



T: (973) 402-9410  
F: (973) 316-8498

100 Washington Street  
Boonton, NJ 07005

**PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 9, 2022 - 7:30 P.M.**

1. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER/SUNSHINE STATEMENT** – Planning Board Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 7:30pm and read the Sunshine Statement:

“This meeting is being held in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, also known as the Sunshine Law, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6. Notice of the meeting was sent to the Daily Record and the Citizen on January 13, 2022 and published on January 19, 2022. Notice was also posted on the Bulletin Board of the Municipal Building and on the Town of Boonton website.”

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Planning Board Vice Chair led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

3. **ROLL CALL** – Planning Board Clerk conducted Roll Call:

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Ms. DeVenezia	X		
Mayor Corcoran	X		
Mr. Brewer	X		
Mr. Khokhar	X		
Mr. Orlusky	X		
Mr. Phelps	X (Virtual)		
Mr. Schnitzler	X		
Mr. Venturini	X		
Mr. Weisman	X		
Mr. Wrobel		X	
Mr. Vasa	X		

The following were also present:

Mr. Scott Carlson, Board Attorney  
Mr. Andrew Holt, Board Engineer (Virtual)  
Ms. Alexandra Handel, Board Engineer  
Mr. Graham Petto, Board Planner  
Mr. Chris Colley, Board Planner

4. **PAYMENT OF THE BILLS**

- a. The Planning Board Clerk announced that the bills are in order to be paid. A motion was made by Ms. DeVenezia, and seconded by Mayor Corcoran, to pay the bills as submitted. All were in favor, and the motion carried.

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. Minutes of the regular Planning Board meeting of February 23, 2022 were accepted as presented.

## 6. CORRESPONDENCE

- a. No correspondence was received.

## 7. RESOLUTIONS

- a. No resolution was received.

## 8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### a. APPLICATION 2016-8 PARK WOODS ASSOCIATES, LLC

#### Park Woods at the Boulevard

Ely Place and Fanny Road – Block 113, Lot 10

Site Plan w/ Bulk Variances

Mr. Plocker of Hutt & Shimanowitz greeted the Board. Mr. Plocker stated that the configuration and placement of Building 1 was shifted slightly, and the three parking spaces next to that building were relocated. Mr. Plocker reintroduced Mr. Keller. Mr. Keller was previously sworn-in for this application, and stated for the record that his licenses remain in good standing.

Mr. Keller presented exhibit R-7 as the updated 'Layout and Dimensioning Plan', dated 7/15/2016 and finalized today, 03/09/2022. Mr. Keller made the following comments:

- Stated that building 1 was slid slightly to the North closer to Ely Place, within the required setback, and the affordable units were moved to South side of building 1.
- Mentioned that the handicap parking space was relocated between building 1 and building 2.
- Commented that by removing the three (3) parking spaces from the North side of building 1 it eliminates a variance requested due to no longer having parking in the front yard.
- Added four (4) parking spaces across road A from building 3, located near the pump station and mailbox.
- Stated that the affordable units, as previously planned, did not meet the 15-foot rear yard setbacks, and the new plan offers full compliance with 15-foot rear yards for all units, eliminating another variance.
- Noted that the new site plan reduced the amount of steep slope disturbance in the 20-25% category by 25 square feet, increased the disturbance in the 25-30% category by 30 square feet, and increased the disturbance in the 30% greater category by 35 square feet.
- Also the new plan will preserve the existing vegetation on the North side of building 1 instead of installing the parking spaces.
- Commented that the design provides engineering controls to manage steep slopes with a robust soil erosion plan, and specifically noted that they are proposing to maintain 40 to 60 foot buffer behind all of the proposed buildings. Approximately 42% of the site will remain in its natural condition.

The Board Vice Chair opened the hearing at this time for Board comment.

Ms. DeVenezia asked for clarification of the relocated parking spaces. Mr. Keller stated that instead of the spaces off to the North side of the site, they are proposing to concentrate the spaces to center of site for use by all tenants. Mr. Keller pointed to exhibit R-3, which showed the new location of the proposed parking spaces.

Mr. Weismann asked if the shifting of the units changed the configurations of the buildings. Mr. Keller referred the question to the architect for his future testimony.

Mayor Corcoran asked if any analysis was done to compare this property to neighboring properties with regards to steep slopes, further commenting that the Avalon project did not have to comply with steep slopes because it was designated as an Area in Need of Rehabilitation. Mr. Keller stated that no analysis was done, because the adjacent sites have been existing for many years. Mayor Corcoran asked if the proposed

change in parking altered the original numbers of disturbance of steep slope. Mr. Keller replied yes, and restated the altered numbers stated in his testimony. Mr. Keller presented exhibit R-8 titled "Slope Map" dated 08/30/2018, but being finalized today 03/09/2022, and commented that the map shows the same slope map as the last meeting, but included a dark line on North corner near building 1 depicting where the reduction and increases were proposed. Mayor Corcoran asked about Mr. Keller's testimony about how adding sidewalks would be a further impact to the steep slope disturbance, noting specifically that the relocation of building a was a further impact to steep slope. Mr. Keller stated that in his opinion as a professional engineer that sidewalks are not needed within this community, and that any additional disturbance to the steep slopes would be offset by the provision of a sidewalk. Adding sidewalks would create a significant impact on the steep slopes by disturbing some of the steepest slopes on the site to include a 4-foot sidewalk; this would relate to hundreds of square feet of disturbance. Mayor Corcoran asked if Mr. Keller would ever consider the overall disturbance of steep slope ever to be significant. Mr. Keller stated that from an engineering perspective, no. Furthermore he stated that they are proposing to maintain a natural buffer with the homes to the rear of the site, they have worked very hard to keep the development as compact as possible, and that adding a sidewalk doesn't provide a significant benefit doesn't counter the disturbance of steep slopes. Mayor Corcoran asked Mr. Keller why he referenced the Avalon project. Mr. Keller stated that he only referenced the Avalon project as a comparison that the Board members, as well as the public, may be familiar with to demonstrate that steep slopes can be effectively managed during construction and mitigated with proper engineering design. Mayor Corcoran asked if there is a degree where steep slopes management becomes unmanageable. Mr. Keller responded that this site would not be unmanageable. Mayor Corcoran asked with concern about the magnitude of the site if less units would be less of an impact on steep slopes. Mr. Keller confirmed yes, but stated that the housing plan and zoning plan permit 20 condominium units. Mayor Corcoran asked if Mr. Keller was familiar with any other properties with similar slopes within the Town of Boonton. Mr. Keller said no. Mayor Corcoran asked if Mr. Keller has ever denied a project, as a municipal engineer, because of steep slopes. Mr. Keller stated no, as long as the project was engineered properly. Mayor Corcoran asked in what towns Mr. Keller currently acts as a municipal engineer. Mr. Keller responded that he in the engineer for Stanhope, Montville, and South Orange. Mayor Corcoran asked how many of the units are proposed to be three-bedroom units out of the 20 units. Mr. Keller advised the mayor to defer to the architect. Mayor Corcoran asked if all of the units were three-bedroom units, would Mr. Keller anticipate school aged children living in the development. Mr. Keller stated that possibly in the affordable unit, but not likely within the market rate units. Mayor Corcoran asked if Mr. Keller was aware if Boonton Board of Education provided busing. Mr. Keller responded that he was not aware. Mayor Corcoran asked if Mr. Keller would consider sidewalks important if the schools did not provide busing. Mr. Keller responded no, because the majority of the surrounding side streets do not have sidewalks.

Mr. Weisman asked for clarification that Mr. Keller has testified to have heard or represented hundreds of applications and never recommended that a Board deny an application due to steep slope disturbance, and asked why steep slope ordinances exist. Mr. Keller stated that the ordinance exists as a control for the Board to determine if the development can be managed properly. Furthermore, Mr. Keller stated that he is not concerned, in any way, with steep slopes from an engineering perspective.

Mr. Brewer thanked Mr. Keller for his testimony. Mr. Brewer asked if consideration was given to decreasing the overall number of units in the proposed development. Mr. Keller responded no, because the zone permits 20 units. Mr. Brewer asked the reasoning as to why it was not considered to decrease the total number of units. Mr. Keller responded that was not a question for the engineer.

The Board Vice Chair opened the hearing at this time for the Board's professionals comment.

Mr. Petto asked if the alternative configuration of site was the tightest configuration design so far, and which of the four buildings has the greatest impact with respect to steep slopes. Mr. Keller responded yes, and building 4. Mr. Petto asked how many units were located in building 4. Mr. Keller answered three. Mr. Petto asked if any thought was had to add one unit into each building 1, 2, and 3, and remove building 4. Mr. Keller responded no.

Ms. Handel asked if more information could be provided on the retaining wall, specifically if the type of wall material has been selected, and what is its long-term ability in steep slopes. Mr. Keller answered that it will most likely be a modular block wall, which is very stable and long lasting, but the specific type of wall has not yet been selected. Ms. Handel asked if the geo-grid will be adequately sized and will bear no effect on steep slope area. Mr. Keller stated that it will not affect the steep slope, the wall will be designed by an structural engineer, it will require a building permit, review from the construction official for code compliance, and an onsite engineer to certify and inspect the construction on behalf of the Town. Ms. Handel asked if a landscaping plan has been revised with this submission. Mr. Keller responded not at this point, but they intend to preserve the shrubs and shade tree at the corner of building 1 where the parking spaces were removed. Mr. Keller further stated that perennials and ground cover would be planted at the North end of building 1, specifically low plants due to the installation of a stop sign. Ms. Handel asked if the retaining wall will provide stability during construction, or if the developer intends to add more landscaping for long-term stability. Mr. Keller referred to exhibit R-3 depicting plantings at the top of the retaining wall behind all of the buildings, and stated that the developer can put some additional plantings in the area behind building 2 and 3. Additionally on the office building side, there will be plantings on the bottom and top of the retaining wall, and that they are eliminating the steep slopes in that area. Ms. Handel asked how many trees were proposed to be removed. Mr. Keller responded that he did not have a number. Ms. Handel asked if a number could be provided at some point. Mr. Keller responded since that is not an ordinance they have no intent to do so. Ms. Handel questioned what other controls could be recommended to mitigate steep slopes in this area. Mr. Keller responded that erosion control matting can be installed behind building 2 or 3, but since a 3:1 slope is proposed it is not a concern. Ms. Handel asked if a geo-technical survey has been performed. Mr. Keller responded that a survey was only done for storm water, and no survey was performed for building. Ms. Handel asked if Mr. Keller was aware of any rock-bed on site. Mr. Keller stated that none was found in testing for the storm water basin. Ms. Handel asked if a cut/fill analysis was performed. Mr. Keller could not recall if one was done. Ms. Handel asked how the conservation easement would be affected with the revised layout. Mr. Keller responded that it will not be impacted at all. Further there were minor changes in Northeast corner of the site in order to satisfy the ordinance that 20% be set aside for conservation.

Mayor Corcoran asked where the storm water basin is proposed to be located. Mr. Keller answered that the underground basin is to be located underneath the cul-de-sac. Mr. Carlson asked what the gallonage of the proposed basin is. Mr. Keller responded that the answer is in the Storm Water Management Report.

Mr. Plocker made a statement for the record regarding the steep slope requirements of the Avalon project.

Having no further questions, the Board Vice Chair opened the hearing at this time for public questioning of this witness based on his testimony this evening.

Ms. Marianne McGlone Belardinelli of 120 Ely Road asked a series of questions about the Avalon project. Ms. Belardinelli asked Mr. Keller if the applicant was paying him. Mr. Keller responded yes, and that he was a consultant. Ms. Belardinelli asked how many low-income units are proposed on this site. Mr. Keller answered three. Ms. Belardinelli asked if the steep slopes controls were based off the NJ Highland Councils Master Plan. Mr. Keller responded yes. Ms. Belardinelli asked if steep slopes could cause erosion, to which Mr. Keller replied if they are unmanaged, yes, but they will manage the slopes during construction, eliminate slopes as proposed, and create a flatter plane. Ms. Belardinelli asked if a fake wall would manage them, asking if walls were not as safe as dirt. Mr. Keller responded that manufactured walls have been used throughout the state for years. Ms. Belardinelli referred to exhibit R-3, asking Mr. Keller to reiterate the location and visibility of walls, to which Mr. Keller obliged. Ms. Belardinelli asked if this development could damage the existing homes. Mr. Keller stated that is why the developer is proposing to maintain a 40-60 foot buffer between the development and the existing properties. Ms. Belardinelli asked if there was consideration for a berm with large arborvitae so people on Ely Road would not have to look into apartments. Mr. Keller replied that is not necessary. Ms. Belardinelli asked about setback requirements along Ely Place. Mr. Keller could not recall the requirements, but stated the development is compliant. Ms. Belardinelli asked if giant rocks were found during construction how would the rocks be removed. Mr. Keller stated that would

be up the contractor, and within applicable regulations. Ms. Belardinelli asked if removal of rocks or rock-bed could cause structural damage to the existing residences. Mr. Keller replied that he does not know the condition of each existing residence.

Mr. Bruce Rockwell of 15 Hapgood Court asked if Mr. Keller was familiar with spot zoning. Mr. Carlson advised to refer that question to the applicant's planner. Mr. Rockwell asked where the recreation area is proposed on site. Mr. Keller testified that no recreation area was proposed. Mr. Rockwell asked if this application was before the Zoning Board. Mr. Brewer responded that the application was before the Planning Board, and advised Mr. Rockwell to his direct questions to the witness. Mr. Rockwell asked if 20 units is permitted, and if this application is permitted. Mr. Keller responded yes, but not without the Board granting variances. Mr. Rockwell asked what the net change in steep slope disturbance was in the updated site plan. Mr. Keller replied that there was an increase in overall disturbance of 40 square feet. Mr. Rockwell asked what the soil erosion controls are based on. Mr. Keller responded that the controls are based on the statewide soil erosion standard, and after this project is built, they expect no erosion. Mr. Rockwell asked if erosion could affect adjacent properties. Mr. Keller stated erosion from this site would not affect adjacent properties. Mr. Rockwell asked if the applicant could make any changes to comply with the existing zoning ordinance. Mr. Keller responded that the changed site plan would remove two variances, as testified. Mr. Rockwell asked if safety was a consideration when not including sidewalks. Mr. Keller responded yes. Mr. Rockwell asked about the vegetative buffer behind the development. Mr. Keller responded that they are proposing to maintain an area, preserved in its natural condition, of a 40-65 foot wide strip behind buildings 2 through 4, and this is not required by the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Marianne McGlone Belardinelli of 120 Ely Road asked how many feet the setback is from building 1 to the curb. Mr. Keller responded the building is 43 feet from the property line to the corner of the building, and the proposed wall will blend into the existing embankment.

Mr. Anthony Peschetti of 109 Ely Road asked when the paving was altered did it change the overall number of parking spaces. Mr. Keller replied that they added one overall space for a total of 13 guest spaces, which exceeds the RSIS requirements.

Mr. Anthony Scozzafava of 155 Fairview Avenue asked Mr. Keller if he testified that the Avalon project is very similar concerning steep slopes. Mr. Keller stated it was not his intent or testimony, and that he referred to the Avalon project to demonstrate that engineer controls can manage steep slopes. Mr. Scozzafava asked why any town has a steep slope ordinance. Mr. Keller replied it was for the governing body to determine what are appropriate controls to those slopes.

Mr. George Chadwick of 116 Ridgeview Place asked if the revision of the slopes came with a guaranty or warranty. Mr. Keller replied that he offered no guaranty or warranty. Mr. Chadwick inquired about the buffer zones between building 1 through 4, and what type of plants would make up the buffers. Mr. Keller stated that it was a natural area not to be disturbed. Mr. Chadwick asked if there would be any type of tree buffer. Mr. Keller pointed to exhibit R-3 showing a proposed mix of evergreens, and he stated the developer would consider adding more trees in rear yard area as the site permits during the build. Mr. Chadwick asked for clarification that the developer does not know the number or type of trees to be removed. Mr. Keller replied that is correct.

Ms. Handel asked about the Town Ordinance on Steep Slopes, §300.94.1-c-1 et al. and asked if the applicant would be amenable to return with an existing vegetation map. Mr. Keller stated that the entire site is wooded, and he does not interpret the ordinance to require him to identify type of trees. Ms. Handel asked with regard to the driveway for building 1 for Mr. Keller to describe the grading going into driveway. Mr. Keller stated that it will be between a 2-3% grade, and that a resident will drive into the project and make a left into their driveway. Ms. Handel asked what is the proposed distance from the stop bar to the first driveway. Mr. Keller replied 27 feet.

A motion was made by Mr. Orlusky, which was seconded by Mr. Khokhar, to take a five-minute recess.

The Board Vice Chair called meeting back to order, and recalled Mr. Keller for further questioning.

Ms. Linda Hogoboom of 21 Chestnut Street asked about the overall percentage of disturbance of the 20-25% steep slope category. Mr. Keller replied that the percentage does not change with the revised site plan. In the 20-25% category, the disturbance is 55.8%, in the 25-30 category, the disturbance is 49%, and in the 30% + category, the disturbance is 35.7%. Ms. Hogoboom asked if the inclusion of affordable housing would allow the developer to bypass steep slope. Mr. Keller responded no, that they still are asking for a variance. Ms. Hogoboom

asked if a steep slope failed during construction who would be responsible. Mr. Keller replied that the property owner would be responsible. Ms. Hogoboom asked if there would be one mailbox per building or a single large mailbox. Mr. Keller replied they are proposing a cluster mailbox between building 2 and 3. Ms. Hogoboom asked if there would be a handicap parking spot for a disabled person to collect their mail. Mr. Keller replied that he would have to research that, and they would provide a space if required. Ms. Hogoboom asked in reference to §300-94.1.c.1 if they would submit an updated landscape plan. Mr. Keller replied that would be up to Boards determination. Ms. Hogoboom asked Mr. Keller to provide steep slopes numbers from Avalon project. Mr. Keller stated again for the record, the purpose of his testimony in reference to Avalon was solely to exemplify how steep slopes can be managed during construction.

Ms. DeVenezia asked if they were to reconfigure site to accommodate sidewalks would it require additional steep slope disturbance, and would it require construction of any additional retaining walls. Mr. Keller stated absolutely, and yes, possibly behind building 2 and 3 the walls could be taller.

Hearing no further questions from the public for Mr. Keller, the Board thanked Mr. Keller for his testimony. Mr. Plocker stated that he has no further questions for Mr. Keller, and Mr. Plocker introduced the applicant's architect, Mr. Robert Larson.

Mr. Larsen was sworn in at this time, and listed his credentials as an architect who focuses on multifamily housing. Mr. Larsen was accepted by the Board as a professional in his field. Mr. Larsen introduced exhibit R-8 titled 'Typical Townhouse Floorplan' and made the following comments:

- Proposing 20 homes; 14 in a townhouse style of one particular type, three in another type of townhouse, and three units of affordable housing.
- Sheet 1 of 2 shows a three-bedroom, three and a half bath, townhouse with 2,400 square feet, the garage side is exposed, and the main story of living is encountering the grade on rear side.
- Sheet 2 of 2 shows the second style or townhouse with a first floor primary bedroom, a total of three bedrooms, and two and a half baths. The primary bedroom is downstairs to provide main-floor style of living, with just over 2,400 square feet
- Noted there will be one one-bedroom, and two two-bedroom affordable unit configurations.
- Stated that all units will have sprinklers as required by code.
- Commented that the affordable units are in a stacked configuration. The ground floor unit is required to be ADA compliant including the entrance.
- Confirmed that trash will be stored within the garage in the townhouses, and the affordable units trash will be stored as showed on the plans.
- Introduced exhibit R-9 titled 'Elevations', dated 02/23/22, with a scale of 1/8 inch is 1 foot. The top shows the typical five unit building, and the bottom is the primary-down townhouse of three. These buildings comply with the required height of 36 feet, and the exterior will use a mix of material, stone, siding patterns, balconies, and PVC trim.
- Stated that the same character will be represented on all sides of buildings, including the affordable units. The garage pattern created on the elevation of the affordable units will not look distinctly different.
- Referenced sheet 2 showing how the low-income units are not distinguishable from the other units.
- Presented exhibit R-10 titled 'Affordable Housing Redesign', dated 03/09/22. The plans reflect a redesigned affordable modular. In compliance with UHAC, they are proposing two two-bedroom, and one three-bedroom, and the previous plan of a one-bedroom unit was not compliant. This also shows the new configuration of building 1.
- Showed that the redesign included the location for trash on the ground floor, a closet accessible from the exterior for 3 cans, and laundry facilities.
- Commented that the original mix of units was found not to be compliant. Introduced exhibit R-11 titled 'Building 1 Floorplans and Elevation', dated 03/09/22, and he shed clarity on what building 1 will look like.

- Showed how the affordable units have been reversed, and noted the architecture will be inset on the garage and will incorporate the cantilevered forms. The design complies with the four-foot break variance, and will comply in buildings 2 and 3 as well, eliminating the need for the requested variance.
- Stated that the character and treatment of the façade is same throughout the project, and the affordable units are central to the project and indiscernible.

The Board Vice Chair opened the hearing at this time for Board comment.

Mayor Corcoran asked if this plan was provided for review by the Board members. Mr. Larsen stated that this plan was in response to the comments from Board Planner. Mayor Corcoran expressed concerns over the loft in buildings 1 and 3, asking if the units were truly a three-bedroom unit. Mr. Larsen responded that the loft is considered to be the 3<sup>rd</sup> bedroom. Mayor Corcoran asked if the units were going to be for sale or for rent. Mr. Larsen responded that he is not sure. Mayor Corcoran asked what the ceiling height would be in the loft. Mr. Larsen responded the height would be 8 feet, and it is considered a dormer.

Ms. DeVenezia noted the moderate change in grade along the front of building 1 through 3, and stated that the elevations don't show accommodation in the change of grade. Mr. Larsen responded that the accommodation is in the pitch of the garages and driveways.

The Board Vice Chair opened the hearing at this time for the Board's professionals comment.

Mr. Petto thanked Mr. Larsen for his testimony, and for the response to his reports comments. Mr. Petto asked for clarification of the square footage for the units. Mr. Larsen responded with the proposed two two-bedroom units are 809 and 877 square feet, and the three bedroom unit is 1,265 square foot. Mr. Petto asked Mr. Larsen if he was familiar with ordinance for minimum square footage, stating that the two-bedroom unit would have to be 1,000 square foot minimum, based on the R-4 zone townhouse design standards. Mr. Larsen stated that it is his intention to comply with the UHAC standards. Mr. Petto asked if the trash enclosure was placed to the left of entry door, and if consideration was for an accessory structure for trash storage. Mr. Larsen stated that they did consider a small shed, and would consider further discussion. Mr. Petto asked for clarification of the elevation pertaining to the windows of the first floor bedroom. Mr. Larsen said that the windows in front of the parking spaces on the front façade were high windows, and that regular windows would be installed to right. He furthered that they will incorporate a trim work pattern to mimic the garage, and keep the design consistent with the other buildings. Mr. Petto asked if there would be vehicular parking in front of fake garage, and Mr. Larsen responded yes stating that was the reason for the high windows. Mr. Petto asked if all of the affordable units were located as presented. Mr. Larsen replied that all affordable units were to be located in building 1 in a stacked configuration. Mr. Petto referenced the R-4 zone regulations where it states that the affordable units must be dispersed throughout project. Mr. Larsen stated that he would consider this an accepted design for the affordable units. Mr. Petto added to the benefit of the Board that the separation of the affordable units is a zoning standard, which would require relief. Mr. Plocker responded with a reference under the COAH regulation 5:93-5.6.

Ms. Handle noted that the affordable units got larger with the new design, and asked if square footage was added to the building or taken away from other units. Mr. Larsen commented that the bedroom count was a necessary incorporation; they used underroof square footage to add the bedrooms, and added a small bump out to the side but did not reduce the front or rear lots. Ms. Handel asked Mr. Keller if the bump out was added into the Storm Water Management Report. No response was made. Ms. Handle clarified the location of a mechanical door for the affordable units, and asked if parking spaces will be in front of the door. Mr. Larsen replied that access to this door would be for mechanical purposes only.

Mr. Plocker commented that the site was rezoned to be included with the affordable housing settlement. Noting that further settlement permitted §300-85J which would permit the three stacked affordable units to be together, and §300-104.2E stating that the square footage applies for townhouse dwelling units, and there is a separate section D for affordable housing which references the UHAC regulations.

Mr. Weismann asked if the affordable units were considered regular legal bedrooms. Mr. Larsen responded yes. Mr. Weismann asked what the process was for incorporating the character of the existing neighborhood

into your design. Mr. Larsen stated that he had driven around the neighborhood multiple times to consider styles and materials, and take into consideration materials such as stone, brick, gables, the eclectic mix of architecture, materials, colors and forms. In his professional opinion, this is an appropriate material and character to compliment the surrounding areas.

Mr. Petto asked if there were egress doors from the rear of the units into outdoor space. Mr. Larsen said that an egress door would be available but only to the ground floor unit. Mr. Petto referred to §300-85J(3) concurring to Mr. Plocker's comment regarding the affordable units complying with the same required setback.

Mayor Corcoran noted that Mr. Larsen testified about materials, and asked if the affordable units would be constructed with the same level and finish of materials as all of the other units. Mr. Larsen responded that he is not quite sure that the finishing of the inside will be finished to the same degree as normal rate units. Mayor Corcoran asked for a yes or no answer. Mr. Larsen replied that they would not seek to have a completely different level of finishes.

Having no further questions, the Board Vice Chair opened the hearing at this time for public questioning of this witness based on his testimony this evening.

Ms. Marianne McGlone Belardinelli of 120 Ely Road asked if each unit would be a two-car or one-car garage. Mr. Larsen stated that every unit is a 2-car garage. Ms. Belardinelli asked how tall each building would be. Mr. Larsen replied 36 feet from the mean grade to the maximum height, and noted that the loft does not add height. Ms. Belardinelli asked if there would be basements. Mr. Larsen stated that the back of the garage is within grade. Ms. Belardinelli asked for confirmation that the plan for garbage storage was in the garage. Mr. Larsen replied that there would be ample space to store garbage and recycling within the garage. Ms. Belardinelli asked if the units would be rentals or sold units. Mr. Larsen replied that he does not know.

Mr. George Chadwick of 116 Ridgeview Place asked if there would be a sprinkler system in each unit. Mr. Larsen responded yes, that the codes requires townhouses, or stacked units, to have sprinklers and regulate where the sprinkler heads go. Mr. Chadwick asked about what materials would be used for the common walls between units. Mr. Larsen stated they would be built with the required fire separation and sound transmission standards. Mr. Chadwick asked the size of the vertical studs, and Mr. Larsen responded that he couldn't answer if the construction will be 2x4 or 2x6, but that it will comply with the energy code. Mr. Chadwick asked about the total lighting on complex. Mr. Larsen replied that he would not speak to the common element lighting. Further noting that a sconce, shielded, with enough light to provide safe recognition to see who is at the door, will light all points of entry. Mr. Chadwick asked for clarification that since there are 20 doors there would therefore be 20 lights. Mr. Larsen responded that the doors are setback 4 feet, and the sconces will be on side, setback walls. Mr. Chadwick asked if the plumbing would be of PVC or copper. Mr. Larsen said he could not comment. Mr. Chadwick asked if there would be a generator for each unit. Mr. Larsen replied that he was not privy to that information. Mr. Chadwick asked for clarification that Mr. Larsen testified that he was trying to duplicate materials in surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Larsen retorted that he did not use word duplicate. Mr. Larsen noticed stone, brick, gables, and other design, and would not bring in materials that are strange to the environment. Mr. Chadwick asked if the material on the exterior of the building would be vinyl or concrete fiberboard. Mr. Larsen replied that they would use a high quality vinyl shake or lap pattern, and that they are proposing a mix of looks and would make an effort to use low maintenance materials. Mr. Chadwick asked if there would be any warranty or guaranty of the materials. Mr. Larsen refused to speak of warranties.

Mr. Bruce Rockwell of 15 Hapgood Court asked if Mr. Larsen considered the character of a structure a fundamental part of his profession in design. Mr. Larsen stated that his effort was to incorporate materials and character seen in homes in the surrounding area. Mr. Rockwell asked if Mr. Larsen felt that the proposed character mimics the neighborhood, to which Mr. Larsen responded yes. Mr. Rockwell asked the height of the structures. Mr. Larsen replied that the structures are 36 feet from the average grade.

Mayor Corcoran asked concerning the two-bedroom affordable units being 809 and 870 square feet if Mr. Larsen was in disagreement with the requirement for a minimum of 1,000 square feet, and that his testimony was that the units comply with UHAC. Mr. Larsen replied yes.

Hearing no further questions from the public for Mr. Larsen, the Board thanked Mr. Larsen for his testimony.



The Board Vice Chair stated that the Board policy is not to accept any new testimony after 10:00pm. A motion was made by Mr. Orlusky, seconded by Mayor Corcoran, to carry all further testimony for this application to the next regularly scheduled Board meeting on March 23<sup>rd</sup> 2022, or April 13<sup>th</sup> 2022, depending on the availability of the applicant's professionals, with no further notice to the public. All were in favor on a voice vote, and the motion passed.

**9. INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENT OF NON-AGENDA MATTERS**

- a. No comment was made.

**10. BOARD DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a. No items were discussed.

**11. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. No new business was discussed.

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

- a. There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made by Ms. DeVenezia, and seconded by Mr. Weisman, to adjourn. All were in favor on a voice vote. The motion carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:49 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Steven Willenborg*  
Steven Willenborg  
Planning Board Clerk.