

Q & A

Present are Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Cusumano, Mrs. Kelley, Mr. Mirabal, Councilwoman Montone, Mr. Swindle and Mr. Shenton

Also present are Robert Russo, CME Associates, Michael Leckstein, Esq., Leckstein & Leckstein, and Cindy Coppola, Coppola & Coppola Associates.

Absent are Mr. Brady and Mr. Awofolaju for personal reasons.

New Business, SP 10-539 (rev)/C&M County Road, Applicant and Property Owner: C&M County Road, LLC, County Road, Block 228, Lots 1 and 2, Block 196.04, Lot 27, Revised plans submitted for Board discussion regarding administrative review/change to original approvals.

Craig Gianetti, Esq., of the firm Giordano, Halleran & Ciesla, attorney for the applicants, states this is a request for an administrative change to prior site plan approval, April, 2011, for the 115 unit townhouse development as part of the Township's Affordable Housing Plan, an inclusionary project that has market rate and affordable units. They are looking, in regard to the 78 market rate units, adjust the footprint of the building, the overall footprint will be shrinking, the overall coverage of the site will be reduced, as well as distance between buildings. They are maintaining all the setbacks required by Ordinance; no variances are being requested.

Walter Hopkin is sworn in and states he is a licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey. Under questioning by Mr. Gianetti, Mr. Hopkin states he is the project engineer, and prepared revised plans that show the proposed changes as part of the administrative approval request. The approved footprint of the buildings, each unit was 23.3 x 37 ft., approximately 160 sq. ft. There are two units proposed with the modifications, one approximately 20 ft. x 36 ft., approximately 750 sq. ft., a reduction from the approved footprint, and the other is 20 ft. x 42 ft., approximately 140 sq. ft., still a reduction from what is approved. The net is a decrease of over 7,000 sq. ft. of impervious coverage. All the setbacks are being maintained. What the smaller unit size permitted them to do was increase the buffer areas, the distance of the units to steep slopes, and increase the space between the buildings; from an engineering standpoint it is an improvement, more green area, reduction in impervious area, and more space between the buildings and the adjacent properties. The size and shape of the play area was modified from rectangular to irregular shaped, and they picked up additional square feet to 10,637 sq. ft., over 500 sq. ft. from the original approval, and gives more room between the play area and the units. The play area is in the rear of the property.

Mr. Gianetti says there was a change to the driveway and entry to the market rate units. Mr. Hopkin says there is a retaining wall adjacent to the beginning of a stream. Thru the process of DEP approval, they classified it as wetlands where it wasn't classified as that before, so they have a semi circular retaining wall to avoid the wetlands. The other modification is the prior application has a common entry; that has been removed, just a façade and door, so each has their own individual entrance and sidewalk and driveway to their units. This is also for the market rate units only.

Mrs. Coppola confirms with Mr. Hopkin that all the changes are to the market rate units only.

Mr. Mirabal asks about the changes to the retaining wall and if there is an architectural drawing showing where it will be. Mr. Hopkin shows the area with the retaining wall going straight back

with landscaping on top. It still goes straight back but then some circular area has been added that will be landscaped as well.

Mr. Mirabal confirms with Mr. Hopkin that the number of units are not changing.

Mr. Hopkin says the retaining wall is being changed because of the DEP; the play area is being changed as a result of meetings with the Board's professionals to make it less of a rectangle but make it more irregularly shaped, and because of an encroachment by the length of one of the buildings would push the recreation area into the buffer area. This adjustment puts it a sufficient set back from the buildings.

Matthew Clemente is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, one of the partners in C&M County Road; referring to the architectural, states they are using the same elements as proposed on the Route 34 project, same siding, roof, stone, windows. The only difference is the turret on the end of each building. There will still be lattice between the units for privacy, the rear and side elevations, same stone, and windows will be put on the sides.

Mrs. Coppola says the floor plans show all the windows on the side as option; Mr. Clemente says those windows will not be optional but will be included.

Mr. Clemente says there will be privacy lattice on the decks, just like on Route 34. Mrs. Coppola says that is not reflected in the architectural plans; Mr. Clemente says they will be included in the final revised plans. Mrs. Coppola says it was a condition of prior approval.

Mr. Shenton says the other change is the front does not have the overhang or porch, and each driveway is separated. Mr. Clemente says if you go over 4 ft. you have to put a sprinkler head on the outside, they have to be dry heads, and they are costly, so that is a reason why they shrunk them down.

Mr. Gianetti asks Mr. Hopkin to explain to the Board the conceptual elevations are different from the site plan in regard to the entrance way and walkway. Mr. Hopkin says the conceptual elevation showing the sidewalk to the door and along the road was not shown on the original plan (**papers are rattling; cannot make out the rest of what Mr. Hopkin is saying**).

Mr. Shenton says now that the architecturals have changed slightly on the market rate units, will there be a like change on the COAH units. Mr. Clemente says if that is what the Board requests. Mr. Shenton says there should not be a difference between the units. Mr. Gianetti says there may be the siding will remain the same between the units, the COAH units were going to have a tower feature that will be removed, but there will be some differences in regard to entrance ways because the units are different and the COAH units don't have garages.

In order to be in line with the market rate units, the towers would be removed. Mr. Leckstein asks if they can be retained; Mr. Clemente says whatever the Board wants. Mr. Leckstein asks for a picture of the proposed tower.

Mrs. Coppola says when you look at the plans previously submitted there are substantial differences. The roof, the tower feature caused more articulation on the side, but there is always a concern when you build affordable units in a separate building separate from market rate units, they stand out. It is best to make them look similar throughout the development. It looked nicer

with the towers, but if the applicant is requesting to eliminate them from the market rate units, then the COAH units would look different if they remained on them. It does not affect livability space of the units. The COAH units as originally designed have a shared doorway, with the wider driveway next to it. If we are making changes to allow them to be similar, the COAH units should have their driveways and entry ways split up, so from the street scape appearance, other than the COAH units not having a garage but a wider driveway, they will basically look the same. She would like to see the tower features.

Mr. Clement says the COAH units will have a door way almost similar (**papers rattling, people talking, can't make out the rest of what the applicant is saying**). There is a driveway, no garage. They are currently on Route 34, and these will be the same.

Mr. Gianetti says from their perspective eliminating the façade and tower feature having them in line with the market rate units, at the same time you don't want every single unit to be the same, same as in a residential development. If there are minor differences between how much space is between the doors in the COAH units, as long as all units have the same façade and same architectural elevation, without the tower. They will not have the garage doors on the COAH units.

The Board is looking at plans and everyone is talking. It is confirmed the applicant will keep the towers on the COAH units, and the COAH units will be the same as on Route 34 that are already built, same building material.

Councilwoman Montone asks to confirm that everything will be the same as on Route 34, and the applicant confirms.

Mrs. Coppola says she has discussed this with Mr. Gianetti; when the Board considered the change in the size of the market rate units, they are going to 22 in width, and that is decreasing the size of garage, originally 12 ft. wide now 9 ft. 3 in. in width, and in length from 20 ft. 4 in. to 19 ft. 2 in. Is that wide enough for a single car garage, to make it usable and to keep a vehicle and trash cans. In this type community when garages are small, the usual things people keep in garage are done, but the car is outside. You can probably still get a car inside the garage but it will be tight.

Mr. Clemente says the standard garage door is 8 ft. x 7 ft. or 8 ft. x 8 ft. Mr. Leckstein says you open the door when you are inside and you need more room. Mrs. Coppola says a parking space is 9 ft. x 18 ft. Mr. Leckstein says the other problem is what is kept in the garage. Mr. Clemente cannot make the garage bigger without making other changes. Mrs. Coppola believes they could be. Mr. Clemente says the garages are in the architectural already; they can't be changed, and the COAH units don't have garages.

Mrs. Coppola asks for confirmation that patios will be provided at grade for the market rate units. Mr. Clemente says all the market rate units have patios on the first floor and decks on the second floor, and they will be shown on the final architectural, signed and sealed, according to Mr. Gianetti.

Mrs. Coppola says the rear elevations on the new plans are not consistent in the location of the windows and sliders on the floor plan. The floor plan should prevail as there are more windows than what is shown on the elevations. If the Board approves this, it should be a condition. The

windows as shown on the floor plans will take precedence over those shown on the elevations; the floor plans are correct, according to Mr. Gianetti, and the plans will be corrected accordingly.

She says a couple of bay windows are shown on the front elevations, for the first living floor, which is a nice feature, breaking up that wall. It is not shown on the floor plans, and should not be an option. She thinks the developer should be required to put in at least two of the bays per eight unit building; Mr. Gianetti agrees to this condition.

She says another consideration is the width of the garage at 9 ft. 3 in. and the driveway is 10 ft. wide. We may not need that width with the smaller garage, and get a little more green space out front. Mr. Clemente says you always have more driveway space, and the Board agrees.

Mrs. Coppola says when Mr. Hopkin talked about the retaining wall now being circular, that wall now goes up to 13 ft. She questioned Mr. Gillen about tiering the wall so there is not such a substantial change in grade from top to bottom. Mr. Russo says he spoke to Mr. Gillen who said raise the grade and make it 10 ft.

Mrs. Coppola says there is a new water line easement shown on the plan not discussed, that will connect to Salem Place, and not shown on the prior plan. She is concerned, and raised it to Mr. Gianetti; it goes thru the 50 ft. buffer between adjacent residential development and some additional trees to be planted. We don't know the distance to keep tree roots away from water easements, so there is a concern whether there will be a hole in the planting buffer.

Mr. Gianetti responds that he spoke to Mr. Gillen, Mr. Russo and Mr. Hopkin, who said the water line is being installed at the request of Mr. Gillen. Mr. Hopkin says there is a water line available to boot the system, provides better pressure and better in fire and safety situations. Mr. Gillen asked them to connect to it. It is a 20 ft. wide easement; they will not plant in the easement but to either side, and do their best to cover the hole. It would be up to Mr. Gillen and Mr. Brady to determine if anything could be planted in the easement. Mr. Russo said perhaps the plantings could be staggered. Mr. Clemente said there was a substantial cost to connect to Salem; at the request of Mr. Gillen they did this to get better water flow.

Mrs. Coppola said the applicant has resolved a lot of the issues she had initially; all variance conditions discovered have been rectified. There should be no variances required.

Mayor Tagliarini confirms nothing will be changed with drainage or any other issues on the project, and Mr. Clemente agrees.

Polling the Board members, the Board's decision is to keep the towers.

Mr. Mirabal asks about the garages; Mr. Clemente says that is the way they were on the original plan. The Board refers to the original plans.

Mr. Gianetti said they never requested a name other than the original application years ago was Renaissance. The applicant is requesting The Bluffs at Aberdeen, and will be on the sign. Mrs. Coppola says there was no sign proposed. Mr. Clemente says there were two trailers with signs, not a permanent sign. Mr. Clemente says these are temporary signs. The street name is not changing.

Mayor Tagliarini will contact the soldier's family to see exactly how they want the street named in memory of their son. They were honored by this suggestion, and thanks the applicants.

Mr. Mirabal moves to approve the administrative changes to the site plan application, with conditions, seconded by Mr. Swindle.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Cusumano, Mrs. Kelley, Mr. Mirabal, Councilwoman Montone, Mr. Swindle, Mr. Shenton

No: None

Abstain: None

New Business, **Monmouth County Planning Board**, Request from County Planning Board for review and comments of draft build out projections for Aberdeen Township

Mr. Shenton reads the letter to the Board Secretary from the Monmouth County Planning Board.

Mrs. Coppola says she is not quite sure what the letter is about; you can see in Table 2, the spread sheet showing build out analysis under different scenarios, the first two being DEP wastewater explanation, one using broad data, one using COAH development capacity by municipality, another the cross acceptance potential development from 2004, and one not applicable to Aberdeen, and then the Bayshore Regional Plan build out. As you scan and look at the residential units each study indicates, there is an incredible discrepancy. Looking at the Bayshore Regional plan, which is the lowest, we have the capacity for another 240 units residential and five acres of nonresidential area. If you go to the cross acceptance potential development from 2004, there is 1,773 dwelling units and 55.4 acres. They were coming up with the September, 2011 DEP estimator, you have the potential of 855 units on 1.4 acres.

Mr. Shenton does not understand if it counts for redevelopment; Mrs. Coppola says it does not. It is flawed in a number of ways; when you look at the map provided in areas provided as potential development, and areas of redevelopment not used as well. She has been working with other towns in Monmouth County and working with the County discussing the problems. The purpose is what are they going to use the build out figures for, how did they derive them. She is going to be attending a meeting after November 18. Her suggestion is Aberdeen be included and addressed by her that there is concern the accuracy of the data provided for Aberdeen. Based on BRSA parameters shows low figures and probably more accurate compared to the data using flawed landscape information taken from aerial surveys, which is not accurate.

Mr. Shenton suggests Coppola & Coppola represent the Township; the Board should make a recommendation to the Council to have our planner represent us in this issue.

Mrs. Kelley moves to recommend to the Council that they have Coppola & Coppola represent the Board at the meetings with the County Planning Board, seconded by Mr. Cusumano, and on voice vote all members agree (Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Cusumano, Mrs. Kelley, Mr. Mirabal, Councilwoman Montone, Mr. Swindle, Mr. Shenton.

Mr. Shenton says the data comes from different agencies. Mrs. Coppola says the letter is written by the County Planning Board. Mr. Shenton says they got funding from the federal government recovery act to do the study and map. We do not know the purpose of the study. Mrs. Coppola says according to the Board the projections were based on a build out model created by DEP regarding waste water management planning.

Mrs. Coppola says the report is not accurate; we need to find out what they are using it for, and then to make sure it is accurate in a way.... **(Board members are talking over Mrs. Coppola, cannot make out what she is say).....** for the Township; she knows the build out figures and different ways that can be to the benefit or be to the detriment of the municipality.

Mayor Tagliarini asks that we preserve 20 plus, or up to 40 acres in Freneau.

Memorialization of Resolution **SD 11-303 (Rev)/Parkside Manor-216 Center Street, Applicant: Parkside Manor, Property Owner: Miguel and Louise Rios, 216 Center Street, Block 313, Lot 19, Minor subdivision with variances** to subdivide existing lot into two conforming lots. Existing home to be demolished and single family home proposed to be constructed on each new lot. Variance required for each lot's covered front porch, 26% building coverage where 25% maximum permitted, in the R 50 zone. Revised to include noticing the above variance and a fence has been added to the plans along the shared property line of Lot 18, is summarized into the record by Mr. Leckstein. Councilwoman Montone moves to memorialize, seconded by Mr. Swindle.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Cusumano, Mr. Mirabal, Councilwoman Montone, Mr. Swindle, Mr. Shenton

No: None

Abstain: None

Memorialization of Resolution **SP 11-524 (rev)/Enterprise Holdings, Inc., Applicant: Enterprise Holdings, Inc., Property Owner: Richard Grimm, 469 Highway 35, Block 243, Lots 3 and 4, Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval with Variances and Waiver requests** to construct a new, 18 ft. x 28 ft. separate building at the rear of the existing building, previously approved by site plan, to be utilized as an enclosed washing and cleaning area for Enterprise rental vehicles. Variances required for Lot Area 40,000 sq. ft. required, 39,781 sq. ft. provided and existing; Lot Depth 200 ft. required, 199.02 ft. provided and existing; Front Yard Set Back 50 ft. required, 26.8 ft. provided and existing; Minimum Distance to Other Building, 15 ft. required, 5 ft. +/- provided, is summarized into the record by Mr. Leckstein. Mr. Mirabal moves to memorialize, seconded by Mr. Cusumano.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Cusumano, Mr. Mirabal, Councilwoman Montone, Mr. Swindle, Mr. Shenton.

Meeting adjourned.