

MINUTES OF THE
EAST BRUNSWICK TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

March 3, 2022

STATEMENT - Open Public Meetings Act

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL -

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

Steve Philips, Chairman
Christine Rampolla
Amy Papi
Ivan Wynter
Leon Gurevich
Steve Pepe
Chester Brandt
Cathy Decker
Bonnie Wilson
Dana Winston

Deepak Arora

ALSO PRESENT:

Jay Weiner, Esquire
Aaron Blessing - Zoning Assistant
Keith Kipp - Director of Planning/Engineering
Terence Vogt - CME

MINUTES

February 17, 2022 - Motion to approve by Mr. Pepe,
second by Mr. Gurevich. Minutes approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Application #Z-21-19 - Lamar Advertising - Proposed
billboard located on the Main Line adjacent to Main
Street and State Route 18, block 150.01, lot 1.03,
in the I/M zone. Mandatory date April 7, 2022. To
be rescheduled to a future meeting. Renotice
required.

NEW BUSINESS

Application #Z-21-29 - 1784 Capital Holdings, LLC - Proposed self-storage facility located at 710 Old Bridge Turnpike, block 834.01, lot 39.01, in the HC-2 zone. Mandatory date March 15, 2022. Adjourned to April 7, 2022, at the Municipal Building without further notice.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is the March 3, 2022, East Brunswick Township Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. In accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law, on December 30, 2021, notice of this meeting stating the time, date, and location was sent to the Home News Tribune, filed with the township clerk, and posted in 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 township is using the telephone meeting format in an effort to mitigate the chance of exposure to COVID-19 as part of the township's ongoing effort to slow the rate of transmission and avoid overwhelming our treatment centers. The dial-in information and agenda have been posted on the township web site and are posted for EBTV members of the public. Members of the public can call in with the number provided if they have any questions of the zoning board members of anything being said tonight at the meeting. You will have 3 minutes to speak. Should you have any further comments or questions, the planning and engineering office is always available by e-mail and phone. Each member of the public shall have only one opportunity to speak during the particular public portion. Thank you in advance for your (inaudible) as we implement this new technology to continue to move the township forward during the health emergency.

Zoning board will not hear any case beyond 10:30 p.m. with the exception of any hearing in progress at that time and will terminate all testimony at 10:30 p.m. The chair reserves the right to call any application in an order different from that appearing on the agenda.

If you could, Aaron, please call the roll.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Winston.

MS. WINSTON: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Miss Wilson.
 MS. WILSON: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Miss Decker.
 MS. DECKER: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Mr. Brandt.
 MR. BRANDT: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Mr. Pepe.
 MR. PEPE: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Mr. Gurevich.
 MR. GUREVICH: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Mr. Arora. Mr. Wynter.
 MR. WYNTER: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Miss Papi.
 MS. PAPI: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Miss Rampolla.
 MS. RAMPOLLA: Here.
 MR. BLESSING: Chairman Philips.
 THE CHAIRMAN: Here.

And now what I'd like to do is, in light of what has happened over the last week, I'd like to listen for a moment of silence as we all pray to see the ending of the attacks and items going on in the Ukraine, if I can ask for everybody to be mindful of that.

(Moment of silence)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. At this point, we have the minutes of February 17, and I will listen for a motion from somebody who is eligible to vote.

MR. PEPE: I'll make a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion from Steve. Do we have a second?

MR. GUREVICH: I'll second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Leon. Among those eligible to vote, which I believe is everybody that -- are there any additions, deletions, corrections, or changes to the minutes as presented?

Hearing none, Aaron, if you can please call the roll.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Pepe.

MR. PEPE: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Gurevich.

MR. GUREVICH: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Wynter.

MR. WYNTER: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Brandt.

MR. BRANDT: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Decker.

MS. DECKER: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Wilson.

MS. WILSON: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Winston.

MS. WINSTON: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Rampolla.

MS. RAMPOLLA: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Chairman Philips.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you. The minutes will pass.

Okay, now for some clarification of what happened and what's going on this evening. The application Z-21-19, Lamar Advertising, which you may remember we established jurisdiction at the previous meeting but we did not hear any testimony. There has been an issue with the request and the application, and we are going to have to have the applicant renote, and if I can ask, Jay, just give us a brief synopsis of what happened.

MR. WEINER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Essentially, there was noted that the notice of the applicant did not sufficiently correspond with the ordinance -- one of the applicable ordinances of which they were seeking relief before the board. So when that was noted, I spoke with the applicant's counsel, and it was understood and agreed they would be renoticing with the corrected notice and a new date would be set forth in that notice. So we're not going to announce a new date now because any new date would be conditional upon them making satisfactory notice. So anyone who's here from the public will need to be mindful of that. If they're entitled to get notice, they will receive new notice. There will be notice of publication as well as in all the regular places where notice can be found through the township.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. So if anybody is calling in or on the phone or listening to the meeting who wanted to have some input into Z-21-19, Lamar Advertising, it will not be heard this evening, and the applicant has to renote, and at some point thereafter, there will be an announcement through the public system of when we will be hearing that application. So just for clarification, that will not be heard.

Now we're moving on to new business, application Z-21-29, 1784 Capital Holdings, LLC. Who's there to represent this application?

MR. MURPHY: Hi. Good evening, Chairman, Chris Murphy. I'm the attorney for the applicant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Murphy. We have -- can you -- I'll leave it -- I'll pass it over to you with the understanding that there's going to be a number of things we have to talk about regarding the way this application will be run through the board.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. Mr. Chair, do you want to start there, or do you want me to introduce the project?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you can -- please, I want you to begin your presentation.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair, members of the board. Again for the record, my name is Chris Murphy. I'm with the law firm of Murphy Schiller & Wilkes. I'm here on behalf of the applicant, 1784 Capital Holdings, LLC. We're here in connection with the property located at Old Bridge Turnpike in East Brunswick, more specifically, block 843.01, lot 39.01. We're here tonight seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval along with a D-1 use variance and other bulk relief and waivers in connection with the development of a three-story approximately 131,000-square-foot self-storage facility on the property. Typical parking, lighting, landscaping, utility, and storm water improvements are also proposed as part of the project. The property is located in the HC-2 General Highway Commercial zoning district.

We're in receipt of multiple reports, including, planning/engineering report from Remington & Vernick Engineers dated February 25, 2022; memorandum from code enforcement officer dated February 28, 2022; a memorandum from code enforcement officer dated December 3, 2021; a memorandum from construction official dated November 17, 2021; a memorandum from the Department of Public Works Water and Sewer Division dated December 23, 2021; and a memorandum from the police department dated December 3, 2021. We've reviewed those reports. As a condition of approval, we will agree with almost all of the conditions and all of the recommend --

MR. WEINER: Excuse me, Mr. Murphy, I apologize for interjecting, but I just want to get something that you'll appreciate on the record is that this is the first hearing of this matter, and as a matter of form, the notices have been reviewed and are acceptable, and the board has jurisdiction to hear this application, which is why the chairman

has opened this and allowed you to begin. But I want to place the jurisdictional note on the record.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Counselor, and I will cross that off of my list because I had it coming up next. I appreciate that, Counselor.

Chair and members of the board, we have multiple professionals here to testify, including a project engineer, our project traffic engineer, our architect of record, and a professional planner. I defer to the chair and to the board as to how you want to run the presentations, but our first witness will be Mr. Josh Kline, who is the project's engineer, and if we would get him sworn in and then qualified as an expert, I defer to the board on how you'd like to do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, what we're going to do, Mr. Murphy, when we have larger type applications like this that we -- we ask that we have one or two witnesses, and then we open it up to the public to allow the public to inquire only what those witnesses have provided us with so we maintain an understanding of how this is being presented as we go forward along the line.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. Sure, okay, I think that's a good plan, and we'll start with Mr. Kline and then go on to one more, and then again I'll turn it back to you to get everyone else involved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. I do leave it open to the members of the board, though, if during the presentation they have any questions specifically of the applicant and their witnesses, while it's being going on, sometimes we will allow those questions just for clarification or to make sure that it's understood what's being presented.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, Mr. Kline, I see you there. If you can raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give this evening regarding the application before us is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

MR. KLINE: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please state your name, spell your last name, and provide your CV for us.

MR. KLINE: Great. Josh Kline, K-l-i-n-e. I'm with Stonefield Engineering & Design. Our address is 92 Park Avenue, Rutherford, New Jersey, 07070. I'm a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey. My license is

active and in good standing. I attended the University of Vermont, where I received a Bachelor's of Science in civil engineering. I've been working in the field of land development, specifically site civil engineering, for over 8 years. I've worked in over 250 commercial, residential, and industrial projects throughout the northeast. I've been qualified as a licensed civil engineer by multiple land use boards in the State of New Jersey. Over the last year, I've presented in front of over 40 boards in the northeast, and I've been accepted as a qualified expert in civil engineering by over 25 boards in the State of New Jersey as well as four boards within Middlesex County over the last 6 months.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, Mr. Kline, your testimony is going to be specifically regarding what aspect of this particular application?

MR. KLINE: Site civil engineering.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

I'll listen for a motion to accept Mr. Kline as an expert.

MS. RAMPOLLA: I'll make a motion to recognize Mr. Kline as an expert in his field.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Christine. Second? Second I see Amy's hand up.

MS. PAPI: I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, all in favor? Any opposed?

Thank you, Mr. Kline, for us going through that procedure.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Kline, you've had an opportunity to review the plans that are being presented to the board this evening?

MR. KLINE: Yes, I have.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. For the benefit of the board, can you please share your screen, and then we'll run through your presentation.

MR. KLINE: No problem. All right, can everyone see my screen all right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Now it came.

MR. KLINE: Right. So thank you. Good evening, everyone. Tonight we're, as Mr. Murphy pointed out, we're here to present a state-of-the-art self-storage facility, including, you know, kind of the most advanced security camera systems, indoor climate control, customer loading.

One of the items I'd just like to kind

of touch on with these types of applications before I go into really the existing conditions is just to kind of make it very clear about this type of facility. So there's no manufacturing. There's no hazardous materials to be stored in the units. There's no living in the units. There's no overnight stay in the units. There's no storage of food or perishable items, and there's no refrigerated units. So those are usually just some kind of some typical questions. But again, these units are geared towards the residential consumer. And, you know, again, those items are not permitted within the units.

The first exhibit I have is the aerial exhibit. I can mark this as A-1 for record. It's dated 2-28-2022. It was prepared by our office.

MR. MURPHY: And just for the matter of process, Chair or Counselor, are we going to be -- we'll send you these exhibits. You had should have these already, but we'll mark them as a matter of process here?

MR. WEINER: Yes, each exhibit when you send in a copy should be marked accordingly as A-1. It should be initialed by the party who is offering it, which in this case would be Mr. Kline, and it should be dated with today's date.

MR. KLINE: Wonderful. Thank you.

MR. WEINER: And that should be consistent throughout any other witness, whichever witness is offering it, they will need to initial it. It will need to be dated today, marked in sequence, and hard copy as indicated sent in to our office.

MR. MURPHY: Wonderful. Thank you.

MR. KLINE: And we did submit these exhibits ahead of time to the township.

MR. BLESSING: We have received them. We actually do have them in our office, Mr. Weiner.

MR. WEINER: Well, just for clarity, since you're referring to them as exhibits, let's just mark them.

MR. MURPHY: We'll mark them, and we'll get the hard copies marked and initialed and sent to you.

MR. WEINER: Exactly. Thank you.

MR. KLINE: All right. So again, we're talking about block 384.01, lot 39.01. It's in the center of the screen. I'm highlighting it on the page. We have Edgeboro Road to the top of the page or to the north. You have state Route 18 as well as

Old Bridge Turnpike to the left-hand side or to the west of the page. We are located within the General Highway Commercial zone HC-2. The property is approximately 3.09 acres.

Orient the board and for the public listening, again, we have Edgeboro Road to the north. We have commercial uses across Edgeboro Road as you go to the west or to the left-hand side of the screen, as I may reference later on in my testimony. We have again State Route 18, Old Bridge Turnpike. This is again kind of a mix of commercial and shopping center uses. As we work our way to the south or to the bottom of the page, again, we're bordered by the Borough of South River. There are kind of a mix of commercial uses as well as kind of some industrial-like storage of cars and vehicles and et cetera behind the site as you can see, and then again to the right-hand side on the page or to the east, we have kind of a commercial and industrial uses as you work your way to the right. We are surrounded by the HC-2 zone on all of the sides that are within the East Brunswick Township, and then the Borough of South River is located within a general business district B-2.

In terms of access and frontage, I'll just zoom in a little bit to the property as I kind of walk through. Edgeboro Road we have approximately 220 feet of frontage. There are two driveways today along Edgeboro Road. There's an unrestricted driveway to the right or to the east, and then there is an egress driveway close to the intersection or to the left-hand side of the building. Along Old Turnpike Road, which is a county road, we have approximately 220 feet of frontage. Just to correct, we have 485, approximately 485 feet of frontage on Edgeboro and 220 feet of frontage along Old Bridge Turnpike. There is one kind of unrestricted driveway to the south, the south kind of corner of the property that remains.

There is an existing two-story building. It's a vacant bank, kind of with bank/office kind of component to it. It's about 10,790 square feet. You know, the building again is visibly abandoned. There's kind of signs of degrading of the facade and the materials of the building. I think something to kind of notice is the building is kind of pushed up towards the kind of the intersection. It's about 28.4 feet along Edgeboro Road and again kind of pushed up to the left-hand side or to the west of

the site with the parking facilities to the east or to the right-hand side of the site.

I think one of the most unique parts about this site, for those that have been out there, is really the unique challenges associated with the topography of the site. You know, there's approximately a 22-foot grade change from the north corner along Edgeboro Road to the south corner on Old Bridge Turnpike. You know, the low point, even just along the roadways, themselves, along Old Bridge Turnpike, along that frontage, you have about a 6-foot grade change, and then along Edgeboro Road, there's definitely a more drastic grade change of about 14 feet. There are steep slopes that currently exist on site. There are steep slopes that are in the really the developed portion of the site along Edgeboro Road, and then there's some steep slopes that exist today within a wooded area on Edge -- along -- sorry -- the eastern property line.

Kind of along that eastern property line there is a wetland. It is an ordinary resource wetland with no transition area. The applicant has filed an application to the NJDEP for an LOI. This was back in spring of 2021. The NJDEP did complete their site visit in November of 2021, and we do expect to receive the LOI shortly, but an application is pending.

The other item to kind of really note about the site from a site civil kind of engineering perspective is stormwater management. The site today has no stormwater management features on site. Today water essentially hits the pavement surfaces and then kind of runs off in all directions, and where that, you know, becomes a challenge or the project this is with the topography, you know, you have a majority of the on-site water or the impervious services are kind of collecting, and they're running out the driveways or running out directly to the public right-of-way that are uncontrolled.

Something else to note is the site is the condition is today, there are no sidewalks around the site. There is no ADA accessible access from the public right-of-way to the site, and the site does not provide ADA accessibility on site currently.

I think the other item, just to kind of note in the existing condition as we kind of look to start talking about the proposed improvements is

with that grade change, there is that 22-foot grade change across the site, but also, the parking and the building area that's there today is sitting about 20 feet above the kind of the surrounding roadways. So the site, itself, is kind of mounded up, and as an existing condition, one of the challenges here is the building as well as the parking area today is much higher than kind of the surrounding roadways as well as the intersections.

Now I'm pulling up exhibit -- I'll mark it as A-2. It was prepared on 12-28-2021 by Stonefield Engineering and Design, and it is noted as the rendered site plan exhibit. This is basically just a colorized version of the site plan that was submitted as part of the application. No changes were made. What we've done is kind of brought in the landscaping kind of to help walk the board through the proposed improvements.

Just to kind of walk through the improvements a little bit, the building is approximately -- the first floor is 42,238 square feet. The total gross floor area is 129,189 square feet. If you include the loading area, the gross floor area is approximately 131,664 square feet. So the loading area -- when you look at a self-storage building, there's a kind of a few main components. One is the loading facility. So as noted, this project does have a climate controlled internal loading facility. I'm highlighting it on the page, but it's to the bottom property line and to the southern property line kind of almost midway through the building. So the idea with this climate controlled loading area is customers are able to pull in to the loading area, and then the doors come down, so all the unloading and loading happens internal to the building within this kind of after the door comes down. So kind of it's all happening internal.

There also is an office that's located to the west of the loading facility. This is where you could go in, you know, pick up ancillary items that are needed for the storage units or kind of meet with the office staff if you're leasing a unit. Again, these units are typically leased now online. You know, with COVID it's kind of changed how a lot of these self-storage facilities operate, but again, units are typically leased online. You can lease them in person.

The auctions, there are auctions that are associated with it, but the auctions take place

online. People don't gather at the sites for those type of things. Everything is kind of done online, but there is an office that is there for customers to use.

The building height is a three-story building. It's 33.3 feet in accordance with the township ordinance, and this is measured from the mean elevation of the finished grade along the front of the building. Should be noted that, you know, the applicant, we did look to kind of maintain the mean elevation around the entirety of the building, and then that's measured from that mean grade to the flat part of the roof. So the building is 33.3 feet in height, and that's in accordance with the requirements. You know, we do note that there are items that are excluded from that height requirement, you know, including kind of mechanical equipment and, you know, things like that that sit on the roof or parapets, but again, the flat roof in accordance with the ordinance is 33.3 feet.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Kline, if I can interject there for a moment, I have a question regarding the height issue, and I'm referring to our own staff report, and I'll ask Mr. Vogt if he can jump in, as well, on this.

There appears to be, according to our staff memorandum at the top of -- basically I'm referring to section B under the architectural, noting that the elevations in the architectural plans include a top coping elevation of 39 feet, which exceeds the zoning standard by more than 10 percent and would be a D height variance issue. So --

MR. MURPHY: Yeah, so to clarify that, Counselor, if I may, we did look at that obviously, and I think that's where Josh is going with this, Mr. Kline is going with this. Our architectural plans included the total height, including the mechanical and parapet height on top of the structure. So when measured correctly pursuant to the definition as defined in the zoning ordinance and the specific exceptions to the height limitations, we believe that we're at 33.3.

Mr. Kline, is that correct?

MR. KLINE: That is correct.

MR. VOGT: Excuse me, Chairman.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Vogt.

MR. VOGT: Can I ask the applicant's professionals to put on the record the rationale as to their conclusion.

MR. MURPHY: I am sure. Josh, if you can just repeat I believe what you -- the way you got there.

MR. VOGT: I guess what I'm asking, define how the code defines height and why your height based on the code definition is 10 percent or less.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. Mr. Kline, do you have the definitions in front of you?

MR. KLINE: I do, yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so can you read the definition of building height.

MR. KLINE: Yes. So the definition from building height is the vertical distance measured from the mean elevation of the finished grade along the front of the building to the highest point of the roof for flat roofs, to the mean height level, between the eaves and ridge for gable and hip roofs, and to the deck line of mansard roofs.

MR. MURPHY: So now can you please read the definition of roofline.

MR. KLINE: Yes. I will have to pull that one.

MR. MURPHY: And just to give you a heads up, the next one we're going to read is exceptions to height limitations.

MR. KLINE: No problem. I have that one next to me.

MR. GUREVICH: While you're looking for that, can I just ask. Where is that height measurement taken from? Because the way the building is structured right now where it's higher on one side and then slopes down to on the other side, is that from the baseline at the lower point at the -- which is I think probably on the diagram in front of you if I was to look at that corner at Edgeboro and Old Bridge Turnpike, as far as I remember, that is a lower point of the building versus further up Old Bridge Turnpike at the back section.

MR. KLINE: No problem. Let me read these two items in, and I think it will do a nice job for me to wrap it up and explain where we measured it from, if you don't mind.

MR. GUREVICH: Sure.

MR. KLINE: Great. So the definition of roofline is the profile of a roof. It's the maximum height of the actual building cover. And then the exceptions to the height limitations, section 228-235, so penthouses or roof structures for

housing of elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans, air conditioning equipment, or similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building, fire or parapet walls, skylights, steeple, flag poles, chimneys, smokestacks, water tanks, or silos may be erected above the height limits prescribed in this chapter.

So what we looked at is the front of the building, and we took the mean grade, which matches the finished floor of the building, and measured to the highest point of the flat roof, which is 33 feet, 4 inches. There are parapets.

MR. MURPHY: And just to confirm, Mr. Kline, that's -- that is in line with the definition of building height, which says the vertical distance measured from the mean elevation of the finished floor.

MR. KLINE: Correct, and it should be noted that 33. -- the mean elevation along Old Bridge Turnpike as well as Edgeboro Road along the face of the building is the same --

(Unknown speakers in background)

MR. WEINER: Amy, can you mute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry about that.

MR. KLINE: That's no problem. So again, we are measuring it from the finished grade along the building to the top of the flat part of the roof.

MR. PEPE: I have a question.

MR. GUREVICH: I'm still a little bit confused on that. So you consider this area in the front where you have the what I believe you call the pull-in unloading dock, that is what you consider the front of the building. It's not -- is that correct?

MR. KLINE: So we looked at it from three ways because we know what (inaudible) so what we did was we made sure -- we ensured that the height is 33 feet, 4 inches when measured on the facade facing Old Bridge Turnpike, on Edgeboro Road, as well as the facade where kind of the main point of entry of the building is. And we do understand one of the unique challenges of the site -- again, this is providing the height in accordance with how the ordinance is written. We do understand -- and I think the point that you are making is that, you know, there are some grade changes across the site. So that if you were to compare the height of the building in different -- in various points around the site, it may look different, but per the

ordinance and how height is measured, the height of the building is 33 feet, 4 inches.

MR. GUREVICH: So you know what, maybe -- I was going to save this question, but it's applicable to this. So if I was to look at as I drove by and looked at the current building, how much -- what is that current building compared to this new building, because obviously it's flat across the top, but if -- my recollection is that if I was to measure along from the base of the building on Edgeboro Road, it would be significantly taller than along the opposite edge of Edgeboro Road, significantly taller. So what is -- if I go to the -- like, how much bigger -- just to make life simple, how much taller is this proposed building than the current building? Like, is it two stories, 30 feet above the current building, 20 feet above the current building, 10 feet above the current building?

MR. KLINE: So the current building is a two-story building. This is a three-story building.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay, but this --

MR. KLINE: This building is --

MR. GUREVICH: -- the same in terms of the height of each story, so if I was to drive by again, split that building into two and then add a second top to make it three, then I would get an idea of the height of this building, proposed building?

MR. KLINE: I think it would be, you know -- again, I don't have the exact floors of the existing building, but again, this is a -- you know, if you were to be -- you know, the building, the floor, the finished floors are within about a foot to 18 inches of each other, so if you were to kind of imagine a 33-foot-high structure in that place, it would have a similar --

MR. GUREVICH: The reason I ask is because a lot of storage facilities have oversized compared to standard facilities that are might be used for office space. So I don't know if this facility --

MR. KLINE: This facility does not.

MR. GUREVICH: -- 10-foot versus 12-foot ceilings. So a three-story 12-foot ceiling cannot be compared to a three-foot 8-foot ceiling.

MR. KLINE: Well, one of the big differences is the building that you have out there today is designed to allow vehicles to pass under it, so the building out there today, you know, is

designed with a higher first floor. This building is designed that the loading facilities actually go into the second floor so that the, you know, a vehicle -- when the loading facilities are taller than the first floor, so think what you might see at other storage facilities is they have a much higher first floor so they can allow vehicles to go in. What this facility does is has three even floor plates, but the loading facilities eat into a portion of the second floor to allow vehicles to safely pass in and out of the loading area.

MR. GUREVICH: Yeah, the current building is -- again, the current building has an ability to drive under it only on the side of Edgeboro Road approximately, where that first driveway was in the previous diagram, correct. As --

MR. KLINE: Let me just zoom in just to kind of clarify for the record. You can drive under the building in multiple points, so you can drive under the building from Old Bridge Road. You can also drive under the building from the other side. So both the north and the south side have multiple points where you can drive under the building. So the first floor of the existing building is elevated to allow vehicles to travel under.

MR. GUREVICH: Correct, but differently on one side and the other. I'm still trying to get an idea of what the relative height is, and maybe we can table that for now. Maybe there is a further explanation or whatever. I'm just saying there is still some confusion for me as to where that 33.3 is measured from, if it's the average of the, you know, the height between Edgeboro to what you consider the front of the building or if it's just from the front of the building.

MR. KLINE: So the height is measured in accordance with the ordinance.

MR. GUREVICH: I understand what you're saying. I'm saying --

MR. KLINE: That is if you were to measure from the front of the building, let's say Old Bridge Turnpike. If you were to measure from the finished grade along the facade to the highest point of the flat roof is 33 feet, 4 inches.

MR. PEPE: Can I interject here. Just, Leon, maybe I'll be able to help you a little bit. In layman's terms, when we clear a site, if you clear a site, right, is what he's speaking at. So whether he clears a site and gets his (inaudible) he's going to go 33, 4. Then there's going to be an

additional 5 foot, 8 above that that's not in the ordinance that's not considered to be the roof height. So --

MR. GUREVICH: Steve, that's not my question, and I totally understand that. My question is that --

MR. PEPE: Where top of curb then would be Leon's question in --

MR. GUREVICH: My question is clear that the height from one corner of that building to the other corner of that building is different because of the grading of the ground. That's --

MR. PEPE: Where did you pull your top of -- what top of curb did you pull from to get your elevation is what he's asking. So what's your benchmark to get that. Where you pulling, at the corner of Old Bridge Turnpike and Edgeboro Road? Did you pull it from over by the shopping center to the right? That's what he's -- correct me if I'm wrong, Leon. You want to know where you're getting that -- where you're getting that height from, correct? Like where out in the street.

MR. GUREVICH: I'm not asking for the street. I'm asking from the grading that would be flat, are you measuring from let's say that parking lot at -- we've taken two different definitions of the front of the building. At one point, Mr. Kline mentioned that the front of the building is considered where the entrance into that second floor drive-in, and at another point in the conversation, he's mentioned that the front of the building is the facade along the Old Bridge Turnpike area, and my point is that the facade along the Old Bridge Turnpike area grades downwards from that driveway from Old Bridge Turnpike towards Edgeboro Road. So if I was to measure at the corner of the building closest -- furthest from Edgeboro Road on the southwest corner of the building versus the -- what's it called -- northwest corner of the building, I would get two different measurements of the height of that building from the baseline, and that was my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I interject here, guys, and try to help.

MR. GUREVICH: Please.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the elevation at the northwest corner of the land that you plan to have as your final, and what is the elevation at the southeast corner or south corners of the building that you're planning? Are they different or

identical?

MR. KLINE: They are the same. So each corner of the building is the same grade as the finished floor of the building.

THE CHAIRMAN: So if we -- if we -- I don't know which one of the plans (inaudible) that showed the final elevations. Your statement is final elevations, every single corner of this building will have the exact same -- there is no grade -- there is no movement of a grade away from the building at the building.

MR. KLINE: Correct. The corners of the building are all 98.5. So it's similar to what you see out there today where -- up from the right-of-ways.

MR. GUREVICH: Is it possible -- do you happen to have -- what's it called -- a side profile view of that? Maybe that can clear it up.

MR. KLINE: We'll be sharing renderings that show the building that maybe will help with the perspective. I can share, you know, we did --

MR. GUREVICH: I'm going off of a visual review of the current building, and if you can accept that the current building, one corner of the building looks much taller than the other corner of the building because the ground slopes downward towards that corner. So if I measure from that downward to the top of the building, the building is flat, but the ground goes down. So it's short here, tall here, right?

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Guys, before we get into this for a long time, I think Mr. Kline understands the question.

MR. GUREVICH: That's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, let's see -- if it would be even possible at some point, Mr. Kline, you may not have it tonight, but if there was some way to superimpose the height or plan of what you intend to be there versus what it might look like if we had the existing structure. At least identify visually where we're going to have this -- what's going to be different vertically or not.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WEINER: We kind of got a little bit -- I'm glad the board jumped in with some very good questions. We got a little bit sidetracked. There was an issue which I'm concerned about that was raised by our -- in our staff memorandum about the potential of the need for a D-6 variance that was

not sought, and I'd like to get back to that. I know Mr. Vogt had asked a particular question and was looking for clarity with regard to certain definitions, and then we kind of went off in a little bit of a tangential direction, and I just want to get back. I want to make sure that Mr. Vogt heard what he wanted to hear and get his position on whether or not that clarity helps in his interpretation because the staff memorandum indicates that more than half of the building is effectively 39 feet high on the Old Bridge Turnpike frontage, including the segment closest to the roadway, and my concern is whether or not according to our professional staff there's a need of a D-6 that was not applied for.

MR. MURPHY: And, Counsel, if I may before the professional engineer jumps in, it's important to note that the reason why that I believe was brought up was not a separate analysis by your internal staff as to the height of the building but the fact that our architectural plans that were submitted as part of our application actually show a 39-foot height because those architectural plans measured from the ground and included all of the items that are excluded from the height definition. So with that.

MR. VOGT: Yeah, if I can just speak, Chairman. I'm comfortable with what I just heard as to the analysis. Raising the issue, there is basically two points. Point number 1 is the plans indicate the height I believe of 33.81, which is consistent with what the applicant's engineer testified to. We wanted to make sure that, A, it was not a C variance for any height as defined to be over 35 feet, which is the zone standard, and more importantly, if it were more than 10 percent over the 39 feet, which is the peak height, that would be a D. I think the testimony that we've heard is based on their interpretation of the zone, which I agree with that they comply with the zone and they are not seeking either a D variance nor a bulk variance for the height.

MR. WEINER: Thank you, Mr. Vogt.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. With that somewhat clarified for you, Mr. Kline, please proceed.

MR. KLINE: No problem. All right. So I still have up Exhibit A-2.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Kline, your screen is not sharing right now.

MR. KLINE: Thank you. That was kind of

explaining the building, kind of focusing on the building. I think one other item to notice, the setbacks, the setback for the front yard is 60 feet, so along Old Bridge Turnpike we are a little bit over 60 feet, approximately 61 and a half feet. The setback along Edgeboro Road is 39.9 feet. I think when we look at setbacks from a site civil engineering perspective, you know, we look at can the site kind of safely accommodate the building location. In this instance, it can. So, you know, we're well under on impervious coverage. We're still maintaining the 20-foot landscape buffer along Edgeboro Road. We're still able to safely manage stormwater across the project. So, you know, again, we're able to kind of accommodate that.

The other thing we kind of look at, which our traffic engineer will go into a little bit more detail, is sight lines, and again, the building location will not impact any sight lines, either at the intersection or the proposed driveways.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Kline, very quickly. When you began to speak again, you had indicated that you had A-2 up. Did you change the exhibits, or is this still A-1 and that was a misstatement? I just want to clarify the record.

MR. KLINE: This is the rendered site plan exhibit I marked as A-2.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline, could you enlarge the area. There's a lot of superfluous -- thank you. So that when you're discussing this application and this site, it's a little bit easier for everyone to view on their screens than what we had a couple seconds ago. Can you clarify that the detention basin or what you intend to do the detention basin is also the area that is in green just next to Old Bridge Turnpike?

MR. KLINE: Correct. So the area in green represents the bottom. It's a bioretention basin. So that provides both a water quality as well as a quantity component to it.

We are proposing 18 parking spaces as part of the project. They're located on both the south and the east side of the building. There is an entrance. I'll let the architect kind of go into the floor plan a little bit more, but there is a kind of an entrance along the eastern side of the building so customers using those seven spaces will have access to it as well as customers will be able to use the loading facilities along the south side.

We are maintaining the approximate location of the driveway on Old Bridge Turnpike, but we are proposing a new driveway. It will, you know, the location really was meant to be, you know, kind of again furthest away from the intersection to kind of minimize, you know, any potential impact. And then along Edgeboro Road we're proposing one driveway versus today where there's two. We've eliminated the driveway that's very close to the intersection, and what we've done is look to locate a driveway kind of as far away as the intersection as possible without kind of impacting with minimizing impacts to steep slopes or the wetland area.

Just kind of as I -- before I move on to the more technical items, I do like to just kind of touch on the operations. So the office component is open daily from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Customers do have secure access to the facility from 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. seven days a week. There is typically about three employees, three employees with the project. There is typically three employees during a peak shift at the facility, between two and three employees.

In terms of security, the site will have high-def security cameras surrounding the entirety of the site, the exterior as well as the interior. All of the exterior doors have key pads, so customers will have individual codes to access the secure areas. When the office is closed, the office is locked, but again, using an individual key pad, a customer can access their unit during those secure access hours. Employees are instructed and do regular walks of both the exterior and interior of the building. I think one of the important things to note is the building and the security system is monitored by a third-party company, and it's monitored remotely 24/7, so if someone were to be accessing -- again, the facility locks at 10 p.m., but if someone were to be in the facility outside of those secure customer hours, you know, the proper authorities would be notified. The interior lighting is also on motion sensors within the facilities.

In terms of deliveries, we are proposing a 6-foot-high masonry block trash enclosure. We'll look to use materials to kind of match the aesthetic of the architecture. That's located to the west of the site kind of tucked in the corner. That will house the dumpster. The trash facilities are only used by the office staff, so customers cannot access

the dumpster. It is locked. So it's a carry-in/carry-out facilities. Customers cannot dump bulk storage or anything like that. Again, it's just for the employees that work there. So trash is typically picked up about once per week. And then again, there's really not many deliveries associated with a facility like this, but, you know, you tend to have, you know, Amazon or UPS or kind of ancillary office supplies, which, you know, typically maybe once, twice a week you have a delivery like that that comes to the site, but again, the facility is designed to kind of accommodate those types of vehicles.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline, what would be an occasion where the refuse area would be required other than what they might make for lunch or paper from the office? What possibly else could they go in there?

MR. KLINE: Correct, so that's -- it's really any ancillary trash from the office component. So like you said, could be paper, it could be items from their lunch, you know, recyclables, but again, it's a very low amount of waste that's generated. There's only, you know, two to three employees that, you know, are operating out of this facility, so again, you may have trash picked up once a week. We like to kind of -- but again, it's on an as needed basis. It would be a private hauler.

THE CHAIRMAN: And with regard to what the -- your customers may have, while I know you would be doing what you could to police them, if somebody has items that could spoil inside their unit and they leave, you're obviously going to have to eventually figure out how to get rid of that. Would that also go into that dumpster?

MR. KLINE: So those types of -- those types of things aren't permitted, you know, in the facility. So no perishables, no hazardous waste are permitted within the facility.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that, and that's fine, but doesn't mean everybody pays attention or adheres to that, and especially if they've got it in boxes and they're going up to their storage unit, I don't think you (inaudible) through every single box that some people might bring in.

MR. KLINE: It's a great point. It's a great question. So, you know, the way these sites operate and what makes, you know, these types of

storage facilities desirable is you want them clean. So this applicant, you know, prides themselves on having clean facilities, not having trash laying around, not allowing kind of customers. So in a case where, you know, something, you know, a customer were to leave something out of control, it is the applicant and the owner's responsibility to make sure they're keeping the facility clean. So whether they had to, you know, move that trash into their secured dumpster, they could. Whether they had to in a unique situation call a private hauler to come pick something up, you know, that's the responsibility of the applicant and something they would ensure they do as part of the project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I think you may have some exposure or some experience with some of the other facilities, and what I just posed I don't believe would be the only time it would ever happen. That's all I'm saying.

MR. GUREVICH: Mr. Kline, can I ask you -- and I apologize. Please tell me if you're going to cover this later, but just because you mentioned lighting, you mentioned indoor lighting. Could you give an idea of what outdoor lighting looks like or may -- where it might be positioned or placed.

MR. KLINE: I definitely will. I can touch on that in a couple minutes, but it's good. It's perfect segue to where I'm heading.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anything more then, Mr. Kline, about what you were talking about with notifying law enforcement if somebody is in the building, et cetera? Was anything more on that line you were going to go through?

MR. KLINE: Sorry, can you ask the question one more time?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. You mentioned -- you alluded to, well, people aren't supposed to be in there certain times and the proper authorities would be notified. That's what I heard you say.

MR. KLINE: So I wasn't -- I didn't mean to allude, but these sites are monitored remotely by a third party 24/7, so any unauthorized access, anything that is being done that's illegal on the facility, there's a third party operator that would notify the authorities or notify the operator of the facility accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so that theoretically could include if it's during hours when there's nobody at the facility the need for the

local law enforcement to go to the site; would that be fair?

MR. KLINE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Could you repeat the hours again for when the employees would be there and when the doors are open.

MR. KLINE: Correct. So the office hours are daily, 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, and then there's something else that's open from 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. or something for open access to anybody who might have a storage item in there.

MR. KLINE: So there is -- correct, there is secure customer access between 5 a.m. and 10 p.m. So someone could use their individual code to access their unit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That doesn't stop them from going after hours, but that's when it might result in having the law enforcement.

MR. KLINE: Correct, so the doors do lock and the site is monitored 24/7.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, but theoretically, from what I understand, if you've got some sort of a code to get in, you're saying that the code gets also locked out and they can't get in after 10?

MR. KLINE: Correct, your code would not work at 10:01. You cannot enter the facility at 10:01.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PAPI: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- next question at this point regarding the lighting, if you can go into that, Josh, Mr. Kline, that would be great.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Chairman, I think there was a question before the board.

MS. PAPI: Go ahead. You can finish. I was just going to question. Are there any type of elevators that are needed in this facility for any reason?

MR. KLINE: So, yes, there are three elevators within the facility. It may be more beneficial if the architect kind of --

MS. PAPI: Okay. I apologize. I was wait -- I didn't -- wasn't sure whether this was the diagram to ask. Okay, I'll wait.

MR. KLINE: No, no problem. He'll do a much better job than I will.

MS. PAPI: Okay.

MR. KLINE: So I can kind of -- I can jump into the lighting. So as part of the project,

we are proposing all new LED full-cutoff dark-sky-client fixtures. We're proposing a combination of both area lights and wall lights. We're only proposing two area lights as part of the project. We're proposing an area light at both of the driveways. They're mounted at 20 feet. Note that 25 feet is permitted so they're a little bit lower than what's allowed by code, and those again are to kind of light the driveway access point. Remainder of the lights are mounted along the building, so they're mounted along the south facade as well as the easterly facade, and those lights are mounted at 20 feet, as well, in order to kind of provide safe lighting. So, you know, the idea is, you know, these facilities want to, you know, encourage security and safety so, you know, lighting is provided within the parking areas, the loading areas, and kind of the pedestrian access paths around the site.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the people would be expected to walk from those parking spots, Mr. Kline, to the door, or they can go in that side door right there?

MR. KLINE: Correct, they can access through the seven parking spots on the east side of the building. They can access through the elevator through that door.

THE CHAIRMAN: And one of those carts you referenced.

MR. KLINE: I believe it was in the Remington Vernick RVE letter talked about handcarts. So there would be handcarts available at the facility, so they could go into the facility, get a handcart, kind of go to their vehicle, load it up, and use it. I think the engineer/planner made a recommendation on providing ramps or easier ways for people to kind of access their vehicles. You know, I don't think that would be any issue. As a condition of approval, we'd be happy to kind of look to locate those ramps or locate, you know, access points in a way that are safe for both the, you know, for the customers and, you know, in areas that are approved by the board engineer.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Kline, if I can just quickly ask, and if this was touched on, I apologize, but I'd like you to visit or revisit with regard to the lighting, the hours and the means of operation. You're giving a lot of information out there, and I want to make sure the board is absorbing everything and we're not going too fast.

MR. KLINE: It's no problem. So in terms of the lighting, the lighting would be operational when the facility is open and then during after hours, so when the facility is not open, they typically ensure a security lighting standard. So the lighting would operate on a dimmed level and under motion sensors, but again, the site would be lit throughout the course of the evening just from a security standpoint.

MR. WEINER: So there would be some lighting of some nature 24/7?

MR. KLINE: Correct, and that's for the security of the facility.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

MR. GUREVICH: Mr. Kline, but for security, again, I wanted to follow up with this. The expectation is, other than using some of the, you know, the side door or the other door with a handcart or walking in as a member, renter in this, the idea is that you can drive a vehicle, like you said, into the climate controlled customer loading area. What's the maximum, like, what's the height of that -- what's the maximum size truck or car that you would expect to be able to fit in there? I see it's 40 feet, you know, in terms of length, 14 feet across. I didn't get a clear indication of height, but just for reference, like, is that a cube van, something bigger than a cube van?

MR. KLINE: So the space as noted is 40 feet deep and 12 feet wide, so it can accommodate your typical box trucks. So it can accommodate in terms of height and length up to a 40-foot box truck, but typically what we find is your everyday, your U-Hauls and your Penske trucks, which are closer to 28 to 30 feet, can be accommodated within those bays safely. But again, any customer is permitted to use those loading area, so you can drive your car or your van right into the loading space. You could back up your pickup truck and use a loading space. So it is meant for customers, you know, any size vehicle can be utilized in that design space.

MR. GUREVICH: And I'm assuming that once the vehicle is in there, the garage doors, you know, would basically close and provide kind of that security. It's a lit area, et cetera --

MR. KLINE: Correct.

MR. GUREVICH: -- until somebody else comes in and opens it or they open it, right?

MR. KLINE: Correct, the door would come

down just to kind of maintain the climate control aspect.

MR. GUREVICH: So I'll open to the board. I have no idea and I'm not sure if it's worth asking. Obviously, with that ramp over there and given the size of the vehicle, it looks just visually that the length, the 40-foot length of the bay versus the space in front is almost the same? And I'm curious how you back it in safely and easily into there, especially with the bumper stops. I'm not sure if those two green areas are bumper stops on the side of the ramp or if they're just -- what's it called -- vegetation to give guidance, but in terms of backing that up, I'll leave it to the engineering department to consider, and if that is something that the board should consider.

I had a follow-on question, but I'll leave it at that at this stage.

MR. KLINE: Yeah, we did submit truck movement exhibits showing a 40-foot box truck can safely back into all three spaces and safely leave.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay, and then my follow-on question on security is, when you state that the lighting dims at night, I'm assuming that if somebody was to go into the unit or into the space and not leave by 10 p.m. that if they then start to move about after 10 p.m., security would be on, motion detector, something, and notify someone that someone is walking around the space, like, inside, even if they entered at let's say 9:50 and stayed 20 minutes or whatever. My question is, but that does not happen if somebody was to then go into their rented unit and stay within that. Is there any understanding of how that is monitored? Like, for example, if somebody was to stay within their unit, do we monitor people coming in, the number in versus the number out?

MR. KLINE: So the facility, it's monitored 24/7, so they're looking at people coming in and out. They're looking at people that are using their units. You know, one thing about self-storage use, which I'll let the traffic engineer go into the, you know, the limited amount of traffic, but it's not a high-volume use even from a customer (inaudible) point basis. So there's not a ton of customers in this building at any one time. But it is monitored. It's monitored 24/7. So, you know, people aren't allowed in their units. People aren't allowed to stay overnight in their units, you know, so there is a company, a third party that

monitors this 24/7 to ensure that things like that aren't happening on site.

MR. GUREVICH: I guess what I'm asking is, I know that between 6 o'clock when the office closes until 10 o'clock, which is when access closes, is there security walking around, or is there anybody that monitors or is expected to monitor the number of people coming in, for example, somebody coming in at 9 o'clock or at 6 o'clock, walking into their unit, closing the door, and, you know, in essence spending the night.

MR. KLINE: So there is a third party company that monitors the facility 24/7, so they are monitoring it from the time the office closes to the time that the secured access closes and then continuing. So 24/7 somebody is monitoring what's going in and out, what's happening on site, kind of all the operations of the site.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay. I think what we're missing here is, you know, the reason I mention in regards to the loading bay is that when I have a security card, I can electronically monitor somebody using my security card and making sure that that same person might use the security card to exit, recognizing that one person came in, one person came out. If I have a single security card that gets an entire truck in, I don't know how many people came out of that truck. It could be more than that one person. My point for that reason is that other than having a security system that monitors visually with cameras and other such detail, there is probably no way between 6 o'clock -- and it might be difficult even up until 6 o'clock -- to recognize if anybody remained in that building either beyond the 10 o'clock time period or otherwise. I was curious if there was a creative solution to such a problem when you create an entrance that is not monitored by individual key card conditions, right, one-to-one conditions.

MR. KLINE: So there is cameras in every single hallway, and there's cameras in the loading facility. So if someone had multiple people get out of their car, instantly they would be on camera. They would be able to see that there was more than one person.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay, but that means that your security -- so your statement is that there is somebody that should be instructed to count those individuals and count what goes in and what goes out 'is that the contention in essence then?

MR. KLINE: No, my statement is there's a third party company that is specifically hired to monitor the site 24/7 and provide security services.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay.

MR. KLINE: This is what they -- you know, that's what they do. They monitor the site. There is cameras in every hallway. There's individual key codes to access the facility, and then again there's individual locks to get into your actual unit.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay, understood. I don't want to belabor the point. I understand your position on that. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline. Mr. Kline, recognizing that we, of course, are going to be having additional meetings, you may just want to have some validation of your monitoring company, exactly how it's impossible for somebody to do what Mr. Gurevich has indicated he's wondering about. So maybe you could have something from them that tells us how it's guaranteed that they cannot -- nobody can violate their intent as Mr. Gurevich was describing, okay?

MR. KLINE: That's a great idea. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay, so there was a question about lighting. I think that we've gotten some of that answered. Mr. Kline, I'm sorry we keep interrupting you, but the board is actively engaged in trying to understand your application. So I appreciate you going, you know, your dealing with us that way.

MR. KLINE: No, it's no problem. It's nice to be able to kind of walk through and get questions taken care of. Is there any other -- before I move on, is there any other questions on the lighting aspect? I do just, you know, want to touch on some of the notable site features, stormwater as well as landscaping.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you can move at this point, Mr. Kline.

MR. KLINE: Okay, perfect. I know I've had the site up on the screen for a long time so this point we've been able to see it, but I just wanted to kind of touch on some of the improvements associated with the project.

The applicant is providing a new sidewalk along Old Bridge Turnpike. This would provide ADA accessibility from the intersection along the entirety of the left-hand side of the

page. It will also provide ADA accessible access to the building. We are providing ADA accessible facilities on site, as well. So that is, you know, a much needed improvement over what exists today.

I did note the steep slopes. The application is disturbing some existing steep slopes on site, so again, a portion of that is an area that is already kind of developed before, and then a portion of the steep slopes, which I'm highlighting on the screen kind of towards Edgeboro Road by the driveway, that's due to one of the nice improvements about this project is we eliminated the driveway closest to the intersection and kind of consolidated to one driveway along Edgeboro Road, and what we did is we kind of realigned the driveway compared today where it kinds of comes at an angle, so we're providing, you know, kind of safe access and better sight lines for customers and people kind of accessing the facility.

We did submit a soil movement exhibit, as well, associated with the application, and so the site has a lot of challenges we talked about from a topography standpoint, but it will be a limited export site of approximately 720 cubic yards.

In terms of other improvements, stormwater management, this is a major development. You know, this is -- as noted about the existing condition, there's no stormwater facilities, no structures, no drainage that are there today, and this site will change that. So we will be providing stormwater management facilities on site. We'll be capturing the water on site. We'll be sending it to a bioretention area that's along Old Bridge Turnpike. So the bioretention area does two things. It filters the water to provide water quality treatment, and then it holds the water back and slowly sends it out.

You know, one of the big advantages of this site is you no longer have this uncontrolled kind of non-cleaned water flowing to the public right-of-ways. We're capturing the water. We're filtering it. We're meeting the water quality standards. We're holding it back, and we're slowly releasing it, but what we're actually doing is we're sending it directly to the stormwater system. So water isn't kind of pouring out uncontrolled to the public right-of-way around us.

You know, one of the things we talk about when we talk about stormwater, just impervious coverage. I think it's, you know, one thing to note

is 75 percent impervious coverage is permitted. We're only proposing 54.7 percent, and it's really a, you know, a minor, you know, increase, you know, of only 1.3 percent what's out there today, so really kind of minor increase, but by doing that small increase impervious coverage, you get the benefit of both water quality and detention systems, which if the project wasn't, again, you could kind of get away without detaining and holding water back. So we are meeting stormwater through reduction, so not only are we kind of pre-meeting the same rate of how quickly water leaves the site, we're actually reducing it for all the storm events in accordance with the new state standards.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline, we got -- C-5 is the sheet that includes all of the stormwater adjustments. I don't know if you can put that up.

MR. KLINE: That's no problem. I have it right here. So this is C-5. It was submitted as part of the --

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't have to give it a number. We have it.

MR. KLINE: Perfect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, but --

MR. WEINER: Does not need to be marked.

MR. KLINE: Correct. So here is the plan, the grading and drainage plan, and kind of as noted along Old Bridge Turnpike to the left-hand side or to the west where you see these contouring, that is the bioretention area. So that's where water coming from the parking areas that I'm highlighting across the bottom of the page or to the south as well as portions of the building are getting directed to that. They're filtering through a media layer, and then they're getting sent out. So this project is subject to the new stormwater regulations. So we're meeting stormwater through kind of advanced BMP's in accordance with the regulations that were adopted last year.

The other portion of the site is, you know, where we're making up some kind of some of this unique challenge with the grading. We do have a water quality unit that meets the 80 percent TSS removal standards. So that's filtering the water and then again directing it directly into the stormwater system. So what you don't have here you can kind of see the inlets around the site is we're not letting water go uncontrolled to the roadways. We're not letting water just kind of spill out these steep driveways as it does today. We're collecting

everything on site. We're filtering it or cleaning it or meeting the water quality standards, and then what we're doing is slowly reducing it directly into the stormwater management system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Including any water from the roof. You didn't mention --

MR. KLINE: Correct.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Kline, if I may --

MR. KLINE: Water from the roof --

MR. WEINER: If I may with regard to the bioretention basin and what you were just talking about, the emergency spillway is designed to discharge onto Edgeboro Road, and I note from our staff report that township approval of this design approach is necessary. Where do we stand in that? Have you obtained approval? And perhaps Mr. Vogt can let us know, as well, where that stands.

MR. KLINE: I think any necessary approvals that were required for the location, you know, we as a condition of approval would obtain. We'd have to work with the board engineer whether he's referencing, you know, the township engineer approval, but again, we would comply with the board engineer's comments.

MR. WEINER: I just wanted to know if you've taken any steps at this point, if you've had those conversations, or are we comfortable with that being a condition of approval should the board deem to move favorably on the application.

MR. VOGT: Chairman, we wouldn't have an issue with that being a condition of approval, if granted, obviously.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline, regarding the basins, the overflow basin, you said it was something that is active, it's not passive, in that it cleans the water?

MR. KLINE: Correct, it's a bioretention basin.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any maintenance required on a bioretention basin?

MR. KLINE: Yes. So this site would require maintenance like any stormwater facility would, and we would, you know, the applicant would be responsible for maintaining, you know, both the stormwater, the bioretention area, as well as the water quality unit, as well as all the stormwater facilities on site.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is there some sort of a regular schedule on maintenance of that, or is it

somebody says, uh oh, it looks like it's stopped up, and they call somebody.

MR. KLINE: No. So there would be -- there's an operation maintenance manual that would be required, and so that would require routine maintenance of the system. So if, you know, I -- may have been mentioned in the board engineer's letter, but it is typical, and we would provide as a condition typically before construction a maintenance, an operations and maintenance manual, which requires routine maintenance of the system.

THE CHAIRMAN: And a copy of that would be provided to the town, as well?

MR. KLINE: Yes, it would.

MR. VOGT: Excuse me, Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Vogt.

MR. VOGT: Yeah, if I can just add on to what was just said. The state regulations require that they have a stormwater maintenance plan showing the owner as the responsible party for all maintenance. That plan has to be in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:8, and ultimately, a copy of that plan is filed with Middlesex County and becomes part of the deed. The maintenance becomes a legal responsibility of the owner.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MURPHY: If I may as the attorney, the owner and any subsequent owner.

MR. VOGT: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Okay, Mr. Kline, thank you for the clarification.

MR. KLINE: That's no problem. Are there any other stormwater related questions, or I'll move over to -- back to the colorized site plan.

MR. GUREVICH: This might be related. I'm just curious. You mentioned the addition of sidewalk along Old Bridge Turnpike, but is there a reason that a sidewalk was not chosen to be added to Edgeboro Road? Does that have anything to do with --

MR. KLINE: There is no sidewalk today or kind of leading in through these industrial facilities. So we understand kind of Old Bridge Turnpike, highway business zone, as well as they were already doing sidewalk improvements to the intersection, the DOT, so we continued it up our site to provide that accessibility. You know, if the board wishes for a sidewalk along Edgeboro Road, the applicant would have no issue kind of providing

that, providing that as a benefit.

MR. GUREVICH: Just wanted to understand the decisioning around that. I appreciate that.

And out of curiosity, is there a charging station, electric vehicle or anything like that within the parking facility?

MR. KLINE: So the project would have to comply with the state ordinance when it comes to EV make-ready, but we are proposing one EV space as part of the project.

MR. GUREVICH: Thank you. That's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline, I'm going to lean on the side of a sidewalk. Ironically, when I was there today, two people were walking along Edgeboro Road going up towards the intersection. Now, I understand that there is a bus stop that's located Route 18 at the corner where to Old Bridge Turnpike merges.

MR. KLINE: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if there are people who are walking to work and work along Edgeboro Road and we can provide them with a sidewalk, I would like to entertain or have the applicant entertain including a sidewalk along Edgeboro Road.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chair, if the board would view this application favorably, we would certainly make that a condition of approval. Josh, is that correct?

MR. KLINE: Yes, that is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, Mr. Murphy, thank you. I don't know where anything is going right now, but I certainly would like to have that in the record.

MR. MURPHY: Absolutely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. RAMPOLLA: Chairman, I have a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, Miss Rampolla.

MS. RAMPOLLA: The basin, for maintenance, does it require the person maintaining it have access to it with a vehicle? Is there vehicle access to that area?

MR. KLINE: Correct. So what we -- what we're doing is we are providing a path for a vehicle. So there's along the area I'm highlighting, so the southern end of the basin, you can see the majority of the basin is at 3-to-1 grading, which is very typical, but on the southern side, what we're doing is sloping it about 10 percent, and this would be -- allow for a pickup

truck or if they're needed, you know, like a mower or some type of equipment, that would provide them a safe area to go down. So the NJDEP, as well as good engineering practice, you know, you tend to want to provide about a path that's about 10 to 12 percent slope vehicles to be able to access the basin.

MS. RAMPOLLA: And then how is that secured? That's gated, or how is that kept closed to anyone but whoever is maintaining that area?

MR. KLINE: Correct. So we -- there would be a gate at the access area, and I just wanted to pull out to see if we were noting the material. So, you know, based on the depth of the basin, we didn't have a fence, but we definitely kind of to discourage any type of access, providing a fence and a gate around it would not be an issue to kind of prevent that type of access.

MR. VOGT: Excuse me, chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good idea.

MS. RAMPOLLA: That would be fence fencing and a gate to keep vehicles out or that would also keep pedestrians out of that area?

MR. KLINE: It would serve for both purposes.

MR. VOGT: Excuse me, Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Vogt.

MR. VOGT: Question for Mr. Kline.

Where the vehicles are going to be driving there, is that going to be simple -- is that simply grass and soil? Is that reinforced?

MR. KLINE: Correct, it was -- it's not being reinforced. It's just grass and soil. You know, again, you know, based on the type of bioretention area and the size of it and the type of equipment expected, you know, it's typically, you know, we don't foresee a vehicle having any issue getting down there. You know, a lawn mower or some type of vehicle like that really wouldn't have any issue getting down that type of slope.

MR. VOGT: What happens if you have to get a Bobcat or something to remove sediment?

MR. KLINE: Again, I think, you know, a Bobcat would be able to again access it just because of the slope, but if you would prefer, you know, again, we're -- we'd be willing to provide kind of reinforced grass if that would be the board engineer's preference.

MR. VOGT: Yeah, I think -- again, if the application gets approved, I think we may want to look at something along the lines, if not pavers,

some kind of geogrid system or something that's going to allow the vehicles to go in and out without creating erosion.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Vogt, if you could just perhaps give me -- I want to jot this down as a potential condition should the board ultimately decide to move on this favorably language that would be satisfactory.

MR. VOGT: My recommendation, Jay, would be something along the lines of considering stabilization where maintenance vehicles would enter and exit the basin could be something along the lines of pavers or Geogrids or something similar such that you could have vehicular access without creating erosion.

MR. WEINER: Geogrids to the access of the -- I'm sorry.

MR. VOGT: The access for purposes of maintaining the basin.

MR. WEINER: For maintaining the basin. Okay.

MS. PAPI: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Amy.

MS. PAPI: I don't know if, Mr. Kline, this is the right time for me to ask, but are there going to be water sprinklers, fire security? What kind of security are we going to speak about when it comes to the fire safety?

MR. KLINE: The building would be sprinklered, and then from a -- the other type of sprinkler, we would have an irrigation system.

MS. PAPI: Okay.

MR. KIPP: Mr. Kline, just one quick question back to the emergency spillway. What -- is that going to be exposed aggregate? Is that the game plan for that? I really couldn't tell from the detail.

MR. KLINE: Correct, it would be kind of a larger stone or a riprap to kind of, you know, protect that area.

MR. KIPP: And the slope is approximately 7 feet, so that would be pretty visible from the roadway, right?

MR. KLINE: It's at a 3-to-1 slope. Again, if I -- I'll go over to the Exhibit A-2, the site rendering plan. So we do along Old Bridge Turnpike and at the corner, we've -- and I was going to kind of touch on the landscaping. As we pull landscaping around to the corner, so we have street trees as well as shrubs and grasses there. So

again, from the corner, the emergency spillway is kind of tucked in, so we would have kind of landscaping around that corner along Old Bridge Turnpike. But again, there's grass, there's trees and things that kind of help blend that into the surrounding.

MR. BRANDT: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BRANDT: I have a quick question for Mr. Kline. With that landscaping in mind by the retention pond, that is an extremely heavily traveled road and intersection. I don't know if our township engineers know or not if there's going to be a redesign of that intersection or not, but I think the way the truck traffic is, maybe your landscaping might need to be adjusted so that the sight line for trucks and/or cars are accommodated safely. I don't know if they're going to redesign that entire intersection in the near future or not, the Edgeboro Road Old/Bridge Turnpike/Route 18 triangle there.

MR. KLINE: So the traffic engineer can speak to the sight lines, but again, there is -- there was a previous ROW taken in along Old Bridge Turnpike. That's where our property line is set now. So they've already -- they did take part of the property. And again, all of the landscaping, the stormwater systems, they're all contained within the site. So, you know, per any information that we have, you know, they're contained within the site, and they provide safe sight lines for anyone traveling in the right-of-way.

MR. BRANDT: Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kline, I would ask you I guess what else -- how much more have you got, because I'm just trying to gauge time, that's all.

MR. KLINE: It's no problem. I was really going to just touch on landscaping briefly, and kind of that was going to wrap things up, and obviously, I'll take anymore questions if there are any.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, if you hold this up, this picture you've got now, the sight line, I think the only real sight line that could potentially pose an issue would be people leaving Edgeboro Road and making a left-hand turn onto Old Bridge Turnpike from the potential for sight line.

MR. KLINE: So we do show sight lines on the -- on our site plan sheet that was submitted. It was reviewed by the board engineer. And none of

the landscaping, none of the proposed (inaudible) impact those sight lines. So all the sight lines are in accordance with the county standards, and again, no sight lines are impacted.

THE CHAIRMAN: And is -- it is the plan for this applicant to have a maintenance -- a lawn or site maintenance for shrubbery and/or lawns and whatever; is that correct?

MR. KLINE: Correct. They would have the site maintained.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Chairman, if I may also, what about the need for sight triangle easements at the site driveways, Mr. Kline?

MR. KLINE: If the board -- I think the board engineer noted it in the letter, so if they are required by the township, the applicant would comply.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

MR. GUREVICH: Can I also ask -- and maybe you might cover this -- are there any signs either on the building, on the grounds, or on the roof proposed?

MR. KLINE: Correct, I'll let the architect speak to the building signage.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay.

MR. KLINE: And I guess just to kind of close things out, since I've had this again Exhibit A-2, the rendered site plan up, I just want to kind of speak very briefly to the landscaping. Be happy to answer any questions. We did look to kind of focus landscaping along Old Bridge Turnpike and focus to have landscaping along the corner. That's where you see kind of the trees and evergreen, the variety that we have going up the frontage. We also have landscaping that we incorporated along the perimeter of the site as well as the access drive from Edgeboro Road just to kind of help, you know, soften the interior of the site. In total, 21 new trees are being planted, and then over a 190 different shrubs, ground cover, and grasses are being planted across the site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Existing area that is I believe a wet -- it's a wetland of sorts on the eastern side?

MR. KLINE: Correct, there is a wetland on the eastern -- easterly property line. It is kind of (inaudible) with a hatch.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are restricted with disturbance in that area; is that correct?

MR. KLINE: So the wetland does not have

a transition area associated with it, but we are well over 50 feet away from it, and we're really kind of minimizing any disturbance near that wetland. We're maintaining the majority of this wooded area you see on the right-hand side or easterly side of the screen.

THE CHAIRMAN: And during the construction, you'll also be required protection against any intrusion of any soil, dirt, garbage, et cetera, from the site onto that existing forested area.

MR. KLINE: Correct, and we at this time have already received our plan certification from the soil conservation district.

MR. BRANDT: Mr. Kline, you're going to clean up that buffer zone between your proposed project and the health care center that's adjacent to the property on the east side, as well?

MR. KLINE: The intention was to maintain the vegetation. You know, technically per ordinance and per the NJDEP, you know, there's steep slope constrictions, but there's not, you know, setback restrictions that we couldn't go in that area, so we aren't disturbing it. Now, we'd be happy to as part of the, you know, kind of the redevelopment of this project to kind of go into the wooded area and pick up any trash or anything like that if the board would like to make that a condition. You know, again the applicant, you know, wants to see this site get cleaned up, wants to see this site be a kind of a nice facility, so if the board would like to make that a condition or you'd like to recommend that, we'd be more than happy as part of construction to go into the wooded area and again maintain the trees, maintain the vegetation, but pick up any trash.

MR. BRANDT: The only reason why I ask is because I was there today, and it looks like somebody had been using it as a midnight dumping zone, so to speak, so there's quite a --

MR. KLINE: It's unfortunate. The site's not, you know, the site as today is in disarray. It's not a maintained site. I think it's, you know, it's vacant. It's abandoned.

MR. BRANDT: Right, and --

MR. WEINER: Can you just give us a compass direction to that area so I can jot down the conditions correctly.

MR. KLINE: So the easterly, the wooded area along the easterly property line.

MR. BRANDT: Thank you, Mr. Kline.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. From the board are there any other -- Mr. Kline, I'm sorry, are you -- have you completed your basic testimony?

MR. KLINE: No, I appreciate it. That really concludes my testimony. Again, from a site civil perspective, you know, this project as a whole will not have any adverse impacts on the community, the adjacent property, the neighbors, and again, we will look to comply with the board engineer's comments and the additional conditions we discussed with the board this evening.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Kline, I did have one last question, quick one. Earlier one of our -- the board members touched on electric vehicles, and I do note that in the staff's, the professional staff report, there was an indication that the location of the EV space should be reconsidered. Are you agreeable should the board decide to move favorably on this to reconsider that to the recommendations of the staff?

MR. KLINE: Yes.

MR. WEINER: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other board questions of Mr. Kline?

Hearing none, Aaron. Can I get Aaron?

Mr. Kline, can you close this down so we can --

MR. KLINE: Yes, I can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Looking for Aaron. Aaron, do we have anybody from the public on the line? I don't hear you.

MR. KIPP: Yes, there's 23 attendees.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, but some of those attendees might be the people, Keith, who are looking to put an objector's case together; would that be fair?

MR. KIPP: Yeah, I really couldn't tell you, but there are 23 attendees.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so I guess what I'd like to do is open it up to the public first, but I'm going to I guess define that first as being members of the public who are not part of an objector's case. So if, Aaron, if anybody from the public would like to ask Mr. Kline questions, Mr. Kline only.

MR. BLESSING: We do have some hands raised, Mr. Chairman.

For the remainder of the attendees, I'd

like to remind that raising your hand is the way to let us know you'd like to address the board. Otherwise, we cannot see nor hear you. There should be an icon on your screen that you can click.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, before we begin to hear members of the public, we do have a notice of one objector from counsel. I don't know if there are other objectors present. I have not received any formal notice from anyone else. I would think after we hear from any members that you just addressed who are not part of objectors, before we close that portion, if we can ask for hands to be raised of anyone who is here on behalf of an objector, starting with counsel, so we know who is here if anyone intends to so speak, and we can get that organized.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, well, I was going to go there, Jay, after we had allowed the public, not part of any specific objectors, to be heard, and I was going to open it up to any formal objector case at least to ask questions. It's not for them to make their presentation; it's just to ask questions.

Aaron, do we have anybody?

MR. BLESSING: We only have one individual raising their hands.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. So let's bring that person in, and then we'll swear them in, and we'll have them ask questions of Mr. Kline.

MR. BLESSING: Very good. Hold on one moment, please. The name comes up J. Mack. I'll allow them to give their full name for the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. or Mrs. Mack, if you could please do -- get yourself fully into the meeting. Your microphone's off and we don't have your face.

MR. BLESSING: Erroneous?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know. Well, I don't think it's fair if we hold on for Mr. Mack or Mrs. Mack if there's not any further questioning. So he's welcome to call -- he or she is welcome to call back in at any point in the future.

MR. BLESSING: Very good. I do have one other hand raised. I will promote them to panelist now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Is that Mr. Rahenkamp?

MR. BLESSING: No, that's -- pardon me. I don't want to butcher their name. Ronald S --

THE CHAIRMAN: Gasirowski.

MR. BLESSING: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good evening, board. My father just had to step away for 1 minute to use the restroom. We represent -- you know, you gotta -- everybody has to do it. But he represents Mr. Carey Tajfel and his company on this application. So normally I would say we would have gone before, so we just went to public comment. So when he gets back, should I just re-raise -- he's obviously going to want to cross-examine and --

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, what is Mr. Gasiorowski's situation? Is he putting forth an objector's case here?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't want any objector case people just yet. We were trying to get people from the regular public.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: He's here now actually.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's okay. Let me just check with Mr. Blessing, who is the one who is the gatekeeper on this, to make sure we don't have anybody else who is just from the public without any other, you know, situation.

MR. BLESSING: At this present moment, Mr. Chairman, there are not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So if, Mr. Gasiorowski, if I'm butchering your name, I'm sorry. If you are an objector, then, please, we're going to go through a little bit more of a formal arrangement here. You are allowed to ask Mr. Kline questions. I would appreciate if you would identify yourself and your affiliation with regard to your objection so we can understand how -- what brings you to us tonight.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: Okay, fine. First, Mr. Chairman, thank you for acknowledging me. My name is Ron Gasiorowski. I have offices in Red Bank, New Jersey. The name of my client is 355 Route 9, LLC. He owns property in East Brunswick at 260 Route 18.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Gasiorowski, if I may interject quickly. Are you counsel? Are you an attorney for this applicant? Because we have not received any formal letter that I'm aware of from any law office indicating your name, and you're indicating you're here on behalf of a client, but I'm not sure what your affiliation.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: First, I am an attorney. I'm active as an attorney in dealing with

many cases involving land use both as an applicant as well as an objector. In this particular matter, I am representing a person who has an interest in this application, and I want to, of course, hear the entire application to see whether or not the matter in which it's proceeding and what he is seeking is either objectionable or not objectionable to him.

I would have one request of the board chairman procedurally. I have listened to the comments of the applicant, and I have to say that the participation of the board was one of the most rigorous I've ever seen going forward, and they've answered many of my questions. But I want to listen to the remainder of the testimony. The only request that I would have is that I prefer to do my cross-examination at the conclusion of all of the applicant's witnesses because many of the answers I'm looking for may come out in that further testimony. But I'm prepared to do it whichever way the board chairman --

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gasiorowski, you are correct. If you're going to be an objector, the way I would normally handle it otherwise would be to wait until the applicant has completely finished his application, and then we would allow you as an objecting attorney to then go through and ask questions of his witnesses and/or of the essence of the application.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: I would prefer to do it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. So just so you're clear, I'm offering it to the public and to theoretically yourself if you just had specific questions of anything Mr. Kline said tonight for clarification purposes. If not, I'm more than happy to wait to recognize you as an objector for this application for your client.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: An if --

MR. WEINER: Before Mr. Gasiorowski answers, I'd like to just get on the record, since he's representing a client, who his client is. He said he's representing an individual who has an interest in the application, but we haven't gotten the identity.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: Just so we're clear, I'm representing basically a corporate entity known as 355 Route 9, LLC. The address of that property is 260 Route 18. I was contacted by the corporate headquarters to be present this evening, listen to everything, ask questions if I find them to be

appropriate, and perhaps at the conclusion of the applicant's case, my client may choose to either present a case or not present a case.

MR. WEINER: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So at this point then, Mr. Gasiorowski, you do not have any witnesses yet you would wish to at least list for us or anything like that because you don't think it's far enough along.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: That's correct, and let's assume I don't ask questions this evening. I don't want to be precluded at the end of the case from asking questions of any witness that testified previously.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, that's fine. You're not -- there is no -- you can certainly revisit it when you -- when it's your turn to make your objector's case.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: Thank you. Thank you for your courtesies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Okay, so, Mr. Blessing, with Mr. Gasiorowski complete and we understand what his role is going to be here, is there anybody else from the public who wishes to at least identify themselves and ask questions of Mr. Kline.

MR. BLESSING: We do have one raised hand in the attendees. It is from Bob Smith.

THE CHAIRMAN: So this is another objector. This is another person from -- who has indicated -- actually, Mr. Weiner, you've gotten a formal note about this?

MR. WEINER: Yes, I received a letter earlier today from another attorney in Mr. Smith's office indicating that they would be appearing on behalf of an objector. So I don't want to speak for Mr. Smith, but I'm going to assume he wants to identify himself and briefly talk about his presence here tonight.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Aaron, if you could then I guess put the person from, you know, Mr. Smith's office through.

MR. BLESSING: Indeed. There may be some technical difficulty. Let me try this other --

MR. SMITH: Are we good? Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I heard your preferences in terms of the way in which you like to do the presentation, and we're perfectly amenable to that, but I think for the record I should at least identify myself. Bob Smith, licensed attorney in the State of New

Jersey. I'm representing Crown Point, which is the owner of 696 Old Bridge Turnpike, which has a fully approved self-storage facility literally just down the street, and our concerns are one of about whether everybody is going to be able to make a living here.

I do have three witnesses for a presentation by our team, and when you believe it's appropriate, we'll be happy to make that presentation, and we would, as Mr. Gasiorowski indicated, like to continue the right to do cross-examination when you believe it's our turn to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine, Mr. Smith. I just wanted to -- well, first of all, it's good to make it clear who the people are involved and interested in this application and the level of which their response or their objector's case is going to be made. So it helps us. What we usually do, and if you've been on since the beginning, once Mr. Kline is done, we will then bring another one of -- we will ask Mr. Murphy to bring another one of his witnesses up, and we'll listen to them. If it is your preference, we're going to do that same open to the public every time after an application's expert talks to us, and you can certainly -- you don't have to ring in necessarily unless you have a specific question of what has just been asked by one of the experts.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, we have no problem with that as long as we will have the right to cross-examine their witnesses at the end.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's certainly your right, and we will be happy to comply with that, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. So --

MR. WEINER: And, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it -- address that with counsel for the applicant, as well. Since there have been identified two formal objectors to this matter, we will need for you to have all of your witnesses available in the future and at those times so they may be examined and questioned as applicable.

MR. MURPHY: Absolutely, we will be prepared to present this in any future meeting.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: In addition, Mr. Weiner, the board may have additional questions that have come up as part of some additional testimony or

something that was brought up in discussion that would then require us to ask one of the people who have already been before us a clarification question. So, yes, I would say that it would be important in order for the application to go smoothly that we always have the chance of asking those witnesses something if it comes up.

MR. WEINER: Absolutely, the board can always ask for more information from any of the witnesses during the course of the application.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Murphy, I guess I'm going to ask you what -- we will be ending as close to 10:30 as possible, but in the meantime, can you just give us a brief as to who else you've got on your list so we can sort of understand and feel what (inaudible)

MR. WEINER: Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Murphy answers that, we need to close the public portion if there was no one else.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Weiner, yeah, get caught up.

Okay, is there anybody -- Aaron, do we have anybody else with a hand up?

MR. BLESSING: There technically is. Mr. Smith, if you're still with us, there's another Bob in the attendee list, and they popped up the same time you did. I was wondering if that might be a duplicate. Otherwise, I could just promote them to panelist and see what happens.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it's Mr. Smith --

MR. SMITH: I think that's a duplicate. My apologies.

MR. BLESSING: Very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BLESSING: With that being said, Mr. Chairman --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Bob, not a duplicate.

MR. SMITH: Oh, sorry, not a duplicate. Maybe somebody else.

MR. BLESSING: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be a coincidence. Okay.

MR. BLESSING: I promoted them now.

MR. BODAK: Chairman Philips.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BODAK: Yeah, just my name is Bob Bodak. I'm chairman of the South River Zoning Board of Adjustment. And just wanted to let everybody know that we also have an approval going through for a storage facility that's going to be just on the

opposite side of the KayDelMar peninsula there. So I wasn't know if everybody was aware of that, but we do -- right alongside Wawa there will be another storage facility that's going to be going up over there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I guess that's not a question for Mr. Kline, but giving us the information certainly is appreciated. You realize that we really can't take the fact that there's going to be another storage facility, even if it was in East Brunswick, as --

MR. BODAK: I realize that, sir, but I just wanted -- there was a concern about having too many and how it -- was there going to be enough, and I just wanted to make sure that everybody is aware there may be, you know, people trying to outbid people in order to get people coming in and that, but we did have some objectors to ours, also. Some of them are similar ones to you have. So again, I just wanted to let you know that, and I appreciate you guys inviting us in order to attend. Thank you.

MR. WEINER: Sir, before you disconnect, for the record, we need your full name, first and last name, and an address.

MR. BODAK: Yes, it's Robert Bodak, B-o-d-a-k.

MR. WEINER: Okay, and an address.

MR. BODAK: And you can send my mail to the Borough of South River.

MR. WEINER: Okay. Can you -- Borough of South River. What is the municipal building address?

MR. BODAK: Washington Avenue, South River, New Jersey.

MR. WEINER: And you are the chairman of the zoning board?

MR. BODAK: Yes. Thank you.

MR. WEINER: Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, Mr. Bodak, I think because you're the chairman, I can speak to you to let you know that you realize that we cannot take into consideration something that is not before us.

MR. BODAK: No, Mr. Chairman, I fully understand, and we brought up very similar concerns that you did as far as traffic patterns and people pulling in and out and things like that, and again, to reiterate what the other lawyers say, you guys are doing an amazing job. Thank you.

MR. WEINER: Yeah, I would just add, Mr. Chairman, that for both -- for the witness, for

Mr. Bodak as well as to the board, that what's going on in another application and in another municipality, essentially, the board's consideration of any application is based on the four corners of this application, so just as any application in South River would be considered on the four corners of that application, and the board should be guided accordingly that we have to consider the application before this board presently.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bodak, it's nice to meet you under these circumstances. Always welcome to drive through East Brunswick, no questions asked.

MR. BODAK: Thank you. Have a great day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Take care.

All right, before -- Mr. Murphy, I'm going to take the usual 10-minute break at this point since we've been at it for almost 2 hours, and so what I'm going to ask is we take a 10-minute break.

Aaron, you want to alert that we're going to be off for about 10 minutes and then --

MR. BLESSING: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- ask everybody to be somewhat prompt to get back.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So we'll take a recess. Thank you.

(Board recess)

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you for giving us a few-minute break there. I guess in the activity as we were ending before we took the break, we didn't officially close the public portion. So for the record, I am going to close the public portion at this point. There will be other public portions at sometime in the future as dictated by the way that the application flows, but at this point, the public portion is closed.

Bringing to that, Mr. Murphy, who would you like to present to us next?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I believe you had asked before we went to break there kind of who else we had that would be testifying. You know, Josh -- Mr. Kline, excuse me -- that testimony was about 2 hours, which was -- it didn't seem that way because it was very interactive, but it wasn't at all boring. We do have --

THE CHAIRMAN: We try to keep it lively.

MR. MURPHY: It was definitely lively,

and thank you for that. We do have our architect of record, Louis Vandeloecht, who would be testifying next. We then do have a traffic engineer, who would also be testifying, John Corak, and then finally our planner. If I heard you correctly, you try to wrap up around 10:30, so I don't think we're going to get through all three of them. I'll acknowledge that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that's accurate.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so you tell me when you're ready to -- you know, we obviously I don't think would want to start Creigh, our planner, at 10:15.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, we wouldn't do that, but what we can do is we can start with your application -- with your next witness, swear that person in, then give their presentation, open it up to the board for any questions it might be had, and then we can proceed, and depending on questions and what things get brought up, Mr. Murphy, will determine how far along we get.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. Thank you so much for that. I think that's a great plan. We'll start with Mr. Vandeloecht as our architect.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did have one question. Sorry to interrupt you. Do you have anybody other than what Mr. Kline has given us about the operations of the facility?

MR. MURPHY: We don't at this -- we don't necessarily at this meeting. We hadn't planned on providing that, but if that's something you wanted, during our next presentation, we'd be happy to.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to say I think that just based on some of the questions from some of the members and also my own questions about how this would operate, I think having somebody as an expert on how this facility, and this facility in particular, not somebody who knows about storage, but knows about this particular type of storage.

MR. MURPHY: Absolutely. Our client is very well versed in self-storage in New Jersey and nationally. So we will certainly have someone from ownership here for the next meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: And they will be able to answer questions specific about the operation of the facility.

MR. MURPHY: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MURPHY: Great. And any other -- we hopefully wouldn't be barred from presenting any

other testimony that we find necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Absent -- no, no, no, until you tell me that, Mr. Chairman, that is our presentation, then at this point, then we say, okay, then, you know, you can't bring anything new; however, I will just say to you that in the event that there are questions that are brought up by some of the objectors, you would then also have the opportunity to reopen anything you felt is necessary to answer them or to refute what they might be saying.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, sir. Thank you for clarifying that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So Mr. Louis Vandeloecht.

MR. MURPHY: Vandeloecht.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm looking -- oh, there he is. Okay, Mr. Vandeloecht, hi. I'm going to -- you're an architect?

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we're going to swear you in. If I can ask you -- do you solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give this evening regarding the application before us is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God.

MR. VANDELOECHT: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, and then now could you give us your name, spell your last name, and give us a little bit of your CV.

MR. KLINE: Certainly. It's Louis Vandeloecht, V-a-n-d-e-l-o-e-c-h-t; licensed architect here in New Jersey I believe for 8 years if my memory is correct; testified before multiple boards there in New Jersey, Toms River, Newark, Paramus, West Orange, South Orange, all on self-storage facilities, probably all in total 15 facilities there in New Jersey and then probably pushing 30 to 35 nationwide.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so you're an architect, but you provide testimony as to what you're building.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Listen from the board -- wait, where did you go --

MR. VANDELOECHT: Certainly. I went to Drury University in Springfield, Missouri, graduated with a Bachelor's of Architecture in 1996.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MURPHY: Your license in New Jersey

is current? I didn't mean to interrupt, Mr. Chair.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's a good question.
It's fine.

MR. MURPHY: Great.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll listen for a motion from the board to allow Mr. Vandeloecht to give us some architectural testimony.

MR. GUREVICH: Motion to approve.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion from Leon. A second?

MR. BRANDT: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. All in favor say aye. Anybody opposed? Looks like it's unanimous, Mr. Vandeloecht. You can give us your testimony, please.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Vandeloecht, you reviewed the plans that were submitted to the board, the architectural sets?

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes, I have.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Do you have some renderings that we're going to be providing this evening? I'd like you to talk about the architectural elements of the project, provide some information on the units, the unit count, the makeup, and also show renderings of the outside of the building, getting to the aesthetics of it and the design elements, if you would.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Certainly. If I can share my screen. Can everybody see my screen?

MR. MURPHY: We can.

MR. WEINER: Is this something that was submitted to the township already as part of the applicant's submissions, or is this something we need to mark as an exhibit?

MR. VANDELOECHT: This should have been submitted as part of the exhibit.

MR. WEINER: Can you identify it, please.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Certainly. It's sheet dated 9-28 of 2020 I believe.

MR. WEINER: And this was submitted previously.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have it, Jay. I am looking at it.

MR. WEINER: Okay.

MR. VANDELOECHT: The sheet you're seeing here -- I'm going to make a brief run through the floor plans before we get to the renderings and talk about really the architecture and exterior of the building. What you're seeing here is the first floor plan. Just to orient everybody, Edgeboro Road is to the top side of the page, and Old Bridge Turnpike is off to the left. What you've got here is the three loading bays that Mr. Kline referenced in his testimony, the small office area down here right off to it, along with the adjacent parking spaces.

One of the reasons I wanted to bring this plan up in particular first was I know there is a question from one of the board members about elevators in the building. This building will be required to have elevators. Currently, there are two right behind the loading bays and then a secondary one kind of off to the side for convenience. Also inside the building there's two exit stairs that are required by building code, and the building will be designed by building code, enforced at the time that we make submission for building permits.

What you're seeing in the main field of the building is what we would consider typical for a self-storage facility of this type. It's a mix of units of anywhere from a 5-by-5 unit to a 10-by-30 unit, usually with a roll-up door on the front, everything connect by hallways. You can kind of see the race track configuration kind of goes around through the self-storage units and then coming through and hitting each individual units as they go.

What we've found over time is between now and when we get to the actual construction drawings for the project, the unit sizes may change slightly. Nothing on the outside of the building would change. It would just be internal units. You know, a 10-by-10 may go to a 5-by-10 just based on final market studies that happen with the owners as they're starting to talk about units inside the market.

Flipping my next sheet, this is sheet A-2 dated 9-28 of 2020, also submitted as part of the packet. Same kind of configuration. For the most part, the second and third floor are the same. Different mix of units. The units don't necessarily stack as you go up through the space. The way the building's constructed, there's not necessarily load

bearing walls of each of these, but the main corridors and all that remain the same for ease of egress use and orientation within the facility.

Flipping then to sheet -- just the outside of the building, this is --

MR. MURPHY: Sorry, this was not submitted as part of original package, but it was submitted after, but as counsel said before, we're still going to mark this. I think we should mark it as A-3.

MR. WEINER: It would be A-3, and if --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we didn't see this, Mr. Murphy. We haven't seen this one yet.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so we'll mark this as A-3. We'll initial it. We'll get hard copies sent in to the department.

MR. WEINER: And can we get a description of this to label it.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Certainly. I would call it the northwest perspective from the Edgeboro and Old Bridge Turnpike.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a rendering of what you expect to be at this site, Mr. Vandeloecht?

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes, it is. I was waiting to make sure we had all our ducks in a row.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, because the first thing that stands out to me is the fact you've got a sign on there.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Correct. I was going to address that, as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. VANDELOECHT: What you're seeing here is the perspective of the building, as I mentioned, from the northwest corner looking from Old Bridge and Edgeboro. One of the things that our client, 1784, as we've done multiple projects for them, both in New Jersey and around the country, is they put a premium on quality materials. They put a premium on making it look like an office building, really upgrading the aesthetics from some of the other self-storage facilities we've seen, and I hate to say it, some that we've done, where they may be using more faux material, brick-like panels, you know, they give the appearance of brick. 1784, as I said, put a premium on using quality materials, so this is real brick, real stone, architectural quality metal panels. They want something that speaks as a gateway into the community if they need to, something that's not going to be an eyesore or, you know, over time start to degrade, you know, as

materials fade and whatnot. They want something that stands the test of time.

What you're seeing here, and as Mr. Chair alluded to, we have a couple signs shown. These are also shown on our elevations that were submitted. The signage is our intent to meet the intent of the signage code, the ordinance that's there in place, so I don't believe we're seeking a variance on that.

MR. MURPHY: And to be clear, if there was to be any relief that was needed after the final signage plan was put together, we'd be required to come back before this board for an amendment.

MR. WEINER: Yes, that would be a separate application.

MR. MURPHY: That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or, Mr. Murphy, you would redevelop your signs to adhere to the standard.

MR. MURPHY: I'm pretty sure that we would not be back before this board, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. But we're having such fun.

MR. MURPHY: We are, but our friends haven't started to talk yet.

MR. VANDELOECHT: The other piece I'll point out here before I flip to the kind of the southwest corner of the site, you'll see these elements here on the main corners. What these are, these are what we call glass display windows. It's in effect a shadow box kind of approach where somebody driving by, you know, it's not just a blank window. It's not a spandrel window where it's just dark all the time, if that's easy enough to explain. It's to give somebody the idea of what the inside of the facility down the corridors look like. These are not real units. There are -- there is nobody walking through these areas to access these spaces except maybe to change a light bulb or occasionally, you know, go through there and dust or sweep or something like that. This is more just again going back to 1784's desire to make these looking more office-like and in that vein and in that style create some interest, you know, in the corridor, at least give somebody the impression of what it looks like inside the building.

If I can then flip --

MR. GUREVICH: Can I just ask before you switch from that diagram.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Certainly.

MR. GUREVICH: So again, going back to

the question at the beginning in terms of height, in that corner over there, the 33.8 or 33.5 feet, would be from that corner to basically just underneath or at the roofline but not at the, like, that space above where the sign is. That's kind of incremental crowning to --

MR. VANDELOECHT: Correct, correct, and what you're seeing here is if you go past where -- everybody can see my mouse point -- where the cornice is from with the signage and also the kind of the emphasis on the corner, this parapet that runs across right here is the coping. The roof, the actual roof is right below that. So we tried to keep that parapet low, you know, to kind of minimize that height, as well, but the actual roof is right behind that. It could be anywhere because it varies as the roof slopes from one side to the other -- and I actually have the roof plan. If questions come up, we can look at it -- where these parapets are, you know, a foot and a half to 2 foot typically above where the roof elevation is, and then we bump up in the corners to kind of create that emphasis and really draw the eye into the corner as opposed to having it, you know, really be just a box.

MR. GUREVICH: So again, not thinking about what the definition is, when I look at this, the measurement is to the top of that -- what did you call it -- the parapet or the -- or is to the roofline that sits a few feet below that?

MR. VANDELOECHT: The measurement I have on my elevations is to the top of this band right here above the sign.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, but if I can interject, Louis, the question is not -- we're talking about your rendering. We're not talking about your measurement. Your measurement was incorrect. The measurement used on our engineering plans, which is 33.4 I believe in height, based on the definition of the zoning ordinance measures to where?

MR. VANDELOECHT: To the roof, which would be right below -- about a foot and a half below this element right here.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MR. GUREVICH: So that's what I'm getting at. So in essence, almost where -- exactly. So like that sign where it says -- states self-storage, the bottom of that sign to some extent is the roofline. Above that is all fascia and kind of designer kind of elements in essence in terms of

additional height, and that could get to the 39 feet, correct?

MR. VANDELOECHT: I would say correct, yes.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay, and that is the same on that one corner or the other corner, the further right-hand side in your opinion?

MR. VANDELOECHT: Over here?

MR. GUREVICH: Yeah.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes.

MR. GUREVICH: Okay. And just for accuracy, because we have that water drainage storage area, which seems to be in that corner supposed to be a, you know, kind of a gully. Over here it's rendered as a hill or slope going up. Is this accurate to what would be seen?

MR. VANDELOECHT: It's as accurate as I can get with our rendering software. You know, I'll be completely up front. Sites sometimes become difficult to render based on the software we have and the perspective we have, so we do the best we can to get it as close to accurate as possible.

MR. GUREVICH: So my expectation is is where we're looking at from this image, what I should be seeing is kind of instead of a raised hilltop with some gray mulch area or whatever, that mulch area more so would probably be a gully, which is going to be that water basin.

MR. VANDELOECHT: And we can definitely go through and take another glance at it and --

MR. WEINER: Can we describe that for the record, compass point, directions, and this image and so forth, to make sure that the record is accurately reflecting about the areas that are being discussed.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes, this perspective would be from the northwest corner of Old Bridge and Edgeboro looking back towards the southwest.

MR. WEINER: Okay, and in this image, are we at the right side of the image, the left side of the image?

MR. VANDELOECHT: We would be at where probably consider the left side of the image.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I ask Terry a question? Terry?

MR. VOGT: Yes, Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The item -- the facade, if you will, that sticks up halfway through the word storage and then up to the top, is it the

understanding that that is not at all ever be taken into account as far as the height of the building?

MR. VOGT: Not to my knowledge, Chairman, the way it's define in the ordinance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'd just like to get a clarification because if it was more ornate than that, is there some point at which it's hard to ignore that it isn't within the boundary of what we would look at.

MR. VOGT: We can look at the code. I'm not aware of any requirement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, because theoretically, if this person wanted to put -- I'm making it up, you know -- an image of the Statue of Liberty up on top of this thing because it was a nice thing to see, does that violate the code? I don't know. That's why I'm asking you, and maybe we don't have an answer tonight, but it would be great if we would clarify that for the next time we get together.

MR. MURPHY: And, Mr. --

MR. VOGT: That's not a problem.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chair, if I may as counsel, in the definition, the exceptions to the height limitations definition, there is an enumerated list of clear exceptions, so I don't know if the Statue of Liberty would fall under any of those, but certainly a flagpole or a chimney or a skylight or a parapet wall does specifically fall under that, so obviously, I don't say that we shouldn't keep looking at it, but I do believe that based on Josh's testimony and your board engineer's prior statement that I think our interpretation is correct and there is no need for variance relief there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Murphy, just because now we have something to look at --

MR. MURPHY: Yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- validates what the presentation was, it gives us a little easier opportunity. I mean, theoretically, if you put 3 feet more on the front facade there, is that still okay? I don't know. That's why I was asking my expert.

MR. MURPHY: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm sorry that --

MR. WEINER: I think that would be very helpful for next time the matter reconvenes.

MR. GUREVICH: And just in terms of for reference purpose, I appreciate, Steven, that was in

line with the question I was just jotting down over here but wanted to wait on. But in terms of the building that's there right now, I think there was testimony that stated, you know, it's a two-story building, so if we were to look on this plan right now, can I make a fair assumption that the current building would come up to the top of, you know, that second floor sort of where that dark gray area is? Would that be the roofline -- exactly, right over here -- for reference purposes? So everything above that being incremental to what is there currently today?

MR. VANDELOECHT: I can honestly say I can't say if it is or not without knowing how tall that building is. I know where this line is, you know. This line is approximately 22 to 23 feet up. Without knowing how tall the building is, I can't --

MR. MURPHY: Josh -- I mean, Louis, if I could, board member, I think what we can do next time is we can just show a superimposed or something beyond my pay grade but show you what the building looks like and what this building looks like either next to it or over laying it, et cetera.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think we talked to Jason about that briefly, Mr. Murphy. I think he wrote something down. So he's probably already busy at work trying to see how that can happen.

MR. GUREVICH: I appreciate it. I'm just trying to while the diagram is up.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you. I just don't want to start guessing on height. We'll provide the --

MR. GUREVICH: I respect that. I respect that and thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MS. PAPI: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to Louis.

Louis, that -- the section that we're speaking on, is that like wasted space because it's -- they're not really windows, but they're an effect of a window, so is that wasted space did you say would be?

MR. VANDELOECHT: It's an opportunity that we do a lot on self-storage facilities to essentially generate some interest into the corner of the building, and if I may, I'm going to flip back to my second floor plan. This is sheet A-2.0 I showed previously. This corner here is what you're seeing in that rendering. So in essence, yes, it's wasted space in terms of leasable area for units,

but 1784 is willing to give it up in order to help create more of an aesthetic and a look as opposed to just having a solid box with no windows on it, if that makes sense.

MS. PAPI: So basically, there is no glass at all on this structure. There's none. It's solid walls, solid everything. There's no glass, right?

MR. VANDELOECHT: Well, there is this glass window that's right here, you know, in the corner that you're seeing. I mean, it's real -- it's true glass. Yes. Let me if I may, let me flip to the other rendering. I think that may make a little better image of what we got going on with that corner.

MR. MURPHY: We're going to mark this as A-4.

MS. PAPI: Oh, wow.

MR. WEINER: We can label this as the southwest perspective.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Correct. This is southwest kind of from the entrance off Old Bridge Turnpike looking toward -- into the site towards the north, northwest.

MR. MURPHY: Louis, when is this dated?

MR. VANDELOECHT: 9-27 of '21. And just to bring everybody into perspective, the view we were just looking at, the sign you're seeing right here, that's the sign we saw in the other view. So what you're seeing here is this lower glass right here goes into the -- correction -- this glass goes into the office space. This glass is those same display windows we talked about, again, creating kind of a shadow box effect. Like I said, it creates interest in the space. It's actual glass. It's 3 feet back. So in theory, if somebody came back here to change light bulb out, you'd see somebody walking through the space to change the light bulb and then walking out and leaving. So it's not like I have somebody in there on a regular basis accessing their units, but it gives that illusion that -- and opportunity, you know, to kind of see what's going on, you know, somebody driving by see, what the space looks like, see what the corridors look like, but it's not actually used for self-storage purposes. So what you're seeing here is a continuation of that -- kind of that entrance element, that corner element that with the mix of the metal panels and the glass. You're seeing the brick and stone on the bottom with some banding to

break it up, and then these three here right behind that white van, those are the three loading bay doors that I think we looked at on the first floor plan that Mr. Kline referenced, and again, some architectural elements, a scaled-down version of the corners, again to break up that -- break up that facade, break up that massing, and not give it just a big, large, box-like appearance. That's something that is important to our client to really make these fit in and make them projects that the community we put them in are proud of.

MS. PAPI: Did we establish how many units are in this structure, how many?

MR. VANDELOECHT: There's approximately 800, 850 I believe. I have to go back -- I'd have to go back and look at the last count. And I say it's approximately because, as I mentioned, over the course of us finalizing the drawings, they'll shift slightly, you know. You may take a 5-by-5 and combine it to a 5-by-10 and break some of them up, vice versa, so it tends to fluctuate kind of between now and when we go in for drawings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Vandeloecht, according to the plans, there's supposed to be 1,063.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Then I apologize. I misspoke.

THE CHAIRMAN: So but I think you need to understand as well that the number of units that you have in there also creates a function of how much traffic you have because it's just as likely someone is going to come in, buy a 5-by-5 as they are for a 30-by-30, except when you have a whole bunch of 5-by-5, you got a lot more potential traffic than you have for 30-by-30. So as we look at the traffic side of this and as we look at the other elements, the number of actual units has a real purpose and a real understanding as to how we deal with traffic.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Understood.

MR. MURPHY: That's correct, and we understand that anything other than a field change and that an engineering would be able to sign off on post-approval would require an amended site plan. I think what Mr. Vandeloecht is saying is that the plan -- and he did for the record misspeak -- is 1,063 units, there may be a few slightly less units and in most cases not more units. But we understand that any change to the interior needs to not elevate above anything more than, quite frankly, a field

change.

MR. GUREVICH: If I may ask -- and this might help us understand in general, you know, from an experience standpoint -- how many of these facilities does your client currently have?

MR. VANDELOECHT: I can speak --

THE CHAIRMAN: Leon, can we have that -- hold that for the person who is going to come back to represent and give testimony about this business.

MR. GUREVICH: Yes, certainly, certainly. I was just thinking from the perspective of understanding what some of these opinion comments that are made, how much experience goes behind those statements. I think it would be helpful. Thank you. I will wait.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chair, Mr. Vandeloecht, do you have any further testimony, or are you --

MR. VANDELOECHT: Not unless there's something that somebody else would like to see or questions. I don't have anything direct, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, what you've provided us with -- I think there were some questions. Since you went to the trouble of making very nice impressions of what the building would look like, I would ask you could use the same expertise perhaps and give us that front face again with the I guess the storm management system in place. Yes. Rather than -- it's a very nice picture. It's very appealing, but it's not going to be what we wind up seeing.

MR. VANDELOECHT: We will go through and we will back check that to make sure that our grading is correct, and if need be, if it's behind the kind of the hillside, which I believe it might be, we can provide a raised up image so you guys can see exactly where that is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that would be appreciated, and --

MR. VANDELOECHT: No problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- the other one that you have, the one the second one you showed, that O-4 -- I mean A-4.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Your neighbor to the south on Old Bridge Turnpike is a lot closer. There's a fence there. There's some other items. This gives the appearance that there's nothing there. You're actually hugging pretty closely to that right property line.

MR. VANDELOECHT: If we can --

THE CHAIRMAN: So as much as it looks nice, I don't want to give the impression that what we're looking at is what's going to wind up because there's other things that are out of your control and a property line there.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Understood.

MR. MURPHY: So we'll revise this rendering, Mr. Chair, to accurately reflect that so there's some relation to what's existing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, it's a perspective issue, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. Understood.

MS. RAMPOLLA: If a new rendering is put together, can it also include the gate and fencing that there was earlier testimony that --

MR. VANDELOECHT: Sure.

MS. RAMPOLLA: -- there would be a gate to stop vehicles other than the ones maintaining the basin there.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, we can certainly --

MS. RAMPOLLA: That would also be in the rendering, that would be helpful, also.

MR. MURPHY: Sure, we can certainly do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Didn't mean to cut you off, Mr. Vandeloecht.

MR. KLINE: No, not at all. We're trying to make sure everybody -- we go in eyes wide open.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BRANDT: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Brandt.

MR. BRANDT: I'd like to ask the architect about the solar panel array on the roof. Does he have a rendering of that? I know I've seen it on the plans, but he doesn't have a drawing or anything.

MR. VANDELOECHT: No, I do not have -- sorry. Excuse me. Sorry.

MR. BRANDT: I mean it's quite an array of you're going to have on your roof, and I'm just curious. I'd just like to hear about it.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yeah, I do not have a rendering showing the array on the roof. See if it's on our roof plan. I mean, what you're seeing here would be -- probably the only thing I would have to show would be sheet A-4 dated 9-28-20 I mean just showing where the panels would be. We don't -- I don't have a rendering per se about where they

are, how would they look from above.

MR. MURPHY: But in any case, Mr. Vandeloecht -- I didn't mean to cut you off. I'm sorry, sir. These would not be visible from the street?

MR. VANDELOECHT: No, they would not be.

MR. BRANDT: So then in effect, with this number of solar panels, this building should be I would say completely energy efficient with -- for the most part.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly in the summertime, Mr. Brandt, but in the wintertime when there's snow on it, I can personally say you don't get any power out of them when there's snow on them.

MR. WEINER: I think also we shouldn't draw those conclusions. We should rely on the testimony presented, and if that is what the applicant wants to present, they need to present that in testimony. The testimony is not provided, then it's not something that you should be drawing such a conclusion from. Only everything that is found by members of the board needs to be based on what was presented by the applicant during the course of this application either in submissions or in testimony or exhibits at the hearings. So let's not make such assumptions as to the energy efficiency or anything else, and let's rely on what is presented as part of the application.

MR. BRANDT: Understood. I was just assuming maybe he was -- they're going for a LEED rating on their building. That's --

MR. WEINER: That's certainly a fair question that we can ask of the applicant, and perhaps Mr. Murphy can have one of his witnesses address that. I just don't want us to draw any conclusions without hearing the testimony.

MR. MURPHY: And what I would suggest is that we be prepared to answer that question and any other questions related to solar panels, at the next meeting likely just looking at my clock and getting another witness on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have one more question, whether Mr. Vandeloecht is the necessary person, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: You've attested to the fact that there are going to be three elevators on this -- at this property; is that correct?

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so of those three

elevators, are they going to have a generator backup in case there's a power failure?

MR. VANDELOECHT: If I am required by building code, which I don't believe we are in this case, I don't believe we have a generator on this building for the elevators.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so you don't -- there's no generator, and so anybody who gets stuck with the lights out, you're going to have emergency lights go on, and they'll be using the existing stair corridors to get exit.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anybody else -- anybody from the board have any additional questions of Mr. Vandeloecht?

MR. WEINER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I have a question of Terry. With regard following up on your elevator question with regard to the generators, is that something that we would be more comfortable with with backup generators because, as the chairman alluded to, if the power goes out, people can use the emergency lighting and the stairs, but it doesn't address the situation if someone happens to be in an elevator when the power goes out.

MR. VOGT: I think a backup on this kind of application makes perfect sense.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Murphy, would the applicant be agreeable to that should the board ultimately decide to move favorable on it?

MR. MURPHY: We would be agreeable to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: With that in mind and Mr. Murphy (inaudible) the architect to indicate where he might put the generator on the -- at the facility so that we would be able to determine if it's going to be ground level, going to be on the roof, et cetera, et cetera, and how he plans to handle that.

MR. MURPHY: Sure, and without speculating here, without thinking about it, I think we'll be able to present that at the next meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I thank you for that.

MS. PAPI: And I just want to say, Mr. Weiner, I was interested in that question you posed so thank you for asking it. About the generator.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, well, let me ask if

there's any other people on the board who have any specific questions of Mr. Vandeloecht.

MS. WINSTON: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MS. WINSTON: I just wanted to know, are the colors used in your rendering, are they accurate to what is going to be built, or they're just used to show contrast and kind of signify -- specifically that yellow on the windows, what is that?

MR. VANDELOECHT: The yellow on the windows is actually -- if I can zoom in here. I'm back on sheet A-2. To answer the first question is we render --

MR. MURPHY: Louis, for the record, that's A-4.

MR. KLINE: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. We pull material pictures from the actual materials. So these are images of the actual brick and of the actual, you know, block that we have that come from the manufacturers that we then use inside the rendering to get as close as possible. Obviously, slight tweaks to the rendering engines that run through based on sunlight, whatnot, will change it slightly, but the intention is for this to be as accurate as possible. If I may zoom in here, what you're seeing here in this yellow is essentially it's a faux door that is placed on the wall inside the shadowbox, and again, as I mentioned, the intent is to show somebody driving by, prospective tenants, kind of what that corridor looks like as you go down through the units. So these are faux doors of the same color that would be inside the building on the typical units.

MR. MURPHY: And, Louis, for the record, is that color, has that been determined? Is that -- I believe that that might have been one of the --

MR. VANDELOECHT: Yes, that yellow is not determined. It can change. Everything else is. The yellow usually is not. If there's an operator, a specific operator that comes to help run the facility, they may change it slightly. We usually use a yellow or an orange in those situations.

MS. WINSTON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions, Miss Winston?

MS. WINSTON: No. Thank you, Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, are there any other board questions specifically about the architecture of this application?

Hearing none, let me ask Aaron, and we'll open it up to the public just to be sure we've covered all our bases -- open it up and ask Aaron if there's anybody from the public who wishes to speak regarding the architecture and the architecture only on this application.

MR. BLESSING: While we do have -- sorry -- while we do have attendees present, I don't see any raised hands signifying that they wish to address the board or applicant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. So then I'll close the public portion at this point for this particular piece of it, and I can ask if you can -- well, first of all, thank you, Mr. Vandeloecht. You can take down your drawing for now.

MR. VANDELOECHT: Thank you all.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I will ask Mr. Murphy, who else do you have, because we're really down to --

MR. MURPHY: What I would suggest based on my sense is that I think we should hold our traffic testimony to the next meeting. I think we should do traffic and planning together, and ownership and anybody else that we determine would be useful, just so we don't start off right with planning. I think that would probably be better.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't think it's going to be so easy to get through your traffic guy, so, yeah.

MR. MURPHY: That's right. That's my point.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure we have more than 13 minutes of traffic questions besides his application.

MR. MURPHY: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Testimony. Okay. So moving on to the next piece of this then, we have to decide when the next time we're going to have a meeting.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Chairman, forgive me if I didn't hear it over the Zoom, but did we close the public portion?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WEINER: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blessing, looking at the calendar, looking at where we are, recognizing that when we have the next available time for this application.

MR. BLESSING: That would be April 7.

THE CHAIRMAN: April 7.

MR. BLESSING: Which would be --

THE CHAIRMAN: Anything else on the board for that night?

MR. WEINER: There is a potential, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to speak for Aaron, but it's something that Aaron and I have been discussing today that, although it's not formal yet because the matter needs to be renoticed, but there's another matter, another D that if it's renoticed was potentially to be on that date. So we could potentially have two D's on that date, this one and that one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it might be the case considering that I'm sure we haven't even gotten into the objector's case on this, Mr. Weiner. If we have the -- if we do the 7th of April, I really can't foresee that there will be a chance that we can actually hear that. We can accept jurisdiction and then reassign it to a new date after that.

MR. WEINER: Yeah, I'm almost wondering on, you know, and I'll leave that for the chair and for counsel to discuss, but I don't know if there's maybe another meeting in relatively not too further out time frame where there's nothing else on, and, you know, this might be given a full night rather than share it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, again, if we start -- if we do this particular application where we're going to share it because there's no way we're going to be able to put something else on and get through this.

MR. BLESSING: Well, the 17th of this month is pretty full. Just as well -- the latter meetings that we have in the month we do try to schedule the residential, the C's. April 21 is pretty well booked with C's. That's why I suggested April 7. After that would be May 5.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we don't have anything technically on the agenda right now for April 7.

MR. BLESSING: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: So at this point, I'm going to say that we should be looking at April 7, and if the other application does go through and all that, we can take jurisdiction, and they -- and once we get through, you know, the C variances for the homeowners and so forth, then we can take up that application then.

MR. MURPHY: Just so I'm clear, we would present our application on the 7th. The other application that there's some discussion about being put on the 7th, you would recognize that application at that hearing and maybe adjourn it to the 21st or another date and they would go on that date.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I just -- I don't want to slice this application up too much in terms of time, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: I agree, and I appreciate that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Considering we have at least two known objectors, and they certainly are entitled to have an objector's case put through, the idea of us, you know, turning this into a little bit more information and then we meet again and then a little bit more information and we meet again is probably unfair to both the applicant, you and the objectors and quite bluntly to the other person who wants to be heard on April 7 but haven't gotten their stuff together yet.

MR. MURPHY: Understood, I think. So we will be heard on the 7th.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm saying that, yes, we would have you here on the 7th.

MR. MURPHY: Got it.

THE CHAIRMAN: And any other issues that might come up, that we can certainly establish jurisdiction on the other one. That won't take but a few minutes. And then we can assign that one another date.

MR. MURPHY: Understood, Chair, and I appreciate that approach, and we are fully accepting of that. So we would --

THE CHAIRMAN: I would believe that both of objectors would also appreciate that, as well, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: And I would be happy that they're happy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So then, Aaron, we will be putting it on the 7th of April.

MR. BLESSING: Indeed.

THE CHAIRMAN: For the record and for anybody from the public who are listening, this application will be continued until the 7th of April. The applicant is not required to send out any further notice. The only notice that will be done is being done here this evening. I will add one little piece to this whole situation, and that is we may be in person.

MR. WEINER: Aaron, is that firm?
Keith, are we in person on April 7?

MR. KIPP: Yes, any application moving forward that hasn't already been noticed as Zoom we want to have in person, yes.

MR. WEINER: So the April 7 meeting will be an in-person meeting and not on Zoom. So Mr. Murphy as well as any of the objectors or members of the public, please note that the participation will be in person at the municipal location, not via Zoom.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be in the courtroom at the municipal building, so -- and that will start again at 7:30 on the 7th of April.

MR. MURPHY: And no further notice is required.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct, no further notice is required. The only notice being given was when you first sent it out, and then tonight we are affirming that.

Do we need an extension, Mr. Weiner, or are we good on time?

MR. WEINER: Aaron, what is our mandatory date on this?

MR. BLESSING: March 15.

MR. WEINER: So we're going to need an extension on that, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: We'll grant an extension until April 30 or 31 at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: April 30 because April 31 doesn't work.

MR. MURPHY: Right, because it doesn't exist. At least I didn't say the 28th. Through April 30. Got it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so that for the public just to understand that we will be having this meeting or this continuation of this application on the 7th of April.

Any other discussions or business from the board? Hearing none, does anybody want to make a motion?

MR. GUREVICH: Motion to adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurevich, thank you. Do we have a second?

MS. PAPI: I'll second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was waiting. I thought maybe we all want to stay.

MR. GUREVICH: Going to say that didn't sound too enthusiastic about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was my concern,

Leon. I didn't think I heard an overwhelming groundswell.

MS. PAPI: I'll resay it. I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favor. All opposed, nay? Good. Thank you. See you in a couple weeks.