

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN  
PLANNING BOARD  
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**REGULAR MEETING  
December 6, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Township of Franklin Planning Board was held at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Chairman Orsini at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read, the Pledge of Allegiance said and the roll was taken as follows:

**PRESENT:** Councilman Chase, Carl Hauck, Alex Kharazi, Cecile MacIvor, Charles Brown, Robert Thomas, Jennifer Rangnow, Godwin Omolola and Chairman Orsini

**ABSENT:** Robert Mettler and Mustapha Mansaray

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. James Clarkin, Board Attorney, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Christine Woodbury, Planning and Zoning Secretary

---

**INTERVIEWS:**

***Preparation of the Circulation Element of the Master Plan:***

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, indicated that he would be stepping down for the course of all three interviews.

- **CME**

Mr. Rob Russo, from CME Associates, introduced himself and noted that he was with Mr. Peter Vandercoy, CME Associates Director of Planning and Jim Watson, Director of Transportation. He told the Board that they were there that evening to talk about the RFP for preparing the circulation element of the Township's Master Plan. He reminded the Board members that they were there in the spring to discuss the Catalpa Park improvements and had been consulting engineers for the Township for almost twenty years now. Mr. Russo then gave the Board a quick background about their company, noting that they were a multidisciplinary engineering firm established in 1983 and had grown to 220 employees since that time working out of six offices. Mr. Russo then stated that they currently represent over 100 governmental entities and had been authorized by Franklin Township to work on a wide range of projects and believe that in that time they had developed a great working relationship with the Township and staff.

Mr. Vandercoy, Director of Planning, then opened a discussion regarding the RFP. He first indicated that they had a total of seven (7) planners in the department, with both extensive public and private experience within the State and have provided municipal services in terms of master plans, ordinances, redevelopment plans, planning and zoning board representation reviews. He added that those services include substantial experience preparing circulation elements, including plans for Neptune Township, Gloucester, Keyport. Mr. Vandercoy stated that they had also done substantial work in municipalities such as Bayonne, West New York as well as municipalities similar to Franklin Township such as Hillsborough to very rural communities in Cumberland and Salem Counties. Additionally, Mr. Vandercoy mentioned that they also had a very experienced transportation department, with broad experience both in South Brunswick and North Brunswick Townships. Because of their breadth of experience, he felt that CME Associates would be able to provide a very detailed and comprehensive township circulation element.

Chairman Orsini stated that the key components of the project were the coordination and support of the Township's economic development efforts, including potential improvements to mass transportation opportunities, the coordination and support of the Township's revitalization efforts in the Hamilton Street corridor, including pedestrian and bicycle improvements, as well as potential improvements to mass transportation. Additionally included in the project was the coordination in building upon recommendations and analysis in existing Township studies and plans and those of outside agencies such as Somerset County and the State of New Jersey and an evaluation of potential complete street initiatives. He asked if they could give the Board their background and approach to those components of the project.

With regard to economic development efforts, Mr. Vandercoy understood the Township's development plans to include both projects within redevelopment areas and other types of specific site oriented initiatives as well as corridor revitalization, commercial re-zonings and issues that come along with those such as parking to accommodate businesses, sensitivity to parking for residents and the inclusion of mass transit improvements. He indicated that they could bring their experience with municipalities that host train stations or those that were adjacent to municipalities with train stations like those in Keyport, Hazlet and Matawan. He then discussed the possibility of linkages to mass transit through bus service or perhaps shuttles to the Northeast corridor, etc. He added that they could take a look at all plans from outside agencies such as the County and the State and see where there might be an overlap and synergy with the Township's goals and vision to see what kind of outside resources they could leverage. Mr. Vandercoy then stated that his firm had some experience in grants and funding and could provide recommendations for those types of opportunities as well.

Mr. Brown then asked what type of experience their firm had with the implementation of complete streets in the jurisdictions that they currently oversee. Mr. Watson indicated that he believed he attended the Township's Complete Streets seminar at Rutgers, and that they had done significant amounts of work for Middlesex County and North

Brunswick as well as adjacent communities. He stated that they were always trying to add the connectivity wherever possible, especially when they were doing Planning and Zoning Board reviews, so as to not always having to rely upon the arterial roadways. He then spoke of always trying to add bicycle lanes where they can as well as sidewalks.

Mr. Omolola asked whether their firm puts together a back-up plan for any project should there be issues. Mr. Vandercoy discussed how they handled an emergency such as Super Storm Sandy when they were working on a project for Keyport. He stated that they did an emergency operations plan, wherein they dealt with evacuation routes where they looked at the topography of the land inundation by flood waters, and put created a map that calculated the risk of the evacuation routes and looked at alternative routes. Mr. Vandercoy stated that they worked with the police dept. in the town as well as the emergency operations official to put together a very detailed plan that included mapping and strategies in case of an emergency.

- **H2M**

Mr. Eric Deline, Senior Project Planner with H2M Architects & Engineers, a 350-person firm based out of Long island, NY, introduced himself. He stated that they work with towns such as Howell, NJ and Parsippany, NJ. Mr. Deline indicated that they like to think that they were a large enough company that they can respond to their clients' needs appropriately, but not so large that they get caught up in the administrative red tape of the larger, international firms. Mr. Deline gave his background of 11 years of transportation planning, some land redevelopment and some land use planning experience. He felt he was a planner that "did it all" and considered all aspects when handling transportation planning projects.

Thomas Falin, President and Transportation Director at BHX Engineering & Planning, LLC, then introduced himself. He then indicated that he had 25 years of experience in the field and was a Professional Engineer by trade. He then stated that he had extensive experience with a client base from local municipalities and real estate developers all the way to the U.S. Dept. of Transportation in a wide array of planning and engineering applications.

Mr. Deline then stated that they work on circulation elements for municipalities, board representation and master plan examinations as well as redevelopment plans. He noted that during the course of master plan examinations, they work circulation elements. Prior to working at H2M, he stated that the worked for VHB, which he indicated was primarily a transportation, engineering and planning firm. During that tenure, he stated that he was involved in completing a number of transportation plans, mostly recently in East Orange, NJ for their master plan that included a transportation element. Mr. Deline then passed around the transportation element that they worked on for East Orange, NJ, for the Board's edification. Again, Mr. Deline stressed that their firm liked to think of the community as a whole, and not just the transportation network

alone. He stated that they did not think of just the transportation issues on their own, but how they interact with the residents, businesses and with people interested in visiting the community. He added that it was not just about the motorists, but also the pedestrians who walk by choice as well as circumstance, people who have to use public transportation or those who choose to use it.

Chairman Orsini again stated that the key components of the project were the coordination and support of the Township's economic development efforts, including potential improvements to mass transportation opportunities, the coordination and support of the Township's revitalization efforts in the Hamilton Street corridor, including pedestrian and bicycle improvements, as well as potential improvements to mass transportation. Additionally included in the project was the coordination in building upon recommendations and analysis in existing Township studies and plans and those of outside agencies such as Somerset County and the State of New Jersey and an evaluation of potential complete streets initiatives. He asked if they could give the Board their background and approach to those components of the project.

Mr. Deline started out speak about economic development, which he stated was integral in anything they do, working on ways to get people to work and school and preserving quality of life by getting people to the places they want to go and home sooner. He then spoke to the East Orange Master Plan, specifically, Mr. Deline noted that that city had two transit stations and were huge economic development engines for that community. He went on to add that not only were they experiencing huge economic growth (\$750 million) over the last few years, but also the impacts of that growth such as accommodating new residents who had never lived in East Orange before, people that may or may not have a car, and people who were choosing to give up their cars. Mr. Deline stated that he knew that Franklin Township was updating its land use element and economic development element right now, and indicated that their firm saw the economic development work done in conjunction with those two elements as well. He then indicated that even though the closest train station was in New Brunswick and not within walking distance from the Hamilton Street/Franklin Boulevard business corridor, he felt that there were opportunities to connect people through bicycle pathway improvements.

Mr. Falin then added to the conversation by stating that he sat on the Board of Directors of the Morris County Economic Development Corp. He indicated that some of the critical items that Chairman Orsini mentioned were exactly what they were addressing at the EDC, which was a joint venture between the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Freeholders in Morris County. Mr. Falin told the Board that transit was a critical issue in Morris County, with some of the highest office vacancy rates in the country in Parsippany, NJ, even as they are putting new office buildings up in adjacent towns. He noted that the problem existed primarily because of the lack of transit connectivity. Additionally, he stated that the coordination between the county and its municipalities through elected officials as well as through economic development authorities is part of what drives the process in planning for infrastructure in Morris County.

Mr. Brown stated that a big component of a circulation element was the engagement with the public and their community. He reiterated their statement that they were looking to create a transportation center for all and wondered what experience they had working with environmental justice populations as well as other underserved communities throughout the transportation decision making process.

Mr. Deline drew the Board's attention back to the city of East Orange, which he stated had a similar population to Franklin Township, but that it had a higher density. He indicated that they had worked within the town of Morristown on their unified circulation and land use element as well as Dover, which had an 80% Hispanic and Latino population. Mr. Deline indicated that they had worked on improving the network with complete streets, which helped connect the communities back to the downtown area by walking there. He added that they had also worked on the Union County transportation plan with the environmental justice populations in the cities of Elizabeth and Hillside.

Mr. Falin stated that they had done many projects in Morris County, and if any of the efforts were funded through the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Northern New Jersey, which was a federal conduit for funding, environmental justice was an absolute necessity for all of the plans that they produce, particularly at the county level. He added that if there was federal money involved at the local level that would also apply.

Mr. Brown then opened up a discussion regarding connectivity to and from the train station in New Brunswick. He stated that New Brunswick was currently in the process of getting a bike share system of which not only the residents of New Brunswick could benefit from, but people in Somerset County in general. Mr. Brown asked what H2M's experience was with bike share systems.

Mr. Deline stated that they had not had any direct experience, but that they did update the Hudson County Master Plan two (2) years ago. He noted that Jersey City was developing their own bike share system as well as Hoboken already having their own bike share system. Mr. Deline stated that part of what they did was to advise the county, knowing that there were other communities like Guttenberg and West New York, to find ways to piggy back off those systems and to share the bike share program, especially for those people who may not have the economic means to subscribe to the typical bike share system.

Mr. Omolola asked what plans they had for a community outreach program.

Mr. Deline indicated that he felt that community outreach was one of the most critical components of any plan. He noted that in East Orange, they did workshops that were more public meetings than sitting at a table and talking about residents. He stated that he felt it was important to hear from the Township to find out what were the best ways to meet up with the community, particularly with traditional populations that might not necessarily be that engaged than others. He noted that they had done multiple meetings with differing groups and communities within the town of East Orange to get everyone's input. He added that they also did a culture festival, noting that they felt it

was more important to get out into the communities rather than having them come to you.

Mr. Falin also mentioned working on the Morris County circulation element, stating that one of the creative mechanisms used for public outreach there was to engage the community at existing events that were already scheduled throughout the calendar year, such as a summer festival or park festival or a program at an historic site that had an annual event.

Mr. Kharazi then stated that Franklin Township had quite a few senior citizens, so reaching out to them and understanding their needs was a priority. He noted that they were located in different places in the Township, but that there were certain places that had a high concentration of senior citizens.

- **WSP**

Mr. Peter Kramer, Director of Planning at WSP's New Jersey office came forward and introduced himself. He noted that they were previously known as Parsons Brinckerhoff, one of the oldest and largest transportation and consulting firms in the country, with a national and international presence. He then told the Board that he had access to any specialty that he would need, including traffic engineering, geotechnical, as well as tunneling. He stated that they had people out working on the Pulaski Skyway and others working on the Rte. 72 bridge out to Long Beach Island. Mr. Kramer then told the Board that they were also a local firm and that a colleague, Edgardo Perez, a Traffic Engineer out of their Newark office, was doing some site plan reviews for one of the schools (Claremont School) right here in Franklin Township. He then told the Board that they had two (2) New Jersey offices, with several hundred planners, engineers and scientists, located in Lawrence Township in Mercer County and an office in Newark, NJ and several hundred staff in their Philadelphia office. Additionally, he indicated that they also had about 500 or so in their New York office. Mr. Kramer then gave the Board the benefit of his background, with 25 years of professional experience in Planning, with an Engineering Degree and a Master's Degree in Engineering and licensed as a Professional Planner in New Jersey along with an AICP license. He then described the type of work he had done in his years of experience, including traffic projections, large traffic models, capacity analysis, township plans, circulation elements, county plans, regional plans for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO's) and statewide plans like the recent New Jersey Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan that they worked on with several other firms. He also indicated that he had been on the Lawrence Township Zoning Board of Adjustment for the past 18 years, with half of that time as Chairman. He then discussed the five (5) assignments that they had completed for the Somerset County Planning Board, one of which was the circulation element for Somerset County. Mr. Kramer also added that they had done three (3) priority investment studies, which were economic re-development plans and integrated land use, and transportation studies as well as a county wide assessment of Somerset County transit and bus service. He then told the Board that the three (3) priority investment studies were to

look at six (6) or seven (7) sites, corridors and large areas in Franklin Township that included Hamilton Street, Franklin Boulevard, the Davidson Avenue and Worlds Fair Drive area as well as Elizabeth Avenue.

Chairman Orsini once again stated that the key components of the project were the coordination and support of the Township's economic development efforts, including potential improvements to mass transportation opportunities, the coordination and support of the Township's revitalization efforts in the Hamilton Street corridor, including pedestrian and bicycle improvements, as well as potential improvements to mass transportation. Additionally included in the project was the coordination in building upon recommendations and analysis in existing Township studies and plans and those of outside agencies such as Somerset County and the State of New Jersey and an evaluation of potential complete streets initiatives. He asked if they could give the Board their background and approach to those components of the project.

Mr. Kramer first started his discussion with the economic development and revitalization, reiterating his earlier testimony regarding the three (3) rounds of priority investment studies, looking at 31 different sites, with six (6) or seven (7) of them in Franklin Township. He discussed the Hamilton Street Business District, stating that they had looked at that area several times, developing alternative land uses for some underperforming parcels, bicycle and transit improvements as well as some small urban design elements. He added that they also looked at bicycle and pedestrian improvements along the Hamilton Street corridor. Mr. Kramer stated that they did find that Hamilton Street was not wide enough because the busses were there, along with on-street parking, and so they developed a plan for those uses on the parallel street system. As a result, they designed a bicycle boulevard, which was a series of links that connected a series of different streets that ran parallel to Hamilton Street and then came back to Hamilton Street as you came closer to the New Brunswick border where there were some bicycle lanes that funneled down to the transit system. Mr. Kramer stated that part of what predicated by the fact that there was the recent inclusion of the three (3) new apartment buildings on Hamilton Street. He added that they also looked adjacently at Franklin Boulevard as well and prepared a road diet assessment. Mr. Kramer then discussed transit services, stating again that they had prepared Somerset County's bus and transit service, with a recommendation to have a supplemental east/west service that would connect Bound Brook to New Brunswick to give some additional shuttle type services and provide local residents to those transit services. In discussing complete streets, Mr. Kramer indicated that they were one of the leading firms in New Jersey in terms of complete streets and had done everything except write the New Jersey State Complete Streets policy. He added that they had created train programs and taught hundreds of people on how to write and adopt a complete streets program and implementation and everything that goes along with that, including engineering, traffic, design, etc. Mr. Kramer then noted some complete streets projects that they completed near Franklin Township in New Brunswick near the college. As it related to coordination with county and regional agencies, he noted that they had done a series of studies for the North Jersey Transportation Planning Association and projects that they were selected to undertake.

Mr. Omolola praised their efforts in the College Avenue area with the bicycle lanes and would be happy to see them do the same for the Township.

Mr. Kharazi then indicated that there were problems with traffic in the Township on certain streets, so having a bicycle lane on those streets from a safety point of view may not be the right direction to go in. He asked how they would assess the safety aspect of offering bicycle lanes.

Mr. Kramer stated that they always erred on the side of safety and that they use a methodology that evaluates what improvement was needed based on the risk level.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Kramer to speak to how they had managed to not only identify, but also advance the concerns of all of the populations that were trying to be heard. He added that Franklin Township was a very racially and ethnically diverse community with a multitude of younger and older people all vying for different services.

Mr. Kramer indicated that they had done 14 or 15 senior mobility workshops across the state as part of their work for NJDOT, which was very much based on a collaborative/outreach process in a three-hour workshop teaching for about an hour and gathering the group of half seniors and half professionals as decision makers in the design process. He stated that they give them clipboards and have them detail what they like and what they don't like, what they are comfortable with and what they were not comfortable with. Mr. Kramer stated that they are then brought back together to facilitate a discussion. He then gave examples of economic justice in Paterson where there were 20 schools in a 2-mile radius and quickly discovered that they needed to slow traffic down on those busy streets and expand the sidewalk area from less than 5 ft. wide to about 10 ft. wide to ensure the safety of the school students. Mr. Kramer then gave another example in Warren County where there were pockets of populations there that take ESL (English as a Second Language) courses and asked them what their needs were.

Chairman Orsini stated that they had come to the conclusion of the interview process and that they would come together in the work session portion of the meeting that night to evaluate and make a choice.

## **MINUTES:**

- **Regular Meeting – November 1, 2017**

Mr. Omolola made a motion to approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. Kharazi seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Rangnow, Mr. Omolola and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None



## **DISCUSSION:**

### ***Vouchers:***

- **Peter Vignuolo – Clarkin & Vignuolo – December Retainers - \$833.33**

Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and all were in favor.

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Brown, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rangnow, Mr. Omolola and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

### ***Extension of Time:***

- **Balaji Property Solutions, LLC – PLN-16-00004**

Mr. Ruben Perez, Esq., Attorney with the law offices of Francis P. Linnus, Esq., appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Balaji Property Solutions, LLC. Mr. Perez explained that the Applicant was before the Board that evening to request an extension of time in order to record their minor subdivision deed. He added that the minor subdivision approval was memorialized in the Resolution adopted by the Planning Board on November 9, 2016. He added that since that time, the Applicant had been working diligently in order to satisfy the conditions of the minor subdivision approval. Mr. Perez indicated that they were asking for an extension of time until May 18, 2018.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Extension of Time until May 18, 2018. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Brown, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rangnow, Mr. Omolola and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Chairman Orsini made a motion to open the meeting to the public for any general planning comment other than what was being discussed in the hearings that evening. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Chairman Orsini made a motion to close the public portion of the meeting. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

## HEARINGS:

- **ASHA ABRAHAM / PLN-17-00001**

Flag Lot Subdivision in which the Applicant wants to subdivide the property into two lots at 199 Wilson Road, Somerset; Block 417.1, Lots 24 & 25, in the R-40 Zone - **CARRIED TO FEBRUARY 7, 2018 – with no further notification required.**

**DL 02/28/2018**

- **PARADISE ADULT HEALTHCARE / PLN-17-00013**

Mr. Francis P. Linnus, Esq., appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Paradise Adult Healthcare. He indicated that they were there before the Board that evening in order to obtain Site Plan approval w/Variances in which permission was being sought to construct 3 gazebos and a shed at 23 Worlds Fair Drive, Somerset; Block 468.09, Lot 58.01, in an M-2 Zone.

Mr. Linnus indicated that the three (3) gazebos required one (1) variance each, one (1) for side yard and one (1) for rear yard.

Mr. F. Mitchell Ardman, Engineer and Planner, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Ardman proceeded to then describe the existing conditions on the site, and entered into the record as Exhibit A-1 a colorized Site Plan rendering. He oriented the Board to the location of access to the property on Worlds Fair Drive as well as the two parking areas and showed them the location of the 15,000 sq. ft. building on the site. Mr. Ardman indicated that there were industrial developments to either side of their property as well as across the street, with an undeveloped property to the rear of the site in the R-40 Zone that fronts on Cedar Grove Lane. Mr. Ardman went on to state that it was his understanding that a Use Variance was granted recently for 50 townhomes on that undeveloped property. He then indicated that the subject property was just over 1.18 acres, with no variances granted on the property for coverage or building setbacks and the adult daycare had been running their program since August of 2017. Mr. Ardman indicated that there were 130 attendees on a daily basis, but that they were licensed to accommodate up to 250 people.

Mr. Ardman then showed the Board the proposed location for the three (3) gazebos along the back, southern property line as well as one shed. He then discussed the constraints on the site and located a 20 ft. wide drainage easement on the site right behind the building running towards the shed. He then told the Board that the gazebos were going to give a covered outside space for the people attending the adult daycare facility so they could play games such as chess or ping pong.

He described the variances for one side-yard setback variance from the gazebo closest to the easterly property line that was 10.4 ft. and 8.3 ft. to the overhang as well as a rear yard setback variance that was 11 ft. from the gazebo closest to the southerly property line. He described the first variance as a C-2 variance and believed it was a better design for the gazebos. Mr. Ardman then indicated that the adjacent use was light industrial with storage outside and didn't see any impact to the adjoining property. He then drew the Board's attention to the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law that the C-2 variance requested would advance. To address the negative criteria, Mr. Ardman stated that they would be moving existing pavement to accommodate the gazebos and did not see a negative impact to the adjoining neighbors or any detriment to the zone plan or scheme. In discussing the rear yard setback variance that was required, where 25 ft. was necessary and 11 ft. was provided with 8 ft. to the overhang, Mr. Ardman indicated that it was a function of the hardship the Applicant had in placing the gazebos to accommodate the drainage easement on the property. He then indicated that there were no variances associated with the proposed shed on the site, but that they would move it out of the drainage easement area as requested in the November 21, 2017 Technical Review Committee (TRC) report. Mr. Ardman then drew the Board's attention to the request in the TRC report for curbing, but asked for a waiver. He noted that they were taking up the pavement in the area where the gazebos would be placed to offset any additional impervious coverage, but that there was just an edge of pavement in that area and already drains into an inlet located nearby. Mr. Ardman indicated that he would review that with staff, but would like a concurrence from the Board.

Mr. Thomas asked how they were planning to treat the rear boundary line, and Mr. Ardman indicated that it would be fenced. There was discussion between Mr. Thomas and the Chairman regarding also having a vegetative buffer beyond the fence line to separate the adult day care use from the approved 50 townhouse project. Mr. Thomas indicated that he believed that there would be a vegetative buffer, but didn't believe that the Zoning Board required the other applicant to provide fencing. Mr. Healey stated that they would look into what was required of the other applicant.

Mr. Kharazi asked if there would be outdoor cooking under the gazebos, and Mr. Ardman indicated that they would sometimes bring out a portable grill, but that it would not be placed within the gazebo structure, but nearby on the sidewalk.

Mr. Brown asked if there would be any night time activities at the gazebo area, and Mr. Ardman stated that the facility only runs till 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Mr. Brown asked if there would be sufficient lighting for the gazebos. Mr. Ardman indicated that they would only be using the area during the warmer months when the sun didn't set until later, but that there was also some building mounted lighting in the rear of the existing building. Finally, Mr. Brown inquired as to whether there would be parties where outside guests would be invited, and Mr. Ardman stated that the use of the gazebos would be for the clients only.

Mr. Voyetovich, Managing Member and Operator of Paradise Adult Daycare, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Voyetovich reiterated Mr. Ardman's testimony that the gazebos would be for the benefit of the clients only.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, the Vice Chair made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Kharazi seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Site Plan w/Variances. Mr. Healey then asked the Board about their thoughts regarding curbing. Chairman Orsini indicated that there was no curbing their presently and that the drainage would occur naturally as it had been doing and didn't feel it necessary to include curbing there. Mr. Hauck nodded in agreement. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Brown, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rangnow, Mr. Omolola and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

- **SYCAMORE DEVELOPERS, LLC / PLN-17-00008**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Sycamore Developers, LLC. Preliminary and final major subdivision requested for proposed 32-lot subdivision located at 1865 Amwell Road, Somerset, NJ; Block 423.01, Lot 1.04, in an R-40 Zone - **CARRIED FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2017 – with no further notification required.**

Mr. Lanfrit explained that the Application was for clustered development pursuant to the Township's Cluster Provision Ordinance to create 32 building lots, one detention basin lot and an open space lot, just slightly under 40 acres. He then stated that in order to proceed with the clustered development, the Applicant was required to prepare a plan to show how many lots that the Applicant could obtain with an as-of-right development in the R-40 Zone, which was where the 32 lots came from. Mr. Lanfrit then testified that they then came to the Planning Board with a Sketch Plat Plan, which was reviewed by the Board, and which was required by the ordinance, the plan for the cluster was sent to various Township agencies for their review and input. He added that there were meetings with the various agencies over the summer months; and all of the agencies recommended a clustered development rather than an as-of-right one (1) acre lot development. Mr. Lanfrit then stated that they gave that information to the Planning Board, who agreed in September of 2017 that the project should move forward as a clustered development. He noted, however, that there were a few bulk variances that they were seeking in conjunction with the Application. He indicated that he would have the Site Engineer discuss those variances. Additionally, Mr. Lanfrit stated that under

the Clustered Development Ordinance, they had a right to cluster the lots down to the R-15 standards, which were 15,000 sq. ft. lots, but in discussions with the various committees, Township staff and Planning Board proposed an R-20 development, which proposed larger, 20,000 sq. ft. lots that were more compatible to what was in the area already. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that doing so would offer a little bit less open space.

Mr. F. Mitchell Ardman, Site Engineer & Planner employed by the Reynolds Group, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Ardman explained that his firm prepared the plans that were the subject of the proposed Application that evening. He testified that they had submitted a conforming plan as part of the Application, as required by the Cluster Development Ordinance. Mr. Ardman then showed the conventional layout plan, which was marked into evidence at the June 21, 2017 meeting as Exhibit A-2, and was now marking it into evidence for the night's hearing as Exhibit A-1, a colorized version of the conventional plan. He then noted that the conventional plan allowed for 32 one (1) acre lots. Mr. Ardman then stated that each lot had the required frontage and the required setbacks for ample building envelopes. He noted that there was an existing pond on the property with wetlands in the southeast corner as well as a small pocket of wetlands in the northeast corner. As part of that conventional development, Mr. Ardman explained that there would be room on the property for storm water detention basins to handle runoff if it was to be developed in that way. Mr. Ardman then pointed out the adjacent land uses, including residential properties along Cedar Grove Lane along the westerly lot line (approximately 30,000 sq. ft. properties) as well as the tree line that basically surrounded the property. He noted the Hunter's Crossing R-40 development as well as the Cedar Grove Cemetery, both on the easterly border of the property. He then stated that there would be no open space with the conventional plan, and only undeveloped areas where the two detention basins were proposed.

Mr. Ardman then entered into the record as Exhibit A-2, which showed a colorized version of the overall Site Plan, Sheet #3, that the Board has already seen, but with a few minor modifications based upon staff comments at the last hearing. He discussed the plan, noting that the driveway for the development was now located at the northern end of the property on Cedar Grove Lane and as far away from the intersection with Amwell Road as practical. He noted that the properties would be made up of thirty-two (32 ) 20,000 sq. ft. lots and meets all the criteria for the R-20 Zone. Mr. Ardman then testified that there would not be any variances associated with the single family lots, but that there would be some variances and deviations for the open space lot. He noted that the open space was located at the southerly portion of the property and was just under 12 acres (11.9 acres) in an area that was a critical view shed to keep as Amwell Rd. runs from the east, with a more dense development area, and becomes more rural as you come around the curve. Mr. Ardman added that many Board members agreed that it was critical to locate the open space area where it was shown on the plans now. He indicated that the one detention basin was now located in the northeasterly portion of the site.

Mr. Ardman then went on to explain why the R-20 lots were more appropriate than the allowable R-15 lots for the subject development. He discussed the sizes of homes in the area in R-40 Zones and the homes that were built on the 30,000 sq. ft. + lots on Cedar Grove Lane. He then spoke about having ample size for a home to be constructed with more setback room. Mr. Ardman also indicated that the homes would look more aesthetically pleasing and able to accommodate for side-loading garages rather than front loading garages for a better visual impact. He also noted that the proposed lot widths match up very well with the lots fronting on Cedar Grove Lane. Mr. Ardman also testified that there was not as much building coverage and impervious coverage allowed in the R-20 Zone as there was in the R-15. Mr. Ardman then opened a discussion regarding the storm water management system, discussing how the runoff would leave the site. He noted that the homes fronting on Cedar Grove Lane actually pitch back toward the subject site and their runoff would also be handled by the proposed detention basin. He then stated that the roadway into the development would be a standard township 30 ft. wide roadway, with a sidewalk on one side of the roadway (easterly side) and go around all the cul-de-sacs and around to the southern end of the cul-de-sac. He then noted that there would be an emergency access drive off the end of the main cul-de-sac as opposed to what was included in the original plan that had a boulevard divided entrance road, which was appropriate according to the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) if you have a roadway of enough length. Mr. Ardman stated that it was not the desired design by the Township. He did state, however, that the emergency access drive did cut through the easement in the open space area. Mr. Ardman stated that the emergency access drive was just that – for emergencies to be used for Fire and Police services – and would be chained on the cul-de-sac side as well the Cedar Grove Lane side. He also indicated that there would be some utilities under the emergency access driveway and would be paved per the Township request and would tap into the existing water main on Cedar Grove Lane. Mr. Ardman added that having the emergency access roadway allowed them to loop the water line for a continuous loop with good water pressure. He then indicated that there was also sanitary sewer line on Cedar Grove Lane that they would be able to tie into. Mr. Ardman then went over the storm water management standards that would have to be met, including three (3) main criteria that were required by the Township as well as the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission (DRCC), including peak flows, water quality and water recharge. He said he had designed a wet basin and made a few changes based upon comments from Township staff on the design criteria. He also spoke about a small, sand-bottomed basin, for overflow and for water recharge.

Mr. Ardman then drew the Board's attention to the open space land fronting on Amwell Rd. He stated that it was approximately 11.9 acres in size. He added that it was 550 ft. to the cul-de-sac from Amwell Rd. and 225 ft. from the cemetery.

Mr. Ardman then discussed the variances that they were seeking in conjunction with the Application. He noted that the first set of variances was related to the size and dimension of the preservation area. He then indicated that the area was 29.79% of the total area, with the requirement being 15 acres and a minimum of 40% of the site to be preserved. He then stated that they were asking for a variance because of the change

from the R-15 to the R-20 lot size, which was agreed was a better scheme by all the committees involved and more in keeping with the residential lot sizes in the area. Mr. Ardman then testified that there was also a benefit in that there was less impervious coverage, more spacing in between the lots, and a better visual impact. The other variance mentioned by Mr. Ardman was for lot size and dimension, where 500 ft. minimum width in basically all directions was required and where there was a portion of the property where there was only 225 ft. at the narrowest point proposed. Since the adjacent use was a cemetery and there were no active neighbors nearby, they felt as if the parcel acted as quasi open space and that the lot design in that area fit the property well in that area.

Mr. Lanfrit then stated that he received a letter from the cemetery association, marked into evidence as Exhibit A-3, requesting that they rebuild a fence for them and undertake some minor improvements along the property line for them to protect the cemetery from the development. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that he had spoken with a Mr. Levis, of the association, and agreed to undertake the property line improvements listed in the letter in Exhibit A-3. Mr. Ardman then testified that the improvements requested by the cemetery association were already on the plans.

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, suggested that Exhibit A-3 only be marked for identification as the Board did not have the ability to question the gentleman who wrote the letter.

Mr. Ardman then mentioned one additional minor variance the NPRC Cluster Ordinance required in that the tract needed to be 40 acres in size, where they were providing a tract of 39.91 acres, with less than a ¼% difference, a de minimus deviation. Additionally, Mr. Ardman indicated that there was one more variance for the encroachment of the easement that provided the fire and emergency vehicles access to the development that would be required.

Mr. Ardman then stated that the open space lot was proposed to be conveyed to the Township as well as the lot that contained the detention basin. He added that there had been discussions that the Township may not want the open space lot, and if that were the case, they would sit down with Township staff and discuss the most appropriate way to handle the open space, whether it is retained by the current owner or new owner or some other way to protect it. He added that they had deed restriction requirements that did preserve it as open space and would be part of the discussion.

Mr. Healey then explained that no matter the mechanics of it, the ordinance would require that there be appropriate mechanisms placed on the open space property, whether it is deed restriction or conservation easement, that the property could never be developed in the future.

Chairman Orsini brought up a past discussion regarding having a homeowner's association rather than the current owner retain the open space since it was possible that the current owner might no longer own it at some point in time. He added that the next owner might fight the deed restrictions. Mr. Lanfrit agreed that they would have the

discussion with Township staff and try to come up with an appropriate mechanism to protect the open space. Chairman Orsini then brought up the same concern for the detention basin property, and Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they would discuss that with Township staff as well.

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, interjected, for the benefit of the public, that if there was going to be a deed restriction and/or conservation easement type of language included, that it would be a document that would be recorded in the Somerset County Clerk's office; but more importantly, it would be a restriction that lawyers say "runs with the land" and would stay with the land into perpetuity regardless of who owned the property..

Vice Chair MacIvor indicated that the Open Space Committee, at their meeting the evening before, made a recommendation to have a conservation easement. Mr. Healey stated that it was the Planning Board's recommendation as well at the concept stage of the discussions. Chairman Orsini still felt that a homeowner's association would be the best way to deal with any issues with the open space area rather than with a private owner.

Mr. Healey then reminded the Applicant of one more variance that needed to be discussed regarding proposed Lot 1.14, which was actually a thru-lot, where there was frontage on the proposed street and a 50 ft. sliver that wound down to Cedar Grove Lane. Mr. Lanfrit stated that they had been in contact with the two property owner's that surround that strip of land, and was confident that the land would be conveyed to one or both of the property owners and would not be part of the development any longer. He added that they could seek the variance, for protection purposes, but felt that the entire issue would go away very soon. Mr. Ardman showed the Board and the public the area in question on Exhibit A-2, the proposed site plan, to further the request for the variance and noting that a restriction could be placed upon that lot that no driveway could be constructed on that property to connect it to Cedar Grove Lane and, therefore, could not truly be considered a thru-lot.

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, suggested that should the Board consider approving the Application, that a provision be included to state that the subject proposed strip of land could be added to one or both of the adjoining lots without the requirement for any further subdivision application.

Mr. Ardman then gave a brief summary and justification for the variances that they were seeking, utilizing the C-2 criteria of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL). He added that he didn't believe that there was any detriment to the public good and no negative impacts to the adjoining neighbors.

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, asked if Mr. Ardman could agree that the benefits to the Township substantially outweigh the benefits, and he answered in the affirmative.



Mr. Thomas asked whether there would be curbing in the development and Mr. Ardman answered in the affirmative. He wanted to specify that they include block curbing to match all the other newer developments in the area. Mr. Ardman indicated that they had already planned to include granite Belgian block curbing.

Mr. Ardman then reviewed the staff reports, starting with Mr. Healey's Planning report. He indicated that they had spoken about many of the comments, but agreed to do what was required under the Township ordinance regarding the tree contribution. He then discussed item #7c in Mr. Healey's report regarding preservation of the hedgerow and what they could or could not do with respect to what currently existed on the site. Mr. Ardman stated that they would preserve what they can of the hedgerow, but it would basically be the trees and the hedge that was along the easterly edge towards the property line and along the westerly edge towards the property line. He added that towards the center of the property, was located the roadway and the houses that were laid out. If they were to preserve the hedgerow in that center area, Mr. Ardman stated that they would have to move the development more to the south, and the preserved open space area would be much smaller as a result. He testified that what was presented to the Board that evening with the larger contiguous open space area was a much better alternative than trying to preserve the hedgerow. Mr. Ardman then discussed item 8 in Mr. Healey's report regarding a trail to be placed on the property that would go towards the Township's Open Space. He stated that there was a drainage and access easement that would go through the lots to connect to the Township Open Space area.

Councilman Chase suggested that the strip of land for the trail be added to the detention basin Lot 1.20 rather than having it be an easement, by possibly moving the house on the lot there slightly, to avoid any future homeowner there getting upset about people walking up the easement. Mr. Ardman indicated that they could discuss the issue with Township staff, but that the setbacks for the lot in question could be an issue in order to try to keep a side-loading garage. Mr. Healey concurred that it would be better to keep the trail on the detention basin lot rather than create an easement on a private lot. A discussion ensued regarding how they might demarcate the position of the trail. Councilman Chase suggested the use of wood chips.

Mr. Healey asked that they address comment #6 in his Planning report. Mr. Ardman reiterated that they would be providing sidewalks on the one side of the roadway and was continuous. Mr. Healey indicated that Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) indicate that the topic of sidewalks were treated differently depending upon whether you have a low- or medium-intensity development. Mr. Ardman indicated that he believed that they had a low-intensity development and that a 30 ft. wide roadway with a sidewalk on one side was more than adequate and appropriate. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Brown asked if there was on-street parking, with the inclusion of a 30 ft. roadway, and Mr. Ardman answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Ardman addressed Mr. Hauck's Public Works report, dated November 27, 2017 and Mr. Zilinek's Engineering report of November 28, 2017. Mr. Ardman indicated they have

already complied with the Public Works comments and could comply with all of the Engineering comments, but wanted to discuss the comment regarding lighting. He added that they had proposed lights at all the intersections, the end of the cul-de-sacs and the critical points on the curve as you come into the site to include nine (9) LED lights on the site. Mr. Ardman added that they were not trying to light the area up like might happen in a more dense development in an R-10 Zone or in a senior development. He indicated that there was a typo that indicated 34 in total, and that they would provide the detail for the lamp posts on the plan, per Chairman Orsini's request.

Mr. Lanfrit stated that they met with the Fire Prevention professionals and everything that was requested had been included.

Councilman Chase asked whether the utilities would be placed underground, and Mr. Ardman answered in the affirmative. The Councilman stated that the Environmental Commission recommended that they mix the type of street trees so as not to have a long run of the same species. A discussion ensued, and Mr. Healey stated that they had revised their plans and it was now consistent with the Environmental Commissions' guidelines. Councilman Chase then indicated that the house on Lot 1.34 was shifted to the left and was much closer to the house on Lot 1.33 than to the one on Lot 1.35. He state that it would be better if the spacing were more even, and Mr. Ardman testified that he felt he would be able to do that and still keep the side loading garage. The Councilman then brought up a gradient deviation on Lot 1.28, and Mr. Ardman indicated that there was a grade difference in that area and that the house could be a good contender for a walk out basement.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Mr. Richard Nazar, representing his mother, Delores Nazar who lives on Lot 10 on Cedar Grove Lane, Somerset, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Nazar asked what would happen to the house and outbuilding on the open space property. Mr. Lanfrit stated that they would have discussions about whether the land would continue to be farmed and maybe one of the structures would remain to hold farm equipment, but that the home on that portion would be taken down regardless. Mr. Healey indicated that they showed how many homes could be accommodated on the site with existing R-40 zoning that included 32 lots. A discussion ensued among the Board. Councilman Chase noted that there was a note on the plans that all structures on the open space property, including the stone driveway would be removed. Mr. Nazar then stated that he felt an overlay on the plan should be done before a determination was made to take out the centrally located hedgerow on the property. Mr. Ardman indicated that the grading that had to be done in the central portion, there might not be an opportunity to save everything there, but they would make an effort to save some nice trees if they exist there.

Mr. William Tybor, 312 Cedar Grove Lane, Somerset, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Tybor asked if there would be any type of fencing put in from his home, the first one

near the access driveway, all the way down to the entrance driveway for the development. Mr. Ardman indicated that there were no plans to put in any fencing. Mr. Tybor then asked if a sidewalk would be put in along the emergency access driveway, and Mr. Ardman stated it would be a 16 ft. wide paved drive, but there would be no sidewalks and the roadway would be chained and locked.

Mr. Walter Guagliano, 304 Cedar Grove Lane, Somerset, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Guagliano asked why they could not provide the required 40% open space. Mr. Ardman then reiterated his testimony from earlier in the hearing regarding the provision of that with R-15 zoning, but that the homes would be very tight. Their intent, as stated by Mr. Ardman, was to make the lots behind the homes along Cedar Grove similar in width to fit in and look more seamless and more compatible with what was already there. Also, Mr. Ardman stated that the idea was to have the open space in one contiguous space and not spread out over the community. A discussion ensued among the Board regarding all the discussions that were held with the various committees. Mr. Healey stated that that was why they were asking for the C-2 variances, meaning that what was presented was a better zoning alternative. Mr. Guagliano then had a question regarding drainage, and Mr. Ardman briefly described how the basin on the property worked to retain and manage the runoff.

Ms. Donna LaCoco, 312 Cedar Grove Lane, Somerset, came forward and was sworn in. Ms. LaCoco asked about any traffic control report that might have been done in the area for the development. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that a traffic study was done on March 9, 2017, by Dolan & Dean, and measured both what the traffic pattern was now on Cedar Grove Lane during the peak hours of traffic and what affect the development would have after it was constructed.

Mr. Gary Dean, Traffic Consultant and Principal of Dolan & Dean, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Dean explained to Ms. LaCoco what was included in the traffic study and reiterated what Mr. Lanfrit testified to regarding traffic counts during peak hours of travel along Cedar Grove Lane. He stated that most of the travel was going in the northerly direction toward Rte. 287 and Easton Avenue and anticipated that traffic from the develop would follow the same pattern. He indicated that right turns out of the development would be somewhat facilitated by the signal at Amwell Rd. Mr. Dean added that left turns out of the development would take longer and operate at a lower level of service doing so. He discussed that the design complied with all of the County design standards for a new street. Mr. Dean explained that the entire road system was governed by RSIS standards, statewide regulations that dictate things like the width of the road, the curvature of the road, whether there was curbing and sidewalks included, etc. He then stated that they would expect 24 vehicles during peak hours to be coming out in the morning and coming into the development in the evening in an hour's time, equivalent to one car leaving or coming every 1-2 minutes and was imperceptible with no detrimental effect on Cedar Grove Lane. Mr. Dean indicated that the traffic counts were taken on March 7, 2017 from 7-9 in the morning and 4-6:30 in the afternoon. A discussion ensued and Mr. Dean indicated that the counts indicate 1,800 vehicles in a single hour during the peak hours, with only 24 coming from the proposed development.

Mr. Richard Nazar came forward again and stated that his mother's property was adjacent to the 50 ft. piece of property that fronts on Cedar Grove Lane. He indicated that his mother was interested in purchasing that property, but wanted to know if it would be incorporated into her existing lot or if she had to go through any additional documentation. Mr. Lanfrit stated that they would be required, as part of the final plat, to subdivide that property from the rest of the development and convey it to Mrs. Nazar when it would automatically merge into her lot and she would not have to do anything further.

Seeing no one else coming forward, Chairman Orsini made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Councilman Chase then opened a discussion regarding a comment from the D&R Canal Commission regarding runoff going into the canal. Mr. Ardman indicated that they believe they had satisfied their concerns to gain their approval.

Mr. Lanfrit then gave his summation regarding the proposal.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Application with all the recommendations previously discussed, to include the language to cover the conveyance of the 50 ft. strip of land to one or both of the adjacent property owners without the necessity for a separate subdivision. Additionally, the recommendation that the any buildings that need to be removed from the open space property, it needed to be done before the first home was completed in the subdivision. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Brown, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rangnow, Mr. Omolola and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

There were no Committee Reports discussed.

#### **WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS:**

- **Discuss Interview Proposals**

Mr. Healey discussed the costs presented by all applicants, noting that two (2) of them, H2M and WSP, were consistent with each other and in the neighborhood of 30,000. He noted that CME was a good deal lower in price at \$12,400. Mr. Healey recommended

that the Board discuss which firm they felt would do the better job, with cost being a factor, but not the overriding factor.

Chairman Orsini stated that in listening to the three (3) proposals, his impression was that even though they had CME in the Township doing many project over the years, he felt that their proposal as far as the Township goes, was “vanilla”, for lack of a better term. He added that he got the idea that their plan would be very “boilerplate” and by the numbers. The Chairman then ranked the three proposals, with H2M ranking the lowest since their experience didn’t seem relevant to Franklin Township. He then stated that he felt that WSP gave the most specific, relevant answers to the Township’s needs since they had already worked in Franklin Township and had done some work with Somerset County and would rank them as #1 for their proposal.

Mr. Vincent Dominach, Economic Development Director, indicated that they had worked with WSP and felt that they had the best opportunity to continue working with them since they already had a good working relationship with them.

Mr. Omolola stated that felt that WSP was very concise and complete, with good examples. Mr. Thomas agreed with all of the comments, and felt that maybe CME came in with some preconceived ideas of what they were going to find since they had been doing work in the Township for quite some time. Vice Chair Maclvor stated that she was favorably impressed with WSP and very glad that Mr. Healey and Mr. Dominach were both recommending them. Councilman Chase stated that in reading through their introductions prior to listening to the presentations, he was impressed with WSP’s familiarity with the Township and knowing what we mean when we say that circulation was important to economic development. The Councilman stated that it made them the overwhelming favorite in his mind. He also added that the presentation went into the most detail about what they would do, particularly about outreach to the public. He also stated that he liked the detail they provided regarding complete streets. Mr. Brown indicated that he was fortunate to be familiar with all three firms and had worked in different capacities with a number of them. He then indicated that he thought WSP outshined the other two proposals and were leaders in the field of complete streets, not only in New Jersey but across the nation and bring forth the most progressive thoughts about circulation and transportation. Mr. Brown then indicated that what they spoke about regarding their level of community involvement matched what was stated in their report. He did state, however, and should take into consideration, was that WSP did have the opportunity to go last. He did add, however, that he felt H2M would rank #2 in his mind, specifically because of his knowledge of their work in East Orange, which was a difficult situation to navigate from a public input standpoint and because they brought in experts locally who had the knowledge to put forth a plan that was representative of the multitude of the population there. He then said that he thought CME put forth a generic plan that did not take into account the challenges in Franklin Township. Ms. Rangnow agreed wholeheartedly with Mr. Brown’s opinion as well as those of other Board members who ranked WSP #1. Chairman Orsini then read Mr. Kharazi’s choices from earlier in the evening since he had to leave the meeting early. The choices indicated by Mr. Kharazi were that he

ranked WSP #1, CME #2 and H2M #3. Mr. Hauck also agreed that WSP made the best presentation and had done work with the Township and County and had a good working relationship with members of staff. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Chairman Orsini thought that they could be very confident in proposing going with WSP as their first choice to prepare the circulation element of the Township's Master Plan.

Mr. Brown then opened a discussion in highly suggesting that applicants prepare exhibits utilizing the technology available in the chambers so that the public would be better able to see them. A discussion ensued among the Board.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairman Orsini made a motion to adjourn the regular meeting at 10:15 p.m. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary  
January 8, 2018