bother, you know, dealing with the cemetery because they won't respond to you. I wrote two letters to you guys. No response. So we would just like -- we would like a responsive neighbor. We were also told that there were going to be trees over along the

line of our fences which never happened. And as I say, we just want response -- a responsive, ethical, good neighbor. I actually take a lot of comfort in knowing that the people buried next door to me are my bubbes and zaydes, and that's fine. I don't have an issue with it. I just want a responsive neighbor that's going to do the right thing.

MR. BRAVMAN: I think, Dr. Lampert, what -- and, Mr. Sachs, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think if there's going to be an approval, there was going to be condition in here that there will be no -- nothing other than the operation of the cemetery --

MR. SACHS: Yes.

MR. BRAVMAN: -- without approval.

MR. SACHS: In fact, Mr. Sultan, I'm going to give you some advice on this, as well, is that if you're currently permitting All County Tree Service to store their vehicles on the property, you're in violation right now because you're now -- you've now put an additional use on this property other than the cemetery use. So I would strongly suggest that you cease and desist from having All County park their vehicles on the site, do any tree cutting, and certainly respect the residential neighbors adjacent to this.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Dr. Lampert.

MR. SULTAN: I didn't know that it was happening. I didn't know tree cutting was happening. I knew he was storing trucks or, you know, his equipment. I'll apologize for that.

MR. SACHS: He shouldn't be storing his equipment even. I mean, again, you know, that's a secondary use on this property that it's not zoned for. So, all right, I think you've got the point.

MR. SULTAN: I hear you.

MS. KASSETTA: Can I make a suggestion for Dr. Lampert specifically.

Dr. Lampert, did you receive a copy of the notice that my office sent about this hearing?

DR. LAMPERT: I did.

MS. KASSETTA: So you have my contact information on that notice. Why don't you reach out to me, and I can put you in contact with Mr. Sultan to work out any remaining maintenance issues or, you know, just to have one another's contact information.

DR. LAMPERT: Appreciate that, but I do think that at the end of the day, you know, as was mentioned, you know, they were in contravention of

the business description, and they need to clean up the site, and it shouldn't be beholden to me to have to facilitate that. So I certainly appreciate your offer, and I will keep your number, and I will be happy to reach out to Mr. Sultan, but again, I have enough to do on my regular day that I shouldn't be cleaning up my cemetery.

MR. SULTAN: Okay.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Dr. Lambert. Dr.

Lambert.

MR. BRAVMAN: I'm sorry. I know Mr. Criscuolo, you -- because I can't see it either. Nothing is lighting up on my screen.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Dr. Lampert, this is Joe Criscuolo. I sit on this board, but I'm also the township business administrator, and I work quite closely with Mr. Kipp and code enforcement and so on. If you see these activities going on, please call the mayor's office and let us know. I'll give you the number. 732-390-6810, and I'm just going to tell -- I'm just going to make the statement now -- and Mr. Kipp's on the meeting -- we will be out there tomorrow, and those vehicles better not be parked there tomorrow night. I am going to personally go up there and look for those vehicles, okay.

MR. KIPP: And thank you, Joseph, and, Mr. Lampert, our code enforcement will follow up and will enforce -- you know, perhaps if you had written to us and we were aware of it, we could have done something sooner, but now we'll certainly follow up on this.

DR. LAMPERT: Much appreciated, and I thank you all, and I wish the cemetery the best of luck.

MR. CRISCUOLO: And if you have trouble on weekends, I monitor my e-mail address all the time, and if you call my office, I'll give you my e-mail address, and if you have a problem on a Saturday, you can let me know, and we will look into it even on a Saturday, Sunday, doesn't matter. You just -- I will take this very seriously as a nonpermitted use on that property abutting a residential neighborhood.

DR. LAMPERT: Thank you very much.

MR. CRISCUOLO: You're welcome, sir.

MR. BRAVMAN: Mr. Kipp, are there any other members of the public wishing to be heard?

MR. KIPP: Yes, we have --

MS. CLARKE: I would like to be --

MR. BRAVMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

MS. CLARKE: No, go ahead, whoever needs to go first.

MR. KIPP: We do have someone in the public. Gaurav Kapoor. Can you hear us, Mr. Kapoor?

MR. KAPOOR: Yes. Can you hear me?

MR. BRAVMAN: Good evening, Mr. Kapoor. Could you please raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you provide shall be the truth and the whole truth?

MR. KAPOOR: Yes, I do.

MR. BRAVMAN: Please state your name, spell your last name, and provide your address, please.

MR. KAPOOR: Sure. It's Gaurav Kapoor, K-a-p-o-o-r, and the address is 19 Winchester Drive, East Brunswick.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you.

MR. KAPOOR: Yeah, my concern was more along the lighting, as well. I understand the spillage shouldn't come to the residential area. I wanted to understand, is the lighting timed, is it always on, or, you know, what kind of timing would it be on. Right now I look back into the cemetery from my back yard. It's always pitch dark. I want to ensure it stays that way. If it's not, then we need to look at also potentially adding trees along the fence line to make sure it does.

MR. BRAVMAN: I believe -- and Mr. Fichter, I believe you're still on the line. The testimony was the operations from the lighting are not going to change and there's going to be no lighting as the residents are inquiring about; is that correct?

MR. FICHTER: I didn't quite follow the format of your characterization of the question. Could we try that again.

MR. BRAVMAN: I guess the residents from the rear are wanting to confirm that there's not going to be lighting that's now going to change and impact them.

MR. FICHTER: No, there would be no impact on those neighbors. I was just going to take a measurement, but I won't hold you up and look at it. Suffice to say, it's probably a thousand feet or more. With a number of trees and partially the building, there's a lot of obstruction, so these lights are -- there's no chance there's going to be light spillage anywhere near those residences so

they are safe from these lights.

MR. SACHS: When will those lights be turned off, what time of the day? I mean, obviously, there's no activity in the evening at a cemetery, so.

MR. FICHTER: Yeah, typically for a site like this, the lights would be shut off. That's, you know, an obvious cost saving measure, but there are select lights that would be left on for nothing other than security. We haven't gotten into that level of detail with the applicant. I would assume that perhaps one or two building mounted lights would remain on, and that would be it.

MR. SACHS: Well, could they be motion -- could they be some type of motion detector? I mean, rather than have illuminating lights all evening. You know, we're talking about a cemetery. We're talk about a facility that's closed.

MR. FICHTER: Can I punt to you, Mr. Sultan, on that, or would you --

MR. SULTAN: Yeah, we'll find a motion or something to that effect.

MR. SACHS: Okay.

MR. SULTAN: Maybe we'll have a few dusk to dawn and then motions just for security reasons.

MR. SACHS: Okay.

MR. SULTAN: There's going to be no lighting in the back of cemetery, you know, as far as the neighbors in the back.

MR. SACHS: Okay.

MR. BRAVMAN: Do you have any other questions?

MR. KAPOOR: There was mention of lights of back of the building, the building being created, right?

MR. FICHTER: Yeah, there are building mounted lights in the back. They are downward facing lights. They're inside a container. They shine down. Most of those lights are blocked from view from your house by the existing maintenance building. There may be one or two that aren't, but again, they're 15 feet high. They shine down. You have approximately a thousand feet between you, and there's a couple lines of trees between you, as well, so those lights will have no effect on your property.

MR. SACHS: And you're going to put them on a motion detector anyway.

MR. FICHTER: Correct.

MR. SACHS: Okay, so they'll be off.

MR. KAPOOR: Thank you.

MR. BRAVMAN: Does that answer your questions, Mr. Kapoor.

MR. KAPOOR: Yes, it does. Thank you.

MR. BRAVMAN: Mr. Kipp, do we have any other members of the public?

MS. CLARKE: I had one question.

MR. KIPP: No, there's not, Larry.

MS. CLARKE: Well, me.

MR. BRAVMAN: Miss Clarke, are you going to be a member of the public?

MS. CLARKE: Yes, please.

MR. BRAVMAN: Can you just raise your right hand.

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MR. BRAVMAN: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you provide shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. CLARKE: Yes.

MR. BRAVMAN: Please state your name and your address for the record.

MS. CLARKE: Sure, Julie Clarke, 7 Winchester Drive. My question was actually the lighting, but that was solved, but also hours of operation. When are people allowed to visit and be in that cemetery? Just curious. Are there hours?

MR. SULTAN: Me?

MS. CLARKE: Yeah, please.

MR. SULTAN: So pretty much the cemetery is open from the morning, and it closes at dusk, and burials are usually done usually around, you know, 11 to 1-ish, of course, sometimes later, but there's none after dark.

MS. CLARKE: Okay.

MR. SULTAN: And visitors during the day pretty much.

MS. CLARKE: Okay. We do get some visitors at night. That's why I was just wondering. I've seen a -- it's a little scary at times, but it's okay. Thank you. That's all.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you. Mr. Kipp, are there any other members of the public?

MR. KIPP: There is not.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay. I'm going to close the public portion. Are there any other board questions or comments?

MR. PHILIPS: Larry, I have one. It's Steve.

MR. BRAVMAN: Sure.

MR. PHILIPS: Brought up by what Miss

Clarke had mentioned. Do you have gates or any kind of barrier that stops people from driving around the cemetery after theoretically your staff has gone and nobody is there?

MR. SULTAN: As of now, no, because we don't have the supporting problem. If we do, we can put something in place. I don't think it's necessary.

MR. PHILIPS: I don't know. I don't live there. But if the people who do see that there's lights moving around out there at night, then maybe there might be something.

MR. SULTAN: I think it's visitors Miss Clarke mentioned, but --

MS. CLARKE: I've called the police a few times because it does make me nervous because I'm not sure whether it's visitors or it's people wanting to, you know, make their way into my home, so it kind of makes me nervous at times.

MR. SULTAN: I mean, most cemeteries I know are really -- they're open, but I mean, I have no idea to, you know, at one -- at a later date, if it's something that's needed, we can do it.

MS. CLARKE: Okay.

MR. SULTAN: I don't see that it's needed right now because I see all the cemeteries in East Brunswick actually -- they're open. But I hear your concern, and if it is a concern, we'll address it.

MS. CLARKE: Thank you.

MR. BRAVMAN: Are there any other board questions? Comments?

MR. WENDELL: Yeah, Mr. Bravman, just one from Councilman Wendell. I actually was -- this is more towards Larry or Keith. With this other wood operation that's going on on site, can we condition either this approval or at least issuance of a building permit on the complete cleanup of whatever this operation is?

MR. SACHS: Yeah, I think so. I mean, obviously, it seems like there's some other activity ongoing on this property, which I think Mr. Sultan has agreed to eliminate, and certainly, our crack code -- our crack planning and engineering staff is going to be out there tomorrow along with Mr. Criscuolo to take a look at it. So, yes, I think there's only one use allowed on this site. That is the use of a cemetery with now this brand new beautiful building being constructed, but certainly, we can put that condition in there, Jim, not a

problem.

MR. WENDELL: And I just want to say, if the resident, you know, if the members of the public are still listening, it's probably going to get a little bit worse before it gets better based on what I see in the aerials out there. There's some big tree trunks and things like that that will probably have to be cut up before they can be removed so, you know, I think everybody has got to give them enough time and enough patience to allow this operation to get cleaned up.

MR. SULTAN: Appreciate that.

MR. KIPP: Jim, we'll monitor it, and then if the proper cleanup is not happening, then violations will be issued, fines and court. That's how it works.

MR. WENDELL: All right.

MR. SULTAN: Starting tomorrow morning. Tomorrow morning I'm starting to have them pull out all their stuff.

MR. SACHS: Good.

MR. SULTAN: I was closing an eye to it. I've been the president for about 6 years now. I go there and I see those trucks. It's ugly. It's unsightly. I comment. You know, they clean it up. But I got to do a better job.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Well, you're the property owner, so the fine is going to go to you, so I think you have a motivating factor to heed the warning, and we want to see continued improvement of that area.

MR. SULTAN: This is a beautification project.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Thank you very much.

MR. SULTAN: I hear you. Thank you.

MR. BRAVMAN: Okay. Larry, are you satisfied that the CME report, the recommendations --

MR. SACHS: Yes.

MR. BRAVMAN: -- the testimony that's needed, the agency and staff reports have all been addressed by the applicant?

MR. SACHS: Yes, I am, Mr. Vice Chairman, yes.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you. Okay. Are there any other questions or comments?

Okay. Seeing none, what is the board's pleasure with this application?

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll move this application. I'll move the approval.

MR. BRAVMAN: Chairman Taylor. Do we have a second?

MR. HASHMI: I'll second. It's Muhammad.

MR. BRAVMAN: Seconded by Mr. Hashmi. Can we please take a roll.

MS. MORACE: Miss Cohen.

MS. COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Hashmi.

MR. HASHMI: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Philips.

MR. PHILIPS: I want to make sure we understand we're going to be a good neighbor, and I vote yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Criscuolo.

MR. CRISCUOLO: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Councilman Wendell.

MR. WENDELL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Heppel.

MR. HEPPEL: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mr. Bravman.

MR. BRAVMAN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Mayor Cohen.

MAYOR COHEN: Yes.

MS. MORACE: Chairman Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BRAVMAN: Thank you. The application --

THE CHAIRMAN: Larry, thank you for --

MR. BRAVMAN: -- been approved.

MS. KASSETTA: Thank you all for your time this evening.

MAYOR COHEN: Thank you.

MR. SULTAN: Thank you for sticking it out everybody. Really appreciate it.

MR. SACHS: No problem.

MR. BRAVMAN: I'll turn it back over to Mr. Taylor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Thank you very much, which is -- tonight was the perfect reason why you're such an able vice chair.

So, Loren, is there any other business to come before us this evening?

MS. MORACE: No, that's all.

(Audio disruption)

THE CHAIRMAN: And our next meeting is?

MS. MORACE: It's January 27. As of right now, there's nothing on the agenda.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, then once again, everyone, let's have a good 2021. Things are

looking up. Let's stay safe, and let's have a motion to adjourn.

MR. WENDELL: Go Saints.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go Saints.

MR. WENDELL: I'll make the motion to adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that note, we're going to end the meeting.