

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**VIRTUAL MEETING
July 2, 2020**

This Regular Meeting of the Township of Franklin Zoning Board of Adjustment was held virtually at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Chairman Thomas at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read, and the roll was called as follows:

PRESENT: Laura Graumann, Alan Rich, Gary Rosenthal, Joel Reiss, Cheryl Bethea, Richard Procanik, and Chairman Thomas

ABSENT: Anthony Caldwell, Bruce McCracken, Robert Shepherd, Kunal Lakhia

ALSO PRESENT: Daniel Lagana, Board Attorney, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Christine Woodbury, Planning & Zoning Secretary

MINUTES:

- **Regular Meeting – May 7, 2020**

Mr. Rosenthal made a motion to approve the Minutes as submitted. Ms. Bethea seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rich, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, Ms. Bethea, Mr. Procanik, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Regular Meeting –May 21, 2020**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. Rosenthal seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

RESOLUTIONS:

- **Constance Rossi / ZBA-20-00010**

Vice Chair Graumann made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Mr. Reiss seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Terence Browning / ZBA-20-00003**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Vice Chair Graumann seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Ursula Gibson & Adam Cora / ZBA-20-00006**

Vice Chair Graumann made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Mr. Reiss seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Andrew Burian & Carol Dellatore / ZBA-20-00009**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Vice Chair Graumann seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Neil Patel / ZBA-20-00005**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Vice Chair Graumann seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Reiss, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

HEARINGS:

- **1340 HAMILTON STREET, LLC / ZBA-20-00004**

Applicant had already received approvals for Site Plan and Use Variance. Applicant is now requesting a modification to operate the service station 24-hours/7 days a week at 1340 Hamilton Street, Somerset; Block 80, Lot 1.01, in an M-2 Zone - **APPLICATION HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN – without prejudice.**

- **DIAMOND INVESTORS & BUILDERS, LLC / ZBA-19-00030**

“C” Variance in which the Applicant was looking to build a 2-story, single-family dwelling at 61 Juliet Avenue, Somerset; Block 160, Lot 1.01, in an R-10 Zone - **CARRIED TO JULY 16, 2020 – without further notification required.**

For those wishing to participate in the July 16, 2020 hearing via Virtual WebEx Meeting, the event address for attendees will be posted on the Township’s website at:

<https://www.franklintwpnj.org/Home/Components/Calendar/Event/15598/2193>

For those wishing to listen via telephone the call-in number is: **+1-408-418-9388** and the access code is: **129 366 2387**

- **ELION ACQ., LLC / ZBA-19-00043**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Elion Acq., LLC. “D(1)” Use Variance, “C” Variances, Minor Subdivision & Site Plan in which the Applicant was subdividing the property into two lots and will be constructing two warehouses – 1) Building 1 - 425,250 sq. ft. and 2) Building 2 - 118,800 sq. ft. at 47 Veronica Avenue and 74 & 102 Bennetts Lane; Somerset; Block 88.02, Lots 13, 25, 26, 71, 72, with portions of the property in the M-2, R-40, A and O-P Zones – **CARRIED FROM JUNE 4, 2020 – with no further notification required.**

Mr. Procanik asked to be recused from hearing/voting on the matter this evening.

Board Attorney, Mr. Daniel Lagana, asked whether there were enough voting members on the panel that evening for a quorum. Board Secretary, Christine Woodbury, indicated that they would have six (6) voting members that evening.

Mr. Lanfrit stated that he wanted to discuss the ramifications of the smaller Board representation with his client. He then asked if they could take a brief recess so that he could contact his client to decide whether to proceed or not. Chairman Thomas allowed the recess.

Mr. Lagana suggested to the Chairman that should Mr. Lanfrit choose not to proceed that evening with the hearing, he indicated that they could still present their Application that evening, and any voting Board members not present that evening could either read the transcript or watch the video and be prepared to vote on the matter at the July 16, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Lanfrit returned from the recess and indicated that they would like to proceed with their testimony that evening and defer to the end of the testimony to determine whether they wanted to move forward with a vote that night.

Mr. Lanfrit indicated that Elion Acq., LLC was the contract purchaser of Lot 13, 71 and 72 that were referenced in the Chairman’s opening statement. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that there were three (3) components to the Application, noting that there were several environmental constraints on the property. He then told the Board and public that the basic Application was to take Lot 13 and create a minor subdivision so that there would be two (2) lots (Lot 13 currently has 60+ acres). He went on to state that once the subdivision testimony was presented, they would go on to present an Application for Site Plan approval on the larger of the two pieces that was being subdivided. Mr. Lanfrit then indicated that that larger piece would be then merged with Lot 71 and Lot 72 to make that a conforming building lot, upon which the Applicant intended to construct two (2) warehouses. Mr. Lanfrit then stated that the third part of the Site Plan Application, and why they were before the Zoning Board, was that they were proposing to construct the storm water management basins on Lots 25 and 26, which were not in the M-2 Zone. He then noted that one of the lots was in the R-40 Zone and the other lot was in the Agricultural (A) Zone. Mr. Lanfrit summed everything up by saying that the warehousing and all of its related activities would be located within the M Zone and the storm water management basins would be constructed on property that was no in the M Zone, which was why they required a Use Variance.

Board Attorney, Mr. Daniel Lagana, asked Mr. Lanfrit that Mr. Freud present his Engineering testimony, allowing for the Board and public to ask questions, prior to presenting Planning testimony. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that he would have Mr. Freud present his Engineering testimony and bring him back at the end to present his Planning testimony. Chairman Thomas agreed.

Mr. Robert Freud, Engineer/Planner, employed with Dynamic Engineering, 1904 Main Street, Lake Como, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Freud testified that he and his firm prepared the plans that were the subject of the night's Application. Mr. Freud then described the subject property and the surrounding land uses, utilizing an aerial exhibit, dated 6/4/2020, (Exhibit A-1) taken from NJ GIS Services from approximately 2015, which he testified was still accurate. Mr. Freud then pointed out the lot on the aerial exhibit that was proposed for the lot subdivision, that included Lot 13 (long, narrow lot with 60+ acres) in the M-2 Zone that had extensions out to Rte. 27 as well as Lots 71 and 72, which extend to Veronica Avenue. He explained that Lots 71 and 72 were smaller lots in the M-2 Zone (with about 2 acres each) but provided a couple hundred feet of frontage along Veronica Avenue. He did note, however, that there was a small section of Lot 13 that extended into the G-B Zone and fronting on Rte. 27.

Mr. Freud then showed an exhibit showing the proposed minor subdivision plan (Exhibit A-2) and prepared by James P. Deady Surveyor, LLC, that was submitted to the Board. He noted that it showed the subdivision line running north/south, dividing Lot 13 into one portion towards Rte. 27 and the other portion to the interior of the lot that would then be combined with Lots 71 and 72 so that the majority of the new Lot 71.01 would be about 48 acres with frontage on Veronica Avenue and extending into the M-2 Zone portion of the site. He then showed the Board on Exhibit A-2 that the remaining portion of Lot 13 and proposed to be called Lot 13.01 would be about 16.77 acres that would retain the frontage and access on Rte. 27. Mr. Freud testified that the new Lot 71.01 would be a fully conforming and compliant lot, meeting the frontage and lot width requirements. He added that neither of the lots required any variances to create the subdivision. Mr. Freud then indicated that the Lot 13.01 had two frontages along Rte. 27, with one of those an undersized frontage that was an existing condition that would remain unchanged. As to Lot 13.01, he added that no new variances would be created there. Mr. Freud stated that another, larger portion of Lot 13.1 near the north end of the lot in the O-P Zone had full frontage along Rte. 27. Mr. Freud indicated that there would be no development proposed on Lot 13.01 that evening.

Mr. Freud drew the Board's attention to Exhibit A-1, and discussed the environmental constraints located on proposed Lot 71.01 that was comprised of farm fields and wooded areas as existing conditions. He indicated that the constraints were located within the wooded areas and included drainage channels that run north/south through the eastern portion of proposed Lot 71.01 as well as on the western portion and were tributaries to Six Mile Run. Mr. Freud stated that those tributaries fell under the jurisdiction of NJDEP for both flood hazard area control as well as for wetlands. He added that because they were also within the Delaware & Raritan Canal State Park jurisdiction, they were also subject to their jurisdictional review. Mr. Freud indicated that applications had been submitted to both agencies, and that NJDEP, specifically, had issued the verification that identified the 100 year flood plain and the repairing buffer for the two (2) tributaries of Six Mile Run that come through the site. Regarding the freshwater wetlands, he stated that there had been a prior Letter of Interpretation (LOI) from the NJDEP for the property, but it had since expired. Mr.

Freud then stated that a new LOI had been applied for from NJDEP and was currently under review. He noted that they had not completed their field inspections due to the delays related to COVID-19 but felt that their review would reveal what was consistent with their plans based upon the previous LOI. He added that they had submitted the plans to the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission (DRCC) and were in the process of coordinating technical review comments with them.

Mr. Freud then gave testimony related to the Site Plan utilizing Exhibit A-3, which was a Site Plan rendering and dated June 4, 2020. He explained that the exhibit showed the western portion of the property and the area that was subject to the Site Plan Application. He pointed out the location of both Lot 71 and 72 along Veronica Avenue as well as Lots 25 and 26 in the southern portion of the property in either the Residential (R-40) or Agricultural (A) Zone. Mr. Freud told the Board that Lots 25 and 26 would be used solely for the location of the detention basins and for a buffering area and that all of the development on the property would be contained within the M-2 Zone. Mr. Freud then discussed how the site would function, speaking of ingress/egress, the number of buildings, and on-site circulation. He indicated that there were two (2) warehouse buildings proposed, including Building 1 with approximately 425,250 sq. ft. (5,400 sq. ft. or approximately 1.27% would be utilized as office space) and was a linear east/west building with employee parking on the north side wrapping around the west side (283 parking spaces) and loading bays and trailer parking on the south side (81 loading docks and 93 trailer parking spaces). Mr. Freud then described the second building, Building 2, which was located a bit further east of Building 1 and included approximately 118,800 sq. ft. (3,750 sq. ft. or approximately 3% dedicated as office space). He noted that there would be employee parking on the west side, with the loading docks and trailer parking on the east side of the building for a total of 80 parking spaces, 18 loading docks and 21 trailer parking spaces. Mr. Freud then discussed the circulation on the site, indicating that there was a 30 ft. wide boulevard driveway on both sides of the landscaping coming in from Veronica Avenue through Lots 71 and 72 to access the facility with trees dividing the ingress and egress driveways as a safety measure and to provide an aesthetically pleasing and improved entrance treatment. He added that it also allowed for separation of access for fire and emergency vehicles into the site. Mr. Freud described the site circulation once into the site by giving vehicles a choice to either move counter clockwise to access the employee parking to the western side of Building 1 and then the truck bays and trailer parking area as well as a trash enclosure to wrap around the building to come to the main (east/west) drive aisle, which would allow for truck recirculation and access to Building 2. He noted that the parking area on the north side of Building 1 for employee parking had separate access points on both the east and the west sides of the parking area. Mr. Freud then testified that there was circulation around the entire Building 2, with the employee parking on the west side and the loading docks and trailing parking on the east side leading to an exterior trash enclosure and then ultimately back out to the main (east/west) drive aisle. He showed the Board the areas to the east of Building 2 that included the combination of wetlands and the floodplain with barrier and buffer that was identified with the NJDEP and the wetlands and stream and buffer area to the west of Building 1. He noted a small pocket of wetlands on Lot 72 and showed an area between the two buildings that included an unregulated stream, from a flood hazard standpoint, but was regulated from a wetlands standpoint and the reason for creating the separation between Building 1 and Building 2. Mr. Freud stated that during the design development stage of the Site Plan, they did look to see if there would be any way to include site access from Rte. 27 through the subdivided lot; however, there was the issue of the

extension of Six Mile Run that came through that area along the subdivision line where there was the sensitive area of wetlands, flood hazard area, and buffers.

Mr. Freud then discussed the Lighting Plan for the site. He indicated that they have included area lights on poles and lights along the buildings, with all of the exterior lighting comprised of LED fixtures that were downward focused to have no glare or view of the element from within the housing. He then noted that the parking lot exterior lights in the truck courts would be 30 ft. high, 22 ft. high in the employee parking areas and 22 ft. high for the building-mounted lights. Mr. Freud indicated that they had included house-side shields on the fixtures on the south side of Building 1 to minimize spillover onto the residential and agricultural properties on that side of the building. He did add that they were asking for a waiver for a minor light spillover at the southern property line. He then discussed the separate trash enclosure that was being provided for each building and located in the southeast corner of the trailer parking area for Building 1 and in the northeast corner of the trailer parking area for Building 2. He then added that they would both be enclosed and match the architecture of the building.

Mr. Freud then discussed the accessory structure that was in the south east corner of Building 1 that included a water tank and pump house to help provide sufficient water for fire service on the site for both buildings. He noted that the pump house was approximately 14 ft. tall and 550 sq. ft. and the water tank was 35 ft. tall with a radius of about 19 ft. wide. Both elements were set back about 50 ft. from the rear property line, where 100 ft. was required due to environmental constraints that existed between the two buildings. Due to the placement of the storm water management structures, those accessory structures would be several hundred feet from any residential development.

Mr. Freud then drew the Board's attention to the storm water management system that would include two (2) detention basins, with one (1) basin to service each building. He then discussed the specifics of each basin to include the size and location of each, noting that the basin for Building 1 would be designed as a wet pond and to drain to the tributary to the west and the tributary to the east of the building. Mr. Freud then explained that the basin for Building 2 would be designed as a sand bottom infiltration basin with discharge in a southwesterly direction towards the existing drainage features. He testified that the design of both basins was determined by the extensive soils testing on the site and that the drainage patterns were consistent with how the site drains today in a north to south direction. He then added that the design of the storm water management system on site was determined by the three important components/requirements for a major development that included water quality, recharge, and water quantity.

Mr. Freud then addressed the basin that would service Building 2, noting that it was in the R-40 Zone and was the reason why they needed a Use Variance for that basin. He also then explained the environmental constraints on Lot 25 that directed the placement of the basin for Building 2 and told the Board that there was no opportunity on that lot for any type of R-40 residential development. Mr. Freud then addressed Lot 26 that would house the basin for Building 1 and was located within the Agricultural (A) Zone. He told the Board that the size of the lot was approximately 21 acres. Mr. Freud indicated that Lot 26 had frontage along Bennetts Lane, with some wetlands and encumbrance of buffering on the western portion with the remainder of the lot currently being utilized as farmland and considered developable land. He then discussed the proposed buffering for each of the basins, noting that the basin for Building 2 on Lot 25 had the existing vegetation of 50-100 ft. and all the way out to Bennetts

Lane. Mr. Freud described a 50 ft. wide swath of evergreens along the 100 ft. of basin for Building 1, with another 50 ft. area of buffering to screen not only the basin but the transition from the M-2 Zone to the Agricultural (A) Zone. Mr. Freud then described several other elements of landscaping that was proposed for the site, primarily focused at the access of the site near Veronica Avenue with trees planted not only in the center of the boulevard entrance, but also along either side of each drive aisle. Additionally, plantings will be included along the employee parking area on the north and west side of Building 1, with a combination of shade trees and shrubs, with the same planted around the perimeter of Building 2, especially in the employee parking area to supplement the existing vegetation. In all, Mr. Freud indicated that there were almost 300 trees proposed to be planted on the site, comprised of 169 shade trees, 94 evergreens, 35 ornamental trees and 700 shrubs.

In designing the site, Mr. Freud indicated that they did look to see if the storm water management system could be placed on Lot 13.01, but an underground basin created maintenance issues.

Mr. Freud then spoke about the variances that were being created by the proposals, including the accessory structure setback that was discussed earlier, where 100 ft. was required and they were proposing 50.8 ft. to the rear setback line of Lot 13. Secondly, there was required a parking lot to residential zone setback, where 25 ft. was required and they were proposing 21.2 ft. from the rear of the trailer parking and lastly, the drive aisle width in the employee parking areas, with a minimum of 26 ft. wide drive aisles required and 25 ft. was proposed.

Mr. Freud then addressed the comments in each of the professional reports associated with the Application. The first report discussed was the Engineering report from CME Associates, dated May 26, 2020. He indicated that they could comply with all of the comments in the Engineering report, noting that a number of them were related to storm water management design and that they had been working with CME Associates to address any and all comments to their satisfaction. He then stated that they were working with the Franklin Township Sewerage Authority to comply with all their requirements included in their report of May 26, 2020. In addressing the report from the Police Dept., dated February 11, 2020, Mr. Freud indicated that they could comply with their request for some additional signage. In addressing the report from Mr. Cianfrani from the Public Works Dept., dated January 21, 2020, Mr. Freud indicated that they could comply with their comments. He then addressed Mr. Hauss' Fire Prevention report, dated May 26, 2020, and he indicated that he reached out to other property owners adjacent to the subject property along Veronica Avenue in order to obtain agreement to have an emergency access and was not successful. He also reminded the Board that any access out to Rte. 27 was precluded due to environmental constraints as discussed earlier in the hearing. Mr. Freud again reiterated that they have enhanced the boulevard out to Veronica Avenue and included wider drive aisles to facilitate emergency access in and out of the site. He then discussed the inquiry to Mr. Hauss from a representative owner regarding the enhanced boulevard drive and was requesting some minor modifications to the design, which were included in the Application package. Mr. Freud indicated that they would work to satisfy the design considerations requested on the Veronica Avenue access. He then discussed Mr. Hauss' request for a separate water tank and pump for each building, indicating he had a discussion with the Fire Prevention Director stating that the two buildings would always stay with a single owner and the property would not be subdivided. Mr. Freud indicated that he believed that they would be able to satisfy the fire codes in that regard without the need for a second tank and water pump. He then discussed

the controls in place that would bring any subdivision before the Board and would have to include agreements for shared driveways, landscape maintenance, snow plowing, as well as shared water pump and tank maintenance, etc. Mr. Freud indicated that Mr. Hauss was satisfied. Mr. Freud then addressed the memo, dated January 14, 2020, from the Environmental Commission which asked for some corrections to the Environmental Impact Assessment. He indicated that the corrections had been made and the report had been resubmitted. Mr. Freud then addressed Mr. Healey's Planning report, dated May 25, 2020, stating that they would provide a buffer against the residential zone around the detention basin and that they were in compliance with the ordinance with respect to the buffer. He then indicated that they would take care of the tree replacement and have also taken care of the environmental constraints with some permits in hand and waiting on others. Mr. Freud then spoke to a comment regarding the parking requirements, discussing the proposal against what was required. Combining the office and warehouse components of the Application, Mr. Freud stated that it resulted in the need for a total of 254 parking spaces, with 363 provided, and 283 at Building 1 and 80 at Building 2. He noted that the final breakdown of office and warehouse space would be determined by the tenants occupying the buildings - currently the buildings were being constructed "on spec" without specific tenants in mind. He added that currently, the parking ratio was at 1 per 1,500 sq. ft. of building area, which he stated was relatively common in the industry and provides the best opportunity to lease to the "best" candidates. Mr. Freud indicated that he had a discussion with the Applicant based upon Mr. Healey's request to land bank some of the parking spaces until tenants were in place. He added that the outcome of that discussion with the Applicant was that he felt it was the best way to market the property by building out all the proposed parking spaces at this time. Mr. Freud stated that they were well below the maximum allowed for impervious coverage on the site based on the proposed Site Plan.

Mr. Healey asked whether they were going to put the buffer in an easement area with the owners of the warehouse development responsible for its long-term maintenance. Mr. Freud stated that the Applicant was willing to put the buffer area within the easement area. Mr. Healey asked how the buffer would be maintained, i.e., would they have irrigation put in place? Mr. Freud indicated that they would typically not provide irrigation, but plant evergreens that would be efficient enough to survive without it. He stated, however, that they would provide spot irrigation there for the first two (2) years.

Mr. Healey then asked Mr. Freud to explain the nature of the easements that would be on the properties for the water tanks and pumps. Mr. Lanfrit stated that there would not be a need for easements or cross easements because both buildings would be under the same ownership.

Vice Chair Graumann then asked if the drive aisles next to the buildings would be one-way, and Mr. Freud indicated that they would be two-way drive aisles. Mr. Freud also stated that there would be enough room for two trucks to pass each other.

Mr. Healey noted that none of the public viewing the meeting through Webex has indicated that they have a question, so he unmuted the public callers on the phones to see if anyone had a question for Mr. Freud's Engineering testimony.

Mr. Carneglia, Block 88.02, Lot 24.01, Somerset, NJ, spoke up to ask a question. Mr. Carneglia asked what the depth was of the detention basin that was going to serve Building 2

on the property and whether they were going to have a fence around it. Mr. Carneglia also asked if the 50 ft. buffer around the detention basin also included the sewer easement. Mr. Freud explained that basin #2 was going to be about 6-7 ft. deep (the sand bottom infiltration basin) that would not have standing water in it, and they did not have plans to put a fence around it as it had a 3:1 side slope, which was an appropriately safe slope. Mr. Freud then addressed Mr. Carneglia's second question by stating that the sanitary sewer line ran along his property line and that they did not have any development plans on the lot next to the homeowners property (Lot #25) except for the basin. Mr. Freud added that there would be wooded area left remaining between the basin and the homeowner's property. Mr. Carneglia then asked if the hours of operation could be limited for trucks to back up on the property since the back-up beepers could be very annoying later in the evening. Mr. Lanfrit explained that there was nothing in the ordinance that would prevent any tenant from operating their business 24/7, so there was a potential for it to be that way.

Mr. Healey then indicated that there was a person on Webex who wanted to ask a question.

Mr. Jonathan Gottlieb, on behalf of Gordon Veronica Associates, LLC, for owners of the two properties directly to the north of the development (Lot 75, Lot 77, and Lot 79 – medical office buildings and a Lab Corp. location). Mr. Gottlieb was inquiring about landscaping and fencing to further screen those businesses on Lot 75, 77 and 79. Mr. Freud explained that it was not typical to screen in that manner in the M-2 Zone.

Hearing no one further wanting to ask Mr. Freud a question on his Engineering testimony, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Edward Mayer, Architect, employed with Ware Malcomb, Newark, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Mayer indicated that he prepared the architectural plans that were part of the Application that was submitted. Mr. Mayer referred to Exhibit A-4, showing the architectural plans for Building 1. He gave the measurements and size of the building, noting the building height was 42.7 ft. to the top of the panel where the maximum building height allowed was 50 ft. He explained that the exterior tilt-up wall panels were to be 10 ft. insulated panels made of concrete with an insulation sandwich. He indicated that the interior "clear" height of the building would be 30.6 ft. Mr. Mayer then told the Board that there would be 84 loading docks and three (3) drive-in doors that would allow a truck to drive up the ramp and come into the building. He then stated that the building was being built to accommodate up to four (4) users with the notation of four (4) possible office locations within the building. Referring to page two (2) of Exhibit A-4, Mr. Mayer then showed the architectural plans for Building 2. Again, he gave the measurements and size of the building, noting that the building height was also 42 ft. to the top of the panel. He indicated that the interior "clear" height of the building would be 30.6 ft. to the outer roof joists. . Mr. Mayer then told the Board that there would be 20 loading docks with two (2) drive-in doors. He added that Building 2 was being prepared to accept up to two (2) tenants with the notation of two (2) possible office locations within the building. Mr. Mayer then showed the third and fourth page of Exhibit A-2, showing the building elevations, and then moved on to the renderings which were shown on page five (5) of the exhibit. He described the base colors of the buildings, grey at the office areas and white as a base color with accents of charcoal blue and a band of black wrapping around the corner of the building. Mr. Mayer then testified that both buildings would have the same colors and utilize the same materials. He then told the Board that the HVAC systems would be set back within the areas

above the office spaces and will not be seen from the street. He indicated that the building would be able to accept solar panels if a tenant requests that and anticipate providing the structure for those.

Mr. Healey opened the meeting to the public. Hearing no one interested in asking a question of the Architect, the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Matthew Seckler, Traffic Operations Engineer and Principal of Stonefield Engineering & Design, 92 Park Avenue, Rutherford, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Seckler indicated that he prepared the Traffic report that was submitted in conjunction with the Application, with an initial report submitted October 4, 2019 and a revision that was submitted March 19, 2020. In order to prepare the Traffic Study, Mr. Seckler indicated that they observed the traffic conditions in the area of the site, noting that the intersection of Rte. 27 with Veronica Avenue and Howe Lane was a very congested intersection. He stated that both Veronica Avenue and Howe Avenue were both arterial roadways that lead to the major roadways in the area, including Rte. 27, that carried 20,000 to 25,000 vehicles per day. Mr. Seckler noted that the traffic was a bit heavier in the morning going northbound with the traffic going towards New Brunswick and the evening traffic appeared to be more balanced. He added that Howe Avenue and Veronica Avenue had a little more traffic in the morning going westbound with generally a lot of left turns from Rte. 27 onto Veronica Avenue and Howe Lane in the morning. Mr. Seckler stated that there seemed to be more vehicles coming from Veronica Avenue and Howe Avenue turning onto Rte. 27 in the evening. Mr. Seckler stated that they did updated counts in the area on February 19, 2020, showing slightly lower counts from what was done previously with the LG site nearby in 2017, with 8% less in the morning and about the same in the evening. He testified that the intersection was very congested, however, Mr. Seckler indicated that it was not the intersection that was necessarily the issue, but really the downstream and upstream conditions from the intersection. He noted the backups from Jersey Avenue that spill back onto Howe Lane to Rte. 27. Mr. Seckler stated that they took the traffic counts taken in February, 2020 and added in the estimated counts for the LG development as it was not fully occupied at the time of their traffic count. He said they also looked two (2) years into the future to imagine what the counts would be using some growth rate factors. He then spoke about what has been going on in the past few months and that there were no projections going into the future post-COVID-19, but there are decreasing trends going through period of higher unemployment and recession periods, plus the whole work from home scenarios that would change the traffic counts previously taken at any point in the future. Mr. Seckler then spoke about the calculations made based on the projections from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) to determine the traffic counts that would be generated from the subject site. He spoke about an updated ITE journal article that focused on warehouse developments, noting that there was more truck traffic during the peak hours in the past, but that the trend had changed to show a reduction in the truck traffic during peak hours from 30% to 13% as warehousing facilities kept their truck traffic off the roadways during peak hours for better efficiency. Mr. Seckler then focused on the ingress/egress capabilities, the design of the site and the safety of its access to Veronica Avenue, giving his opinions on how the site operates well with all the components included on the site as detailed in Mr. Freud's Engineering testimony. He noted the long driveway into the site from Veronica Avenue of greater than 500 ft. before the first decision point in the circulation system on the site as a positive. Mr. Seckler then discussed their analyzation of the Rte. 27/Veronica Avenue/Howe Lane intersection and noted the increase of about 1-2 vehicles every cycle to the existing traffic pattern. He added

that the traffic they were adding with the new development would be likely in the morning peak hours southbound on Rte. 27 and making a right turn on to Veronica Avenue. He then drew the Board's attention to the on-site circulation, noting that there were nice wide parking spaces at the loading bays with industry standard designed parking lots and site circulation design. He gave his opinion that he did not believe that a significant impact was being created here in terms of the roadway network. Mr. Seckler indicated that there was a request in the Engineering report for a letter from NJDOT affirming the Applicant's belief that they had no jurisdiction over the development that related to the access points. He indicated that they had filed a letter of no interest from the NJDOT when they received the Engineering review letter in late April, 2020, but because their staffing had been irregular since then, they had not gotten a response yet. Mr. Seckler indicated that they did not have any problem with including the receipt of the letter of no interest as any condition of approval.

Chairman Thomas opened a discussion for reiteration of testimony regarding the trend of manufacturing/warehousing operations avoiding being out on the roadways during peak hours in order to improve efficiency of operations. The Chairman then discussed the safety regarding left hand turns out of the driveway, and Mr. Seckler indicated that they had very clear sight distances at that driveway to ensure safe left turns.

Mr. Healey then opened the meeting to the public wishing to ask questions of the Traffic Engineer from those following along through Webex.

Mr. Jonathan Gotlieb, 31 South Fourth Street, Highland Park, NJ, on behalf of Gordon Veronica Associates, LLC, for owners of the two properties directly to the north of the development (Lot 75, Lot 77 and Lot 79 – medical office buildings and a Lab Corp. location), Mr. Gotlieb indicated to Mr. Seckler that Wednesdays were the least active days for medical offices and labs and that their traffic counts were taken on a Wednesday in February, 2020. Mr. Seckler indicated that medical offices in that area were not seen as an intense use and that their traffic counts were taken during the peak morning hours of between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. which were not coinciding with peak hours of medical offices and labs. As such, Mr. Seckler testified that he did not think his opinions would change. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Peter Wagner, representing Dinesh Singal, a doctor who owned the property known as Block 88.02, Lot 74 came forward. Mr. Wagner brought up a discussion regarding traffic in the area, specifically truck traffic and possibly seeing the increase of trucks coming and going from the facility due to COVID-19. Mr. Seckler agreed that that might be true, but it also would decrease the automobile trips to grocery stores, pharmacies, etc. by individual motorists. Mr. Wagner then opened a discussion regarding the length of the trucks travelling on Veronica Avenue and how many could queue at the intersection and on their way down Howe Lane to Jersey Avenue. Mr. Seckler then explained that all the calculations in their report consider the wheelbase of the trucks and the extra time needed for trucks to get going after sitting at a red light at the intersection. He also added that the traffic counts were taken in February, 2020, prior to the effects of COVID-19. A discussion ensued. They then spoke about the trends of the warehousing industry going towards spreading out their trucks on the roadway to avoid peak hours on the roadway to increase efficiency.

Dr. Lampert, Oncologist and tenant of 75 Veronica Avenue, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Dr. Lampert brought up a discussion regarding the increase of automobile traffic post-COVID-19

due to more people travelling alone, which would increase traffic counts, not including the truck traffic to and from the Site. Mr. Seckler reminded Dr. Lampert that the traffic counts and their study was done pre-COVID-19 and considered the traffic patterns at that time. A discussion ensued regarding the industry standards for the warehouse/manufacturing industry and how those were used to come to Mr. Seckler's conclusions. Lastly, Dr. Lampert expressed his concerns for the safety of his older, weakened patients travelling to and from his office for appointments who do not necessarily want to drive, but have no choice in the matter.

Mr. Rich then asked what the level of service was at the Rte. 27/Veronica Avenue/Howe Lane intersection. Mr. Seckler stated that the level of service was Level "D" in the morning peak hours and Level "F" in the evening peak hours. He reminded the Board that he felt these levels of service were not necessarily due to the way the intersection operated but was also negatively impacted by the backup from Jersey Avenue to that intersection.

Not seeing anyone further wanting to speak who are viewing the hearing via Webex, Mr. Healey then proceeded to unmute the callers to see if anyone wished to ask questions of the Traffic Engineer.

Ms. Cathy Blumig, 176 Bennetts Lane, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Ms. Blumig indicated her concern for the Applicant to provide a buffer from the warehouse to the residential properties on Bennetts Lane. Mr. Healey indicated that the Applicant was planning to provide a buffer in that area. Ms. Blumig then had a concern for the effects of the warehouse activity on the site, particularly if it were to run 24/7, and wanted to know what effect it would have on the wildlife in the area. Mr. Freud indicated that the NJDEP was also looking at the impacts to wildlife in the wetlands areas. He added that they do follow their guidelines for review of threatened or endangered species in the subject area. He also told Ms. Blumig that the NJDEP had their staff monitor that and confirm what was required, which evaluated and prescribed the buffering off of the wetlands and the stream in the environmentally sensitive areas as well as what can and can't be developed, times of year when property can be developed. Mr. Freud indicated that those guidelines were part of their wetlands and floodplain permitting from the NJDEP. He went on to discuss that the property was in an M-2 Zone, which contemplated just this type of use as long as the NJDEP standards were met.

Resident, 1341 Hamilton Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Mr. asked how the development was going to further impact the intersection of Veronica Avenue and Hamilton Street. Mr. Seckler indicated that the subject property was in the M-2 Zone and was earmarked by the governing body for just such a warehousing/manufacturing use with access on Veronica Avenue. He then noted that most of the traffic would be headed out towards Rte. 27, as evidenced by our observations and counts. He added that there was no restriction for which way the traffic would go coming out from the subject property, however.

Hearing no one further wanted to ask questions of the Traffic Engineer, Mr. Healey closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Lanfrit then recalled Mr. Freud to give his Planning testimony. Mr. Freud indicated that he reviewed the variances that they were seeking, including the "D" variances for the detention basins. Mr. Freud then gave testimony to justify and support the variances that were included in the Application. He indicated that he would speak first regarding the "D" Use Variances

and relate to the installation and construction of the detention basins on the site (Lots 25 and 26) because they were located in the R-40 and Agricultural (A) Zones. As was pointed out in the previous discussion, Mr. Freud testified that all the warehouse use was located within the M-2 Zone. He added that the detention basins were normally associated with a use and could be found in a residential or agricultural zone and the use was not unfamiliar in that area. Additionally, he stated that it was only because the detention basins were connected to the use in the M-2 Zone that makes it a different scenario. As stated earlier, Mr. Freud indicated that the detention basin on Lot 25 was encumbered by wetlands and floodplain which made the placement of any type of development on that property in the R-40 Zone prohibitive. As such, Mr. Freud indicated that they had used it for the most benign purpose and use which was an above ground detention basin. Similarly, moving to the west to Lot 26, which was in the Agricultural (A) Zone, Mr. Freud stated that a basin would be familiar in that zone if a residential property were developed there. He noted that the basin would be about 100 ft. wide with a 50 ft. wide buffer would serve to screen and protect that area. In reviewing the use variance, Mr. Freud indicated that they look at the positive and negative criteria and how they could advance the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL). He then described several purposes of the MLUL that would be advanced with the proposal, including to encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands to promote health, safety and general welfare as well as to provide adequate light, air and open space. Mr. Freud indicated that they were under the maximum impervious coverage on the lot in the M-2 Zone with approximately 55%, where 65% was the maximum. He also stated that open space was provided in the R-40 and Agricultural (A) Zones with the placement of detention basins on those properties. Lastly, Mr. Freud stated that the development provided a visual environment through creative design techniques and good civic design and arrangements by placing the detention basin and its buffer behind the tractor trailer movements as well as placing the other detention basin on the residential property, with the abundance of natural vegetation and buffer helped to screen it and Building 2 from the Bennetts Lane frontage. He then drew the Board's attention to the negative criteria they needed to address, indicating again that the buffer around the detention basins mitigated any detriments to the surrounding area.

Mr. Freud then addressed the three (3) "C" variances, which he stated fall in line with the design considerations that were put into play with the Use Variance. He stated that the first was the accessory structure setback for the pump house and water tank where 100 ft. was required from the residential zone and 50.8 ft. was provided. He added that when you stack on 100 ft. of detention basin easement, there then becomes 150 ft. setback from any effective residential area along with the 50 ft. landscape buffer around the basin. Similarly, the next variance described by Mr. Freud was the parking area setbacks to the residential zone where 25 ft. was required, and 21.2 ft. was proposed. He noted that the detention basin and buffer created an additional 100 ft. of distance to the Agricultural (A) Zone that could be used for a residential structure and could separate any effective residential use in that area. Mr. Freud indicated that the final "C" variance was for the drive aisle width, where 26 ft. was required, and relief was requested for the northerly employee parking area of Building 1. He added that all the other drive aisles were in excess of 30 ft. for adequate truck movement on the property, but 25 ft. was provided in the areas where only passenger vehicles would be. Mr. Freud testified that they felt that it was an appropriate design and avoided excessive or unnecessary impervious coverage. He added that turning movements in and out of those parking spaces were more than adequate and that there would be no negative impacts. Mr. Freud indicated that the final consideration would be the design waiver they were requesting for the lighting

along the rear property line towards the residential zone, which was the Agricultural (A) Zone in that case, where the lighting should not exceed 0.1 foot candles and where there were instances where the lighting got to 0.5 or 0.6 foot candles. He then described that a half a foot candle equated to a full moonlit night, but that was mitigated by 100 ft. of detention basin and another 50 ft. of landscape buffering separating the residential use from the lighting and created no impact to any residential activity. In weighing positive and negative criteria, Mr. Freud's conclusion was that there would be no substantial detriment to the public good and that the granting of the variances would not substantially impair the intent or purpose of the zone plan or zone ordinances.

Mr. Freud indicated that in designing the site, he looked at possibly placing the detention basin under the parking lot on the M-2 Zone property; however, looking at the conditions on the property, he felt it was more appropriate to place an above ground basin which also provided additional screening. He added, though, that if an underground basin were placed under the parking lot, there would be about 100 ft. of separation to the Agricultural (A) Zone (Lot 26) which could be developed into a residential property. He indicated that there could not be anything developed on Lot 25 in the R-40 Zone due to the wetlands there.

Chairman Thomas then asked how much separation there was from the northern property line and the office space. Mr. Freud indicated that there was about 10 ft. of plantings between the property line and the main roadway on the property and on the immediate opposite side of the property line there was a drainage easement that was about 15-20 ft. wide and would be undisturbed into perpetuity. The Chairman then asked if a fence along the property line there would act as an additional buffer and satisfy the concerns of the medical offices across the street and possibly reduce some of the sound. Mr. Freud stated that placing a fence would delineate the property line but would not reduce any noise there.

Chairman Thomas then asked Board Attorney, Mr. Daniel Lagana, a question regarding the testimony of the Traffic Engineer, noting that it was his understanding that the streets in the area were supposed to be able to handle the traffic generated by the zoning in the area. The Chairman indicated that there was a traffic volume issue in the area, but that they were always advised to consider whether or not there were actual unsafe conditions created by the traffic and not to be concerned as much about the volume. Mr. Lagana stated that when it came to the "D-1" Use Variance, the use variance in this case was really tied to the detention basins and not to the site circulation or the parking count that they do comply with according to the ITE standards. He also added that the warehouse use was appropriate for the property where it was being developed (M-2 Zone). Mr. Lagana further stated that the Board was really looking at the intersection of where the site meets the road, where the public might have the tendency to look beyond the site and off-site. He then told the Chairman and the rest of the Board that they do not have the jurisdiction to mandate off-site improvements. Mr. Lagana then repeated Mr. Seckler's testimony regarding the traffic congestion at the intersection of Veronica Avenue, Howe Lane and Rte. 27 as being a direct result of traffic congestion upstream and downstream of that intersection and was not generally a result of the intersection, per se. He also reiterated Mr. Seckler's testimony that indicated it was also not a result of the traffic at the intersection of Veronica Avenue and the Applicant's driveway and that the projections would be that the development would add only one (1) or two (2) cars to the queue at the Veronica Avenue/Howe Lane/Rte. 27 intersection. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Healey then opened the meeting to the public for questions of the Planner and his Planning testimony.

Mr. Peter Wagner, representative of Dinesh Singal, asked whether the buildings could be reduced in size to allow the basins to be included on the property in the M-2 Zone. Mr. Freud stated that the underlying zoning controls in the M-2 Zone allowed for up to 65% impervious coverage and the Applicant's proposal was at about 54%. He added that the zoning controls allows for up to 50% building coverage and they were at 25%. Mr. Freud then had a discussion with Mr. Wagner, indicating that looking at the big picture, they determined that what was proposed was the best use of the property, based on all the testimony given that evening, and that the positives far outweigh any negative impacts of putting a detention basin in the Agricultural (A) Zone. A discussion ensued.

Seeing no one further wanting to speak who are viewing the hearing via Webex, Mr. Healey then proceeded to unmute the callers to see if anyone wished to ask questions of Mr. Freud's Planning testimony. Hearing no more questions for the Planner, the meeting was closed to the public for questions.

Board Attorney, Mr. Daniel Lagana, had a question related to the Planning testimony. He asked Mr. Freud whether there was any fencing proposed around the detention basin along Building 1. He indicated that there were designed slopes with a 3:1 ratio. Mr. Lagana then asked if fencing around that detention basin would create a safer condition than not having a fence there. Mr. Freud indicated that there was no fencing proposed around the detention basin because fencing typical did not deter anyone getting over the fence and it sometimes deters response time and ability to react to someone who breached the fence and would not say it was definitely safer with a fence. Mr. Lagana then asked if placing fencing along the southerly property line reduce light spillage that they discussed in that area. Mr. Freud indicated that a fence placed on the property line there would not have much impact based upon the location of where the lights would be affixed (30 ft. high). He did note that the light from those fixtures dissipated over the first 30 ft. to zero over the detention basin. Mr. Lagana then asked if a fence would reduce noise generated from the truck traffic, and Mr. Freud indicated that he was not a sound expert but stated that it would depend on the makeup of the fence and the materials used.

Mr. Healey then asked whether there was anyone who wanted to give their comments who are viewing the hearing via Webex.

Mr. Jonathan Gotlieb, 31 South Fourth Street, Highland Park, NJ, on behalf of Gordon Veronica Associates, LLC, for owners of the two properties directly to the north of the development (Lot 75, Lot 77 and Lot 79 – medical office buildings and a Lab Corp. location), came forward and was sworn in. He indicated that his first comment goes to noise, smoke, interference, and truck traffic along the loop road behind his client's property. Mr. Gotlieb stated that there was fencing that could solve the noise problem and tall trees would protect the medical facility from that kind of pollution and interference. He indicated that he would like to see both items included as a condition of any approval. Mr. Gotlieb also reiterated his earlier statement that the day of the week the traffic study was done was not a true representation of the traffic in the area and it was not done over a period of weeks, but only on one day. He then discussed his perceived inconsistencies regarding the impacts of a possible 24/7 operation on the site and the impacts of the truck traffic trying to make left turns

out of the facility. Mr. Gotlieb indicated that he opposed the Application and did not think the Application should be voted on until a new Traffic Study was prepared and presented to the Board. . Finally, he did not think the variances were needed if the Applicant would shrink the development of the property. He also stated that there would most likely be more Applications for warehousing along Veronica Avenue and felt that the Board and the Township should look ahead to improvements to Veronica Avenue as well as the ability to create a secondary ingress/egress to the property.

Mr. Peter Wagner, representing Dinesh Singal, a doctor who owned Lots 73 and 74 on Veronica Avenue, both medical office buildings, came forward. Mr. Wagner expressed Dr. Dinesh Singal's concerns regarding the truck traffic on Veronica Avenue interfering with his elderly patients' ability to access his offices in a safe manner. He added that Dr. Singal has had trucks enter his facility to turn around in his parking lots, which makes the access to his offices even more unsafe for his elderly patients. Mr. Wagner indicated that reducing the size of the facility would reduce the amount of truck traffic going into and out onto Veronica Avenue. He mentioned that the development went against item "H" of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), allowing for the free flow of traffic along routes that result in congestion of traffic. Because the development did not allow for a secondary ingress/egress, Mr. Wagner stated that it created an inherently unsafe condition. With all those aforementioned points made, along with Mr. Gotlieb' comments, Mr. Wagner stated that the positive criteria did not outweigh the negative criteria and that his client vigorously opposed the Application.

Not seeing anyone further wanting to speak who are viewing the hearing via Webex, Mr. Healey then proceeded to unmute the callers to see if anyone wished to make comments on the Application. Hearing no one coming forward, the meeting was then closed to the public.

Mr. Lanfrit then made his closing remarks. He indicated that what they were proposing, despite what Mr. Gotlieb and Mr. Wagner were saying, was not an overdevelopment of the site and that they were well under the building coverage requirements and well under the impervious coverage requirements by 10%. He added that part of the reason was because of some environmental constraints. He then addressed Mr. Gotlieb's statement that a typical Traffic Study was usually conducted over a few weeks by indicating that over his law career over the past 40 years, it was not typical to do a Traffic Study over many weeks' time. Mr. Lanfrit then spoke about the comment made by Mr. Gotlieb that the Applicant did not take into consideration left hand turns from the site, indicating that Mr. Seckler testified that left turns could be made from the site and could be made safely because there was adequate sight distance and was included in the Traffic Study. Mr. Lanfrit then addressed Mr. Gotlieb's comment that the Board could not make a decision because the buildings were speculative. He stated that there was nothing in the MLUL or the Township ordinances or any regulations that say that the Applicant had to have a specific user for the building and that the Board needed that information to base their decision upon. Mr. Lanfrit then stated that he had represented many cases and appeared before the Board over the years for medical offices on Veronica Avenue for numerous developers that were speculative. He noted that their information was based upon Traffic Consultants and experts who have done studies of warehouse buildings and could clearly indicate what kind of traffic would be generated by that kind of use. Mr. Lanfrit then referred to the comment made that said the medical doctors did not contemplate the type of traffic being testified to, but the property was in an M-2 Zone that permitted these types of uses for many, many years. He added that when these doctors either bought their buildings or built their buildings, the zoning ordinance permitted

manufacturing, fabrication, wooden paper products, construction, ice cream facilities, manufacture of spirits and liquor, biological, chemical, electrical, dental, pharmaceutical and general laboratories, industrial parks, warehouses, general office buildings, administrative offices, dispatch for taxi and limousine services, indoor recreation uses, hotels, extended stay facilities, childcare centers, personal storage and many warehouses.

Mr. Lanfrit then posed a question to the Board by asking, if the site was developed for all medical offices, wouldn't there be significantly more traffic on the surrounding roadways? He then stated that the Board could not deny an Application based upon traffic. He added that the State controlled the intersection with Rte. 27 and the County controlled the intersection with Hamilton Street and Veronica Avenue. He then went on to discuss the beneficial buffer that would be created for Bennetts Lane by the inclusion of the detention basins on the R-40 and Agricultural (A) Zone properties.

Mr. Lanfrit then discussed Mr. Gottlieb's statement that the development needed a second driveway. He indicated that there was nothing in the Township ordinances that required two methods of ingress/egress. He added that Mr. Hauss, the Fire Prevention Director, would prefer two methods of ingress/egress, but Mr. Freud contacted a number of property owners that had the ability to give them an emergency method of ingress/egress through their properties, including some of the property owners that were there that evening, with negative responses. As a result, Mr. Lanfrit stated that they made modifications to the ingress/egress driveway to satisfy the Fire Prevention Director.

Mr. Lanfrit then indicated that the doctors chose to put their practices within the M-2 Zone that allows all the uses previously delineated. He stated that there are other zones (Office Profession (OP) in the Township that they could have put their practices that would not have been encumbered by truck traffic from warehousing businesses.

Mr. Lanfrit then asked for a 5-minute recess to contact the Applicant to ask if he wanted to proceed to a vote that evening or wait for a full quorum of Board members. Mr. Lanfrit came back from recess to ask if they could carry the meeting to July 16, 2020 and hopefully have a full Board available to vote at that time.

Mr. Healey made an announcement for both Webex participants as well as call-in participants that the hearing would be carried to Thursday, July 16, 2020 at 7:30 p.m. He stated that all Webex users could go to the Township website (www.franklintwpnj.org) and click on the upcoming Zoning Board meeting on July 16, 2020 under the Government tab to find the link to join the meeting on that day and that there would also be a phone number posted as well for call-in participants. Mr. Healey then stated that should anyone have any questions related to the hearing on July 16, 2020, that they should call Christine Woodbury at 732-873-2500, Ex. 6215, for assistance or e-mail her at Christine.Woodbury@franklinnj.gov.

DL 07/31/2020

WORK SESSION/NEW BUSINESS:

There was no work session or new business discussed.

MEETING ADJOURNED:

Mr. Reiss made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 p.m. and the motion was seconded. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
July 8, 2020