

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

Roll Call:

Present:

Mayor Matthew Anesh
Councilman Derryck White
Brian Bythell; Alt. 2
Paul Grzenda
Rich Houghton
Michael Pellegrino
Peter Smith
Jack Pedersen; Vice Chairman
Bob Ackerman; Chairman

Absent:

Stephanie Bartfalvi; Alt. 1
John Mocharski

Also Present: Larry Lavender, Esq.; Stanley Slachetka, PP, AICP, Bob Bucco, PE, CME, CPWM

Chairman Ackerman opened the meeting at 7:00 pm stating that this meeting is being held in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, by posting a notice to The Observer and The Courier News and providing the same to the Borough Clerk.

It is the policy of the Borough of South Plainfield's Planning Board not to hear any new cases after 10:00 pm and no new witnesses after 10:30 pm.

Minutes: May 22, 2018; September 11, 2018; November 27, 2018.

Chairman Ackerman calls for a motion to *approve* the above listed minutes. Councilman White made motion, seconded by Vice Chairman Pedersen. Those in favor: Mayor Anesh; Councilman White; Mr. Bythell; Mr. Grzenda; Mr. Houghton; Mr. Pellegrino; Mr. Smith; Vice Chairman Pedersen and Chairman Ackerman. Opposed: None.

Resolutions: None

Current Files: None

Informal Hearings: None

Public Hearings: (1)

A. Case #784 - M&M Realty Partners at South Plainfield, LLC
Block 550; Lot 3; AH-4 Zone
1111 Durham Road

The applicant is requesting a *Preliminary and Final Site Plan* approval for a 410 unit – 31 buildings – condominium, townhouse and apartment complex. Carried from November 27, 2018.

Kevin Boris – Weingarten Law Firm, 1260 Stelton Road, Piscataway, New Jersey – attorney for the Applicant addressed the Board. Gave an outline of what will be discussed... recalling Mr. Taikina – heard Public and Board concerns from last hearing, will address. Karl Pehnke – to address traffic and Christine Cofone - planner.

It is determined that Mr. Taikina was previously sworn in and does not need to be sworn in again.

Mr. Taikina – M&M Realty Partners of South Plainfield, LLC, 1260 Stelton Road, Piscataway, New Jersey – Director for Real Estate Development – addressed the Board. Mr. Taikina stated that he had made some promises at the previous hearing... updated Exhibit including the pages that were missing.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

Mr. Taikina presented Exhibit A2 – thirty-three (33) page packet consisting of 11’X17’ size pages of the submitted larger sets of plans. Board Members as well as Public received copies.

- E-1 - cover page.
- E-2 - overall demolition plan – dated December 10, 2018.
- E-3 - overall geometric exhibit – dated December 10, 2018.
- E-4 - overall utility exhibit – dated December 10, 2018.
- E-5 - overall grading exhibit – dated December 10, 2018.
- E-6 - overall drainage exhibit – dated December 10, 2018.
- E-7 - overall landscape plan – dated December 10, 2018.
- E-9 - landscape common area enlargements – dated December 10, 2018.
- E-10 – building typical landscape plans – dated December 10, 2018. (Different page from previous exhibit).
- E-8 – landscape entrances and clubhouse enlargements – dated December 10, 2018. (Wrong order).
- E-11 – overall lighting exhibit – dated December 10, 2018. (Different page from previous exhibit).
- E-12 – construction detail exhibit – dated December 10, 2018. (Missing from previous exhibit).
- A1.0 - proposed clubhouse - lower level floor plan.
- A1.1 - proposed clubhouse - upper level floor plan.
- A1.2 - proposed clubhouse – elevations – back and front.
- A1.3 – proposed clubhouse – elevations – left and right sides (missing from previous exhibit).
- A1.4 – proposed clubhouse – roof plan (missing from previous exhibit).
- A2.0 - proposed townhouses – basement and 1st floor plan (missing from previous exhibit).
- A2.1 – proposed townhouses – 2nd floor and roof plan (missing from previous exhibit).
- A2.2 - proposed townhouses – units with basement elevations (previous exhibit was elevations - three (3) stories - front, rear, side.)
- A2.3 – units without basement elevations (missing from previous exhibit).
- A3.0 - proposed stacked housing - 1st floor plans.
- A3.1 - proposed stacked housing - 2nd and 3rd floor plan.
- A3.2 - proposed stacked housing - elevations - front, back, side.
- A4.0 - proposed condos - 1st and 2nd floor plan.
- A4.1 - proposed condos - 3rd and 4th floor plan.
- A4.2 - proposed condos - four (4) story elevations.
- A4.3 - proposed condos - three (3) story elevations.
- A5.0 - affordable housing - 1st and type floor plan – revised October 9, 2018
- A5.2 - affordable housing - elevations - front, rear, right side, left side.
- Color rendering of site plan.
- Color rendering aerial of current site.
- A-1 – alternate entrance exhibit – gated - dated December 11, 2018.

Mr. Taikina stated that the main items that were missing from the previous exhibit (A-1) is the ground floor and basement plan for the townhouses. Mr. Taikina refers to page A2.0 – Basement & First Floor Plan in Exhibit A-2 which is also on the white board:

- Eight (8) unit townhouse row.
- End units enter from the end.
 - Enter into the living room / dining room area.
 - Kitchen.
 - Up the stairs.
- Middle units:
 - Enter into living room / dining room area.
 - Kitchen.
 - Up the stairs.
- One (1) car garage.
- Basement – thirty-nine (39) units.
 - No basement under garage.
 - Mechanical room.
 - Large storage area.
 - Back area opens to walkout.
 - Area can be finished.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

- Provisions for a potential bathroom.
- Sanitary low enough.
- Expected to be offered as an option – bathroom and finish basement.
- Eighty-one (81) units do not have a basement.

Mr. Taikina referred to page A2.1 in Exhibit A-2 also displayed on white board:

- Second floor.
- Large bedroom.
 - Master bath.
 - Walk in closet.
 - Separate shower.
- Two (2) bedrooms.
 - Shared bath.

Mr. Taikina displays color rendering on white board.

Mr. Taikina stated that in the meeting and conversations from the last time, he would get some answers from the builder.

- Board requested a gated community.... Yes, will do.
 - Will work out details with Mr. Bucco and Mr. Slachetka.
 - Will provide plans to Professionals.
 - Believes can get most out of buffer.
 - May have gate structures in buffer.
- Disbursement of Affordable Housing units... Yes, will disburse the Affordable Housing units in the multi-family buildings to comply with the Settlement Agreement. Does not have those plans tonight.
 - Will work out details with Mr. Bucco and Mr. Slachetka.
- Sewer... Borough needs to do a sewer study. Agreed to contribute to study. Mr. Bucco has not completed what the study will entail. Will be meeting with PARSA later this month. Believes when Applicant returns next month that will be determined.
 - Bob Bucco stated that he is meeting with Borough Engineer, Len Miller, and the representative from PARSA on Thursday at 9:30 am at Borough Hall.

Mr. Slachetka questioned Mr. Taikina:

- Who will address the connection to Runyons Lane and any design issues regarding internal road network. Per Mr. Taikina, Mr. Pehnke will address. However, believes have complied with the Settlement Agreement and Borough Ordinance for the future connection to Runyons Lane. Willing to do so now but cannot have it as a condition of this approval. Can agree to seek it from Edison but cannot have this approval conditioned on an outside agency approval that they have no control over. There is case law. Edison does not have to say 'yes'.

Chairman Ackerman asked how many roads can connect to Edison side. Mr. Taikina stated two (2)... one (1) connection in the northeast and one (1) in the southeast. Chairman Ackerman continued... any connection would like to have gated that only residents from this development have access. Mr. Taikina stated he agreed... gated access to Runyons Lanes. Mr. Taikina stated that the main entrance will have call box... the entrance closer to Route 287 will be residents only... the access to Runyons Lane will be resident only gate.

Mr. Lavender requested Mr. Taikina to forward the for mentioned case law for his review. Mr. Boris stated he will do so.

Mr. Slachetka suggested that should be reviewed in the context of the Settlement Agreement. The attorneys that represented the Borough in the Settlement Agreement should review the case law and have a 'voice' in the discussion.

Mr. Pellegrino asked if the Affordable Housing units will be disturbed throughout the whole complex. Mr. Taikina stated no... only five (5) buildings.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

Mr. Taikina addressed 'tot-lots'. Does not have an objection. The amenity package that was proposed is for the demographic market they are seeking. Can be worked out with the Professionals... where, age demographic etc. Confirmed with Chairman Ackerman that the School Board will be present at the next hearing. Has reviewed the School Board report and other communities in town.

Chairman Ackerman stated that he appreciates the Applicant looking into the 'tot-lots' and to work out the details with the Board Professionals.

Mr. Boris called upon Mr. Pehnke

Karl Pehnke – Vice President of Langdon Engineering – is sworn in as a Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Boris confirmed with Mr. Pehnke that he prepared Traffic Report dated February 26, 2018.

Mr. Pehnke addressed the Board:

- Traffic Study was prepared in accordance with traffic standards.
- Traffic Study incorporates:
 - Inventory of existing roadway.
 - Regulatory devices.
 - Lane control.
 - Geometry.
 - Existing traffic flow.
 - Projects anticipated traffic with development.
 - Assessment where that traffic may go to and from.
 - Using modeling techniques to analyze driveways and operations of road way impact of the development.
- Began preparation for the project in 2017.
 - Video monitoring of existing intersections – March 2017.
 - Results were compared to available data published by State of New Jersey to verify that it is representing the conditions of the roadway.
- Traffic projections used data published in the Institute of Transportation of Engineers. National data base.
 - Accepted by all Jurisdiction regarding traffic.
- Distribution of traffic:
 - Used demographic data... census data to identify people living in the area where they travel to and from – predominately to work.
 - Existing roadway patterns.
- Traffic is modeled using the Traffic Capacity Manual. National standard.
- Site previously developed:
 - Existing two hundred fifty thousand (250,000) square foot corporate office building.
 - Vacant for some time.
 - Vacated by Motorola.
 - Alternative use... residential project.
- Roadway in area have distinctive flows during peak hours.
 - Morning peak hour – 7:45 to 8:45 am.
 - There is an extended period of time when traffic builds and flows.
 - Evening peak hour – 4:45 to 5:45 pm.
- Characterized adjacent roadway system volume as high.
- Critical intersection – Durham Avenue, Hadley Avenue and south bound ramp to Route 287.
 - North bound right to ramp of Route 287 – extremely high in the morning.
 - Two (2) lanes from Hadley – extremely high.
 - Two (2) lanes from south bound approach – turn left onto Route 287 – extremely high.
 - All competing for 'green time' at intersection.
 - Capacity – built out. Maximum lanes.
 - Difficult area to add additional passing.
- Benefit to area... residential project results in a reduced traffic impact then commercial office use.
 - Commercial office use – generates three hundred sixty (360) trips per hour during peak hours.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

- Residential development – generates thirty-four percent (34%) in PM hours and forty-six percent (46%) less during AM peak hour.
- Traffic access to site – used color rendering of Exhibit A-2:
 - Existing driveway to north. Serviced Motorola site.
 - Main access to south.
 - Motorola had access across Famularo Road.
 - Will be closed.
 - Relocated approximately one hundred thirty feet (130') to north.
 - Will not align with Famularo Road.
 - Designed as a Boulevard.
 - Single entry lane.
 - Two (2) exit lanes.... Left turn lane and right turn lane.
 - Analysis of driveways show will be acceptable for service.
 - Most difficult movement – left turn.
 - Advantage of site – majority of traffic will be going north. Approximately, seventy percent (70%) – right turn out.
 - Does not expect substantial number of queues on approaches.
 - Sight lines safe and adequate.
- Site:
 - System of circulatory roadway.
 - Designed consistent to the Settlement Agreement.
 - Road widths are consistent residential site improvements standards.
 - Determined to be minimum and maximum to provide safe circulation in residential developments.
 - Robust pedestrian circulation.
 - Internal roadways – sidewalks on both sides.
 - Linkages throughout development.
 - Sidewalks extend out to Durham Avenue.
 - Sidewalk along frontage of Durham Avenue.
 - Parking:
 - Governed by Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS).
 - Dictate number of parking spaces and design.
 - Parking spaces required – nine hundred nine (909).
 - Providing nine hundred seventy-nine (979).
 - Included in standards – visitor parking.
 - Multi-family – shared parking for residents and visitors.
 - Townhouses – on street parking – various pockets of parking for visitors and residents.
- Connection to Runyons Lane:
 - Providing for anticipated connection.
 - Requires an application and approval by Edison Township.
- Project from traffic standpoint – stands on its own.
 - Access, onsite circulation, parking 'work'.
 - If Runyons Lane connection approved by Edison – adds additional access point for traffic.
- More options – elevates traffic.
- Reviewed Board Professionals review letters.
 - Provided additional information and clarification to the Board Professionals at their request.

Mr. Smith asked how many parking spaces have been calculated for resident parking and how many for visitor parking. Mr. Pehnke stated in the Residential Site Improvement Standards required number is .5 spaces per unit for general visitor parking... two hundred five (205) visitor parking spaces. Mr. Smith stated approximately six hundred eighty (608) parking spaces for residences. Mr. Pehnke confirmed. Mr. Pehnke stated in the multi-family there is no differential parking for residence or visitor... share parking fields. The restricted space for townhomes is the garage.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

Mr. Smith stated that in the Traffic Study it proposed for four hundred ten (410) units is one hundred eighty-nine (189)... less than fifty percent (50%) of people leaving the facility and two hundred fifty (250) residents coming home. Mr. Taikina stated correct. Mr. Smith continued.... With multi-family homes, there are more than one (1) car per family in today's society. Questioned if these numbers are adequate considering the traffic flow since Motorola has not been there for years is higher than projected. Mr. Pehnke stated yes... the database that is used for projecting traffic for a multi-family area by all review agencies and is based off of actual traffic counts from similar multi-family developments. Must realize a one (1) hour period for the projection. Residential traffic flows over a period of time – three (3) to four (4) hours... leaving 6, 7, 8, 9 AM and again in the evening.

Mr. Smith asked when, how long and at what times was the study conducted. Per Mr. Pehnke stated the counts were done in March 22, 2017. The counts are done by recording and during peak hours – 7 to 9 in the morning and 4 to 6 in the evening.

Mr. Smith stated he does not agree with the numbers.

Mayor Anesh stated there is the peak hour but how does that equate to a two (2) hour time frame. Then questioned the number parking spaces currently on the site or using the generic two hundred fifty thousand (250) square feet of the building. Mr. Pehnke stated regarding the two hundred fifty thousand (250) square feet building, used the ITE database since the building is unoccupied and cannot monitor the actual numbers. It did not necessarily need to be occupied by Motorola or by any other business. The difference between office and residential is office development has a higher peaking numbers... start 8:30 – 9:00. Therefore, employees begin arriving hour or two before. Therefore, higher peaking results. A residential development has more even flow. The existing Motorola site from inspections from eight hundred (800) to one thousand (1,000) parking spaces today. Accurate parking spaces for building size. Cautious of comparing the office building that has a peaking hour where a residential development.

Mr. Smith stated that is his concern. As a business it is a certain time frame. However, more people will be coming in and out over a three (3) hour span in the residential development that will cause that much more traffic. Trying to understand with those calculations how that can be based on. Mr. Pehnke stated from the safety and geometry of the driveway, only focused on the one (1) hour peak where traffic was at its worst. Wanted to make sure it can accommodate. A residential area does have a different generation of traffic calculations compared to an office development. There is traffic flow during twenty-four (24) hours. Evening activity is usually higher associated with residential. There is a change in the overall daily characteristics but in terms of the peak hours, there is a reduce impact. That is what is trying to identify. There will be more traffic mid-morning or mid-afternoon that would not be there in an office development but the traffic will move safely in and out of the site.

Mr. Bythell questioned the 'acceptable level of service' regarding the left hand turn out of the development as to what that is. Mr. Pehnke stated that Traffic Engineers relate the capacity to the delay... a grade level similar to grade school – A through F. F is a failing condition – not meaning an intersection is broken down. It is referencing the length of que... experience longer ques. Level of E and F range... considered the limit of acceptable delay. F being people are waiting longer than the should be in order to enter the roadway.

Mr. Bythell asked if there is any consideration of adding a traffic light at the exit / entrance of the development. Mr. Pehnke stated when you start to see at an unsignalized intersection at level of service then you look at alternative options or traffic control devises. One of them would be traffic signalization... under the Manual of Traffic Control Devises which is also a national publication controlled by the National Highway Administration, there is a whole criteria period you must meet in order to consider a traffic signal. A traffic signal is not necessarily a solution to a problem. It can create its own problem if not properly used. In this case, the volume that is being anticipated are not rising to that level.

Mr. Bythell asked if there was any consideration to weekend traffic. Mr. Pehnke stated he did not. For residential areas, the peak conditions are during weekday. There will be weekend traffic but the flow is through the day on a Saturday or Sunday are much lower. Designed for the worst case scenario

Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Pehnke professional opinion that there is more traffic at night then the same time in the morning. Mr. Pehnke stated no... the PM peak hours the accumulation of the higher traffic volume on the road

BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018

system see the most cumulated impact where the road ways experience the highest demands. On Durham Avenue in the morning, there is under one thousand (1,000) traffic flow vehicles per hour. In the evening, it is

closer to the one thousand two hundred (1,200) vehicles per hour. The PM is higher volume. Mr. Smith confirmed with Mr. Pehnke that is occurring currently and asked if Mr. Pehnke thinks the residential units will not impact that number. Mr. Pehnke stated that the analysis does account for the increase during those peak hours and the driveways will operate acceptably.

Vice Chairman Pedersen asked how is the number projected by... the number of units, number of bedrooms etc. Mr. Pehnke stated that ITE uses the number of units. Vice Chairman Pedersen confirms with Mr. Pehnke that it is not based on bedroom count. Vice Chairman Pedersen asked if the parking is based the same way. Per Mr. Pehnke, no... it is based on RSIS – number of bedrooms: One (1) bedroom is 1.8 spaces.... Two (2) bedrooms is 2 spaces.... Three (3) bedrooms is 2.1 spaces.

Mr. Slachetka asked if Mr. Pehnke would address the site circulations. There were some concerns listed in his report. Mr. Pehnke stated the one he noted in the report is the seventeen (17) perpendicular parking spaces which is a twenty-four foot (24') wide roadway. The suggestion is to remove those spaces because of the potential movability restrictions from the back up spaces on the other side of the road. Has no problem removing those spaces. Crosswalk in the area of building #31 and towards the clubhouse area. Does not recommend crosswalks in that area. Did recommend adding a crosswalk in the area of the driveway connection to the parking lot. Mr. Slachetka confirmed with Mr. Pehnke that crosswalk will connect to the sidewalk to the recreation area. Mr. Pehnke stated that crosswalks should be avoided at midpoint locations. Should be at intersections and driveways. Does agree that adding another crosswalk is appropriate between Buildings #31 and #32.

Mr. Slachetka asked if there are any bicycle facilities. Mr. Pehnke stated that 'bicycles share the road'. No separate bike lanes. Roads are set as residential roads. The widths are appropriate for residential development. Traffic speed maintained. RSIS speed is 25 MPH. Could add 'Share the Road' signs. Not sure it is appropriate. Bicycles are allowed to use the road system.

Mr. Slachetka asked if bicycle amenities at key locations can be added. Mr. Pehnke differed to Mr. Taikina. Per Mr. Taikina... no.

John J. Jahr – Najarian Associates, 1 Industrial Way, East, Eatontown New Jersey – Traffic Consultant for the Board is sworn in. Mr. Jahr stated that he has reviewed Mr. Pehnke's Traffic Study and the ITE information carefully. The information is accurate. Reviewed the report for correctness and accuracy. Points out that the previous use of the site as an office industrial type use... Motorola did generate more traffic then what is being proposed at this site as residential. Residential is more disbursed in its arrival and distribution. Not only as listed in ITE, but has gone to similar sites and have done 'after studies. Mr. Jahr agreed with Mr. Pehnke's numbers regarding parking and traffic. As a gated community there needs to be adequate parking in the site. Trip generation is more the use then the number of parking spaces dictated. Mr. Jahr used the example that an office building has very specific time.... Point. Mr. Jahr asked Mr. Pehnke to explain the difference between his '2020 No Build with Re-Occupancy' of the existing site with the '2020 No Build in the condition of residential at the intersection of Durham and Hadley. This shows the difference of commercial and residential because of that 'point'... spike in the graph.

Mr. Pehnke stated to understand the traffic flow one of the conditions was to project forward based upon general growth patterns assuming that the property was never developed. Tested the roadways and capacity. Prepared '2020 No-Build Condition'.... Without occupancy. Identified the existing conditions of the roadway continued regional growth. Then traffic flow capacity with the two hundred fifty thousand (250,00) square foot building by Motorola or another user... then alternatively tested the road with the residential traffic. That intersection of Durham Avenue and Hadley Road is a difficult intersection. The differences resulted in some critical movement when reloaded an office use being substantially impacted with longer queues and the analyses showed the residential impact is substantially less and less aggravating to the conditions described that are competing for 'green time' at that intersection.

Mr. Smith stated that Motorola was an office building with nothing there. If it was redeveloped to residential, do not know the traffic. Put a storage unit there, there will be little traffic. When Motorola was there, Celebrations was not

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

in existence with three hundred (300) plus units. In his opinion as a resident, that area is over generated and looking where these numbers came from. Where these numbers are based on... just South Plainfield. Not discussing the number of parking spaces but based on society, the number of cars owned by a household and the

number of cars that will be on that road that is the safety issue. That there are proper ways and means for traffic to flow in and out of the units that maybe walking the streets the new complex. Looking at what is seen... projecting numbers based on something not there now and has not been there for a number of years based what is no build or office or storage unit... based on the project cannot understand only several additional vehicles when there will be eight hundred (800) cars occupying the units. Believes there will be more traffic flow then the numbers stated. Mr. Jahr stated that Mr. Pehnke did give the real numbers of impact by doing the analysis as if the site did not have Motorola. Mr. Jahr refers to Mr. Pehnke's '2020 No Build' versus '2020 Build' shows the impact. Using Durham, Hadley and Route 287 section which is currently clogged. The peak hours are terrible. Based on today's condition, the site not being occupied, when traffic from this site will degrade the intersection by five (5) seconds. Mr. Smith stated if you compare what is there today to what will be there, the traffic will be less. Mr. Jahr stated no.... it gives the opposite. The no build does not include this development or Motorola... to what is anticipated. The level of service at the intersection today is a D... Councilman White asked Mr. Jahr to identify what a D is in traffic terms. Mr. Jahr explained that traffic is graded A through F... like in grade school. A is there is less than 10 seconds delay.... B is 10 to 20 seconds delay... C is a 20 to 35 seconds delay... D is 35 to 55 seconds delay.... E is 55 to 80 seconds delay.... F is anything above 80 seconds delay.

Mr. Slachetka asked what is considered 'delay'. Mr. Jahr stated that is complicated. Delay numbers are approach or overall. Looks at it as an 'overall'... when you get to an intersection and have to sit for 10-15 seconds it is a B or C. When sitting for 25-30 seconds D or E... when it gets over 40 seconds 'at being here every day'. When the site is unoccupied like it is currently, the level of service is a D. Then add the traffic from the proposed site, it will increase by 5 seconds. Majority of the traffic will be making a right turn and go up to Route 287. People will be making the left turn; however, majority will be making a right. Empty situation now to the projected situation later, the overall will have a 5 second increase. The traffic generated from the proposed site is not more than the traffic from Motorola site. From a Traffic standpoint, prefers not to see site occupied as an industrial or office use, it will cause bigger delay and more significant detriment to the intersection.

Mr. Smith stated that doesn't see the numbers as today. Mr. Smith confirmed with Mr. Jahr that he is referring to page 12, table 5 in the Traffic Study. Mr. Smith continued.... The only 2020 build with accurate conditions is the north bound on the right turn as an F - 90.2 in the PM that is with a no build condition is 67.7. Mr. Smith asked for a clarification on page 12 - table 5 - Durham Avenue and Hadley Road/I-287 ramp - NB. Mr. Pehnke stated that the is the right turn onto Route 287. Mr. Smith continued... that is the only difference that you are considering as a 2020 no build with no occupancy of Motorola building. Mr. Pehnke stated similar.... it is better in that condition. Mr. Jahr stated that Mr. Smith is right on target... the 'no body there' which is what is present is only 67.7 seconds. When the site is built, it will go to 90.2. Mr. Smith stated that he believes there is more traffic flow then what is being shown... based on the number of units, number of cars families own, etc. Believes there will be more then what is being projected. There are still units being built. Knows that the Edison side is not part of this project, but when it is built that will affect the traffic. How this will affect school traffic... buses trying to get through. Mr. Smith stated his priority is the safety of the traffic flow for the residents.

Chairman Ackerman addressed Mr. Smith... the traffic from the other community will not be allowed to go through our community. Mr. Smith stated it is not about going into the development... it is about the vehicles going onto the road. Coming out their development onto Durham Road.... Or Hamilton. The Borough does not get to control where they come out... most of that traffic will be going towards Route 287.

Mr. Jahr addressed Mr. Pehnke... there has not been any testimony regarding the truck turning templet on sheets 57-59. There are some areas that the truck was not making it. Can that be revised or looked into more carefully. Saw some curbs and sidewalks being run over by trucks. Mr. Pehnke stated it was reviewed and the preparer, the Engineer, was not focusing on the turning paths. The turning paths should work. Does not think there is a problem. Will revise and provide them. The geometry is in accordance with RSIS. Mr. Jahr stated he agreed that the geometry is set but people will be moving in and out. There will be a truck going through. Maybe the arrangement of some of the parking spaces or curbing may need to be address. Mr. Taikina asked Mr. Jahr to mark up the plans for their review. Mr. Pehnke stated they are evident on the plan.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

Chairman Ackerman stated that turning radiuses have to be in agreement with the templet that is used for the fire trucks. They all have to meet that requirement. Mr. Jahr confirmed with Mr. Pehnke that a SU47 was used. Mr. Jahr asked to have a revised plan to be submitted. Mr. Pehnke stated yes.

Mr. Bucco stated that there was a concern with traffic from Edison. Mr. Smith stated the flow will be going onto that roadway. Mr. Bucco stated correct. Mr. Bucco stated that Edison would have to notify everyone within two hundred feet (200') which the Borough would have to notified. In turn, it will be reviewed. Mr. Smith stated he understands. Councilman White stated he had asked Mr. Bucco to make the statement for the Public to be aware.

Mr. Boris asked Chairman Ackerman how he would like to proceed.... Planning testimony? Additional comments from Mr. Taikina? Mr. Taikina stated that Mr. Slachetka had asked him to testify to the compliance of the Settlement Agreement.

Chairman Ackerman stated to proceed with the Planner, then Mr. Taikina and the Public.

Christine Nazzaro-Cofone - Cofone Consulting Group, LLC, 125 Half Mile Road, Suite 200, Red Bank, New Jersey - is accepted as a Professional Planner and sworn in. Ms. Cofone addressed the Board. There are no variances. It is in the Housing Plan... when the Borough had their Housing Plan approved by the Court, this is one of sites that was to be utilized in the Affordable Housing. Back in 2014, Mr. Slachetka has completed a Master Plan Re-Examination Report. Ms. Cofone read Goal #3 from the Re-Examination Report to the Board Members and Public:

“To provide a variety of housing types. Working towards compliance with Affording House objectives. Construction of Affordable Housing and inclusion of age restriction housing alternatives within the Borough. Zoning adding to the choice of housing types and range of affordability for housing.”

Ms. Cofone continued... that was added to the Master Plan prior to the Settlement of Affordable Housing. Therefore, would say that the Affordable Housing regulations have been on the Borough's books for some time. Thinks this is a great opportunity. Was encouraged by her client in advance of tonight's meeting that the Affordable Units will be distributed throughout the project. Public members from the last meeting gave some compelling testimony and reasons why it should be done. It is in the Settlement Agreement that it should be distributed. Once that is accomplished and based on her review as an Affordable Housing Special Master sees no issues of non-compliance with the Settlement Agreement. This is a compliant project with no variances or waivers. The density and coverage are below what is permissible. Believes that the Borough zoned the property for this type of development and density. Heard many good comments. There is a willingness from the developer to comply with all of them. Does not see any reason why the project should be improved and it will implement housing plan.

Mr. Boris asked Ms. Cofone with the consistency of the Settlement Agreement, it is consistent with the Borough's Housing Element and Fair Share. Ms. Cofone stated 'absolutely' and with the Master Plan.

Mr. Slachetka stated that the Planning testimony should be brief, it is a conforming application.

Mr. Boris called upon Mr. Taikina to discuss the compliance of the Settlement Agreement per Mr. Slachetka's request. Mr. Taikina began by stating:

- There is a Settlement Agreement which included the Ordinance that permitted the development.
- Consists of four hundred ten (410) units:
 - Twenty percent (20%) set-a-side units for Affordable Housing - eighty-two (82) units.
 - Mix of units:
 - Traditional townhouses in front that do not exceed three (3) stories - forty-five feet (45') height.
 - Stacked Townhouses in the center that do not exceed four (4) stories - forty-five feet (45') height.
 - Multi-family residential buildings in the back along Route 287 that do not exceed four (4) stories - sixty-five feet (65') height.
- Buffer - one hundred feet (100') along Durham Avenue.
- Buffer - twenty feet (20') screened along Route 287.
- Main entrance from Durham Avenue that has no units that accesses it.
 - Club House building at the end.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

- Pool area.
- Public area.
- Centrally located.
- Accessed with sidewalks.
- Public amenities distributed through the site.
- Landscaped.
- Allow a connector road.
- Stand along development.
- Affordable units will be distributed throughout the multi-family buildings.
 - Will have plan before next hearing
- Parking throughout the site.
 - Head-in parking along areas of townhouse street.
 - Parallel parking along multi-family buildings.

Mr. Taikina believes have met the intent and purposes of the Settlement Agreement. No variances. Believes fully compliant plan to implement Affording Housing.

Mr. Grzenda asked if there are sidewalks along Durham Avenue. Per Mr. Taikina, yes.

Mr. Slachetka stated that Mr. Taikina touched up the key elements in the Settlement Agreement that got expressed by Borough Ordinances. Had significant comments on the original design of the proposed development. Have made a variety of comments that the applicant has addressed. There are several items in his review letter dated November 21, 2018 that are continuing comments for Mr. Taikina to address to ensure that the Board is satisfied that the applicant has addressed them. Bottom page 3 of townhouse design, the applicant is willing to work with the Board Professionals regarding the Stacked Townhouses. A discrepancy between the conceptual plan Exhibit to the Settlement Agreement and with the plans that were submitted. There was testimony previously regarding to that. Mr. Taikina stated that one of the issues listed in the Ordinance is how the front is to be treated. The concern is that the buildings with the four (4) garages in the front that the entrances for the units are not prominent enough from the street scape. Will have a covered porch entry that will be located along the walkway... portico that will stick out to identify the entry. The entrances on the side are the normal type.

Mayor Anesh asked can that be provided... what it will look like instead of a floor plan. Trying to visualize the street scape. Mr. Slachetka stated the front elevations. Mr. Taikina pointed to the area using sheet A-3.2 Proposed Stacked Housing front elevations from Exhibit A-2. Needs to make the area 'pop'. Will continue to work with Mr. Slachetka to make it to 'pop'. Mayor Anesh asked can that enhancement be documented in a future exhibit. Mr. Taikina stated yes. Mr. Slachetka stated even the facade. The garage facade can be articulated in a manner that it does not look like one long garage. Believes can be done.

Mr. Boris asked Mr. Taikina if it is possible for him to bring a color rendering of the elevation to the next meeting. Mr. Taikina stated yes.

Mr. Slachetka stated the next item with continued comment was regarding the roadways. There is a combination of testimony from Mr. Taikina and Mr. Pehnke which addressed many of the items. There was discussion about removing some of perpendicular parking spaces and adding crosswalks. Mr. Taikina stated that the Concept Plan in the Settlement Agreement had a twenty-eight feet (28') foot street along the multi family area and townhouse area. It has parallel parking along it. That protected the gathering areas.... Parallel park car, sidewalk then sitting area. Tucked in some on street spaces perpendicular. The concern is that the perpendicular spaces backing out to the parallel park car would be a conflict. Agreed to remove the perpendicular spaces which will allow a better environment. Will provide a mid-point pedestrian crosswalk. The appropriate location would be in the middle.

Mr. Slachetka stated there is some questions regarding the connection to Edison. Made mention of items on page 11 on the Settlement Agreement for the need of a roadway connection now versus the future. That will be addressed by the attorneys who had worked on the Settlement Agreement. Does not believe that this is an issue that will prevent the Board to continue to review the application.

Chairman Ackerman stated that at the last meeting it was discussed to eliminate the twenty-six (26) parallel parking spaces. Mr. Taikina stated that the parallel stays and the perpendicular is being removed. Mr. Taikina stated there

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

are fewer perpendicular spots than parallel spots. Mr. Slachetka stated that minimize the parking impact. A key component in the Settlement Agreement to make the roads a pedestrian friendly.... A key design element. Parallel parking does in fact contribute to that street scape design.

Mayor Anesh asked Mr. Slachetka if the roadway gets any wider. Mr. Slachetka and Mr. Bucco stated it will stay the same.

Councilman White confirms Mr. Slachetka that is the widest road at twenty-eight (28).

Mr. Slachetka stated eliminating the parallel parking and leaving the street at twenty-eight feet (28') will become a 'drag way'. Pedestrian crossings will need to be reviewed to act in itself as a traffic calming for the area.

Mr. Boris stated that is the end of direct testimony. Understands that the Board would like to hear from the Board of Education. Chairman Ackerman stated they are scheduled for the next meeting - January 8, 2019. Has spoken to the Superintendent. They will have their witness and the person who prepared the demographic study present to testify. Mr. Boris suggested to open up to the Public for Mr. Pehnke, Mr. Taikina and Ms. Cofone.

Vice Chairman Pedersen requested a small break.

Chairman Ackerman calls for a ten (10) minute recess.

Chairman Ackerman calls the meeting back to order.

Chairman Ackerman opens the meeting to the Public for questions regarding tonight's testimony.

Tamara Winston - 518 South Plainfield Avenue, South Plainfield, New Jersey - is sworn in. Ms. Winston stated the Traffic Study was done on March 21, 2017. Wanted to know that No Build in 2020 numbers included the upgrades and buildings in the area currently. For instance, the McDonalds... The Wawa. The studies that were based in these numbers where Mr. Smith believes are low, was based on an area that was less developed then it was almost two (2) years after the study was done. Mr. Pehnke stated when a Traffic Study is prepared and there are future projections. Referred to data published in the Department of Transportation. On a yearly basis the Department updates the data upon there analysis of the account data stations. Uses growth factors. Ms. Winston stated that the point that Mr. Pehnke is working off of is almost two (2) years prior to now. Mr. Pehnke stated correct. Those counts project forward four (4) to five (5) years to year 2020 utilizing the growth account. Ms. Winston asked if those growths would account for the newest complex that has been built. Mr. Pehnke stated it will incorporate all ongoing growth. Mr. Winston asked did the ongoing growth include the complexes of this size that had not been built in the small area. Mr. Pehnke stated the growths analysis are from the permanent growth count stations that will reflect these types of growth and are updated yearly. Back in 2008 the growth projections came down because growth in development dropped off. However, within the last several years, growth in development increased. Ms. Winston asked if the projections are being based on a property that has not been in use for some time. What is the accuracy of the number of vehicles from a base line of nothing currently to projections of when the property was last inhabited... ten (10) years ago... and the underdevelopment of the area at that time and state that there will be a five (5) second difference from the volume? Mr. Pehnke stated he is not following. His base counts started in 2017. Then project forward. Analyzed two (2) ways... nothing happens and the building remains vacant, if this project did not build and someone renovated the building and reoccupied. Analyzed that way... what could happen. Then with the residential use. The traffic study is finding that the access design for safety and proficiency and that the traffic data for the board professionals to review. The prior zoning and use of the site resulted in a more intense traffic impact on the road system than the residential. Ms. Winston stated it was used ten (10) years ago. Mr. Pehnke stated they add that traffic back in.

Mr. Slachetka stated as a follow-up to the first questioned asked, the evaluation of the traffic area, is there any unique, distinct or development that might not have been counted for in the DOT's projection of growth in the immediate area that would have affected the traffic level that are projected moving forward. Mr. Pehnke stated he does not think so. The regional growth rates are indicative of the area. DOT did up the rates because of the action they noticed.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

Marvin Braunstein - 1504 New Durham Road, South Plainfield, New Jersey - is sworn in. Has two (2) concerns. Over the course of this year, traffic both on New Durham Road and Durham Avenue have increased. Is uncertain if the traffic study was projected or was the study done by mechanical or electronic measuring devices. Over what period of time if those devices were utilized that study was performed. Cannot believe the projections that have been spoken are accurate.... 2017 and this is the end of 2018. Traffic has increased exponentially. During the peak rush hours, takes him twenty (20) minutes to go a quarter of a mile to get to his home. Disputes the projections that were discussed and delivered to the Board. The entrance should have an egress and ingress lane to allow south bound traffic on Durham Avenue to make left hand turns into the development without backing up traffic on Durham Avenue towards the highway. Similar to Traditions. Can the evidence and data of the Traffic Study be provided to the Public.... Can he have access? Living in that area and traveling Durham Avenue extensively has never seen any mechanical and electronic measuring devices. A concern this study was a projection and not real. Mr. Pehnke stated as he testified, it was done through video monitoring of the intersection in accordance with the industry standards. Documented in the report. Mr. Braunstein asked for the evidence on the measuring device. Mr. Pehnke stated it was a camera - MioVision. A camera is installed and monitored. Mr. Braunstein asked on Durham Avenue. Mr. Pehnke stated yes. Mr. Braunstein asked which intersections. Mr. Pehnke responded: intersections - Durham Avenue and Hadley, Durham and New Durham, New Durham and Talmedge - several intersections. Mr. Braunstein continued stating that he has not seen these measuring devices. Mr. Pehnke stated would not be able to see them.... Very small. Chairman Ackerman gave a copy of the study to Mr. Braunstein.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Taikina through the Settlement Agreement there needs to be a one hundred foot (100') buffer. Something to consider to shorten the buffer to have the ingress and egress roads. Coming from Route 287 and make the left turn into the property, there is a single lane. That will back that area up. Mr. Taikina stated when he looks at the gate complex with Mr. Bucco, they will look at that as well to see if it is appropriate. Does not think the road would need to be widened. The road maybe wide enough to make the lane.

Mr. Slachetka stated he does not believe the buffer will need to be reduced. This may be accomplished through the right-of-way.

Chairman Ackerman stated the road is wide in that area.

Mr. Smith used an example on Route 22 in Branchburg. Does not want the back up to get to the light.

Chairman Ackerman reiterated... coming from Route 287, there will be a lane going straight and a dedicated left turn lane into the development. Mr. Taikina stated it will be looked into.

Wayne Grennier - 1317 Yurgel Drive, South Plainfield, South Plainfield, New Jersey - is sworn in. Mr. Grennier recalls there may be a ten foot (10') easement in the event that Durham Avenue was to be expanded from when he was on the Planning Board.... Is it still in effect? Mr. Bucco stated he will look into it. When he looks into the dedicated left hand turn, he will look into the easement.

Steven Danyo - 323 Walter Avenue, South Plainfield, New Jersey - Mr. Danyo asked Mr. Pehnke if he is paid by Mr. Morris. Mr. Pehnke stated that the applicant does pay him for the preparation and is a Professional Engineer testifying under oath. Mr. Danyo stated that anyone that lives in the area knows that the traffic is horrible... a parking lot at 3,4,5 in the afternoon. Wanted to know if took into consideration the amount of traffic coming off of Route 287... how would a firetruck get down to the area... the houses across the street. Add two (2) to three (3) minutes of additional response time due to traffic... or even five (5) minutes - a life or death situation. A small fire becoming a big fire. Has that been considered... or a rescue squad? There are many trucks that come off Route 287. Mr. Pehnke stated the Traffic Study reflects the volume that is there. Does not dispute and testified that the traffic is heavy in the area. With regard to emergency vehicles on any road, in the State of New Jersey, Emergency Vehicles have the right-of-way and motorists must abide by that. Mr. Danyo cannot imagine with a snow storm or heavy rain, trying to get a fire truck through the area.

Chairman Ackerman stated the issue with the Fire Department, Rescue and Police will be covered at a future meeting. They have provided their own reports. Testimony will be given. Fire Chief will be here. There is a written report. That will be covered at a future meeting.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

Mr. Danyo continued... the amount of traffic coming out of the development is based upon how many residents per unit. Mr. Pehnke stated the independent variable that is used is the number of units. The demographic projection has not been done.

Mr. Danyo stated there could be four (4) to five (5) people in a townhouse. Could have a lot more cars coming out of the development. Talked to Mayor at the Council Meeting. Would like microphones to be used. Could not hear what the Planner said. Did not hear what the Applicants Planner said. Thinks it is inconsiderate not using microphones.

Mr. Danyo confirmed with Vice Chairman Pedersen that he is in Real Estate. Mr. Danyo asked Vice Chairman Pedersen his opinion regarding the housing across the street... by Shady Side Park. Are the prices going to go up or down when this development exists? Vice Chairman Pedersen stated 'neutral'. Bought a house on Shady Side after this project was announced.

Jennifer Sarrubbo - 1332 Jankowski Avenue, South Plainfield, New Jersey - is sworn in. Ms. Sarrubbo asked was there any consideration given to the Traffic Study that it is a truck route. Mr. Pehnke stated included in the study are the typical vehicles on the roadway that are observed... trucks are factored in... large vehicles are factored in. The actual operation of the traffic signal is factored in. Ms. Sarrubbo asked for clarification regarding the emergency vehicles... was that accounted for as well in the future. Mr. Pehnke stated yes. Ms. Sarrubbo stated there is a speeding factor. Approximately a year ago, the visibility and traffic at 5:30 am had a vehicle on her property fifteen feet (15') within the siding.

Chairman Ackerman closed the Public portion.

Vice Chairman Pedersen stated to expand on his statement. Former Board Member Wayne Grennier lives several blocks from him. People feel very disconnected in the area for years. Jokes with people... 'Goes to South Plainfield to South Plainfield by way of Manhattan.' The traffic is bad. Found a house in the area... thought about the project... doesn't think will have a large impact... 'from pretty bad to a little worse'. There is not a lot of choice... decided by the Courts and by the State. Doing the best we can with it.

Councilman White stated in reference to Mr. Danyo's comment regarding the amount of people in a home. That was one of our concerns with the walkout basements. That will be an ongoing discussion. Chairman Ackerman stated he has a lot of concerns.

The audience stated they cannot hear the comment.

Councilman White reiterated his statement moving the microphone closing to him.

Chairman Ackerman stated that the next meeting will be January 8, 2019 at 7 pm. At that time, testimony from the South Plainfield School System and the Board of Education. A representative from the Fire Department may be present... Will confirm with the Fire Department.

Mr. Boris requested that no further notice will be required for January 8, 2019. Chairman Ackerman announced that there will be no further notice other than this evening. It will be posted in the Borough.

Chairman Ackerman asked the audience to quiet down to continue the meeting.

Mr. Boris asked if the Planner needs to return or the Traffic Engineer. Mr. Smith stated that the Fire Department may question the turning radius. Mr. Taikina confirmed with Mr. Pehnke he will be available. It is determined that Ms. Cofone does not need to return. Mr. Bucco asked if Mr. Jahr should return. Chairman Ackerman stated yes.

Old Business: None

Committee Reports:

- A. Street Naming Committee** – Bob Ackerman - report progress.
- B. Environmental Committee** – Rich Houghton & Bryan Bythell - report progress.

**BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 11, 2018**

- C. Council Reports** – Councilman White - report progress.
- D. Mayoral Updates** - Mayor Anesh - report progress.

Minor Site Plan: None

New Business: None

Correspondence: None

Audience Comments: None

Executive Session: None

Adjournment: 9:10 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joanne Broderick
Planning Board Secretary