

MINUTES

MAY 8, 2012

PLANNING BOARD

LONG HILL TOWNSHIP

CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Chairman, Mr. Connor, called the meeting to order at 8:04 P.M. He then read the following statement:
Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board, by sending a copy to the Courier News and Echoes Sentinel and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk, all in January, 2012.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OATH OF OFFICE

Mrs. Wolfe administered the Oath of Office to Charles Arentowicz as a regular member.

ROLL CALL

On a call of the roll, the following were present:

Christopher Connor, Chairman
Charles Arentowicz, Member
Brendan Rae, Vice-Chairman
Donald Butterworth, Member
Joseph Cilino, Member
Jerry Aroneo, Mayor's Designee
Guy Roshto, Member
Michael Smargiassi, Member

Excused:
Sandi Raimer, 1st Alt.

Barry Hoffman, Bd. Attorney

Kevin O'Brien, Twp. Planner
Thomas Lemanowicz, Bd. Engineer
Dawn Wolfe, Planning & Zoning Administrator

X X X X X X X X X X X

EXECUTIVE SESSION - It was determined that there was no need to hold an executive session.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 10, 2012 were approved as written on motion by Mr. Roshto and seconded by Mr. Butterworth.

The minutes of January 24, 2012 were approved as amended on motion by Mr. Butterworth and seconded by Mr. Roshto.

PUBLIC QUESTION OR COMMENT PERIOD

The meeting was opened to the public for questions or comments. There being none, the meeting was closed to the public.

DISCUSSION

PROPOSED LANGUAGE OF OFF SITE SIGNAGE ORDINANCE

Mr. O'Brien said that Ms. Mary Mayer, President of the Long Hill Chamber of Commerce, is present this evening along with some other members of the Chamber and other business owners in the Township and they may wish to comment on the ordinances as we go along.

The changes that Mr. Pidgeon, Mr. Sandow, and he came up with were sent out to the Board which is why they are in various different types and colors. He asked the Board members if they had any specific questions about anything in the proposal.

Mr. Butterworth referred to Item b and said that it says (in part) "Generally, two signs will be mounted back-to-back on the same post on one side of the main road". He felt that, if you are coming up to an intersection you will be too late to see the sign if there is only one post. He also questioned which side of the intersection you would put it on and if the traffic in the other direction will be able to see it. He felt that there should be two posts on either side of the main road.

Mr. O'Brien recalled discussion on that at the last meeting but did not recall if there was a consensus on it. He said that this was the original proposal and so if the Board would like to allow two posts, depending upon the location, we could certainly provide that language.

Mr. Butterworth felt from the standpoint of safety, it is a dangerous situation for somebody that is going in one direction where the sign is *past* the intersection. He felt that it is better to have two posts located so that they will be in the direction of the flow of traffic.

Mr. Smargiassi asked, for example, if a business was on Poplar Dr., is the proposal for a sign on *both* the east and west bound sides of Valley Rd.

Mr. Butterworth replied that that is what *he* was proposing, although he did not know how the rest of the Board feels.

Mr. Smargiassi preferred to see a single sign versus on both sides of the road. He noted that Shop-Rite doesn't have a sign on both sides of the road and people get there. He understood that it is a bigger sign, but he viewed it more as a courtesy sign to alert people of where things are. He said that the traffic is not traveling that fast and felt that a sign on one side of the road that could be viewed from both sides would be sufficient versus having double sided signs on both sides of the road.

Mr. Butterworth said that they wouldn't be double sided signs, just single sided.

Mr. Smargiassi replied that he did not see the need to have signs on both sides of the road at any of the intersections that were in question. He said that it is not a highway and people will be able to see the signs in both directions with a single sign.

Mr. Aroneo was not sure that this is the right thing to do at this time, although he was certainly willing to look at it some more. He said he was trying to envision what Valley Rd. would look like if we had a sign for every business that was on a road off of Valley Rd. He understood the concept that it is supposed to be informational to help people find their destination, but felt that Valley Rd. is already cluttered with signage. He said that if we start adding 10 signs to the end of every street where there are 10 businesses, it would look a little ridiculous. What came to mind are the areas where there are outlet stores and at the end of the road you see the name of every outlet store that is down that street and he did not think that is the right look for Valley Rd.. He said that there has long been a history of signs being located on the property of the business and there might be a good reason for that.

Mr. Cilino asked if anyone had actually explored how many signs are being proposed and how many businesses are off of Valley Rd. that would require a sign.

Mr. O'Brien replied that Mr. Sandow had done a study and presented some findings to the Board either at the last meeting or the meeting prior to that.

Mr. Butterworth recalled that it was at the last meeting.

Mr. Cilino asked for the number.

Mr. O'Brien noted that Mr. Sandow is in the audience. He recalled that there were 3 or 4 businesses off of Valley Rd. on Poplar Dr. that would be eligible for signage. Other than that, he did not think there were any others that would be on Valley Rd.

Mr. Butterworth reminded Mr. O'Brien that there is a dentist's office behind Jaeger Lumber.

Mr. O'Brien agreed. He said that any business on Main Ave. or Valley Rd. would not be eligible for a sign.

Mr. Aroneo said that there are businesses on Warren Ave. and every one could have a sign, as well those businesses on Poplar Dr. and Plainfield Rd.

Mr. Smargiassi reminded that it is limited to service oriented businesses and so it would have to be a place where the general public would go versus a manufacturing facility.

Mr. Connor agreed and said it would include the barber shop and medical supply business on Poplar Dr.

Mr. Roshto said that Sec. 155.11a reads (in part) "Each retail, restaurant, professional, recreational or consumer-oriented service business within 0.3 (three tenths) miles of a street intersection.....". He said that, if he understood "professional" correctly, we are talking about lawyers, engineers, and accountants. He said that we talked about having a purpose for ordinances when we draft them and it would be nice to have a purpose stated here that we could reference back to. His feeling for implementing an ordinance like this, in terms of a purpose, is to allow anybody who is trying to find one of our businesses in town to find them in a higher capacity way and he did not know if there are going to be more professional businesses. He did not know if a real estate agent is a professional (although he felt it is). He had concern that we will see signs popping up for advertising as opposed to being directional. He wanted to know that we are not going to just proliferate the Township with signs. He said that his question is, is professional services what we want here and are targeting?

Mr. Aroneo agreed with a lot of what Mr. Roshto had said, especially about finding a business versus advertising or marketing. It looked like marketing to him and he did not know that we should be involved in that. He said that there are so many ways to find a business now with Google and GPS mapping, for example, and questioned why people have trouble finding places. He questioned if the objective is to market or to help people find their way and said that that is what he was not sure of.

Mr. O'Brien believed that the original objective was to help people find the businesses themselves because there were comments from certain business owners that people had difficulty finding them. He said that the fact that the Board does not want logos, just a particular type of font and the business name with an arrow takes it away from the advertising realm, although every time you put a name in front of people it is a form of advertising.

Mr. Cilino said that his thoughts are based on the answer we just had of how many signs we might need or how many businesses are encompassed. He agreed with Mr. Aroneo and Mr. Roshto. He was concerned about the number of

signs that are already on Valley Rd., as well. It came to his mind that these businesses have pretty much been in the same spot for quite some time and the people that will be visiting those businesses will be predominantly in the immediate area.

Mr. Roshto felt that we should be doing something for our businesses and he thought this was a nice thing to do. He was concerned that we don't know enough yet to know exactly how many signs we are talking about. He said that Mr. Sandow had told us at our last meeting that it is a *minimal* number of signs (like under 12 or something), so from hearing what he said he was not so concerned about that, but when he read "professional services" and he knew that we have these groups that tend to be off the main streets, he felt that we may get more than the 10 or the handful that Mr. Sandow had mentioned. He felt that the Board should be doing something *like* this, however he felt that there may be some way to tweak it to make sure that we are not going to go crazy here with signs.

Mr. Butterworth said that we could probably leave off "the professional" group. For example, if you are going to the dentist, you know where he is. However, if you are going to Murphy's Florist, you may not know. He said that the main concern is that a lot of people will claim professions on these streets and we will get a proliferation of signs.

Mr. Connor recalled that the dentist had testified that he felt he was disadvantaged because he was off of Valley Rd. and he knew that he had tried to purchase on Valley Rd. for the purpose of being more visible but selected a piece of property that was not appropriate.

Mr. Butterworth added that that office has been a dentist's office ever since it was opened.

Mr. Aroneo said that if you are not familiar with the area and have an impacted wisdom tooth and are looking for the dentist that might be more critical than finding the florist. He asked about businesses that are located *on* Valley Rd. and if they would make the argument that we need to put signage on roads *off of* Valley Rd. so that you know which way to turn.

Mr. Connor said that they could not do that under this ordinance.

Mr. Aroneo agreed and said that his question was *if* it could lead to that.

Mr. Cilino asked, if we are thinking in terms of helping businesses out, then wouldn't it be a little biased to selectively set a certain number of businesses for signage. He asked what we would say to the businesses who argue that they were left out of this process.

Mr. Connor said that when this was presented (a long time ago), the fact was that the businesses along Valley Rd. can easily be seen by drivers every day and, therefore, their visibility is very high. If you are off of Valley Rd. on a side street, those businesses are disadvantaged because nobody knows they are there, whereas if a new business is opened on Main St., you will know that the business is there.

The meeting was opened to the public for comments.

Mr. Dennis Sandow said that he was representing the Promotion & Enhancement Committee (PEC). He said that this whole effort started about 5 years ago, or longer, when the Murphy Garden Center opened up on Magnolia Ave. and asked if they could put a sign out on Valley Rd. and they were told by the Board at the time that they would get to it. He said that the Chamber of Commerce produced draft language in September, 2010 that "mucked" around for a year until the process started up again. He said that there have been many opportunities to kill this and today might be just another opportunity. With regard to Warren Ave., he said that there are no consumer oriented businesses there other than the dentist and, unfortunately, he was in the audience tonight prepared to speak but he had to leave the meeting. He said that this whole process has been vetted and referred to the PEC and vetted by them and what you see in front of you is the end result of the PEC's compromises and compromises with the attorney and Mr. O'Brien's rewording of some things. He was not sure it could be polished any more. With regard to the question of signs on both sides of the street versus a double sided sign, the original proposal was, as Mr. Butterworth suggested, a sign on each side of the street favoring each direction of travel. He said that a lot of members of the Board thought that that would lead to clutter by having two sign posts rather than one. He said that the majority of the PEC agreed that one sign post, double sided, would be appropriate and they "skinnied down" the signs from the original proposal which was 5 S.F. to something like 2 S.F. and they will all go on one sign post. To the specific question of clutter on Valley Rd., he said that there are only two intersections on Valley Rd. where these signs would qualify. One is at Poplar Dr. (where there is Murphy Garden Center, the barber, and the medical supplier) and that sign would probably go on the corner in front of the Shop Rite and, if you look closely, you will find that there are no sign posts on that corner. Because of the traffic light, he said that there isn't even a stop sign on that corner. In front of the gas station, he said that there is a post in front of the street sign with a little arrow pointing to the Little League. He said that that intersection is essentially naked, waiting for this to be the first signage. He said that the other sign would be at the intersection of Warren Ave. for Dr. Garafalo's office and, at that intersection (the corner by the Community Center sign board) there is one post right now and it has a double sided sign on it pointing to the DPW. He said that it is a perfect target location to put Dr. Garafalo's sign below the DPW sign. In terms of sign clutter, he said that we have sign clutter problems in this Township that are far beyond these signs. He urged the Board to look at the new Chinese restaurant at the intersection in Millington. He said that there are 5 sign posts within 8' coming up Division Ave. He said that there is a stop sign, a Rt. 287 sign, a sign that has a picture advising you to slow down when you make the bend by the Fire House, and two others. Fortunately, he said that that is not one of the targeted intersections for these signs, so we won't contribute to that. He agreed that there is sign clutter in

the Township, but said that it is beyond the scope of the Board and he certainly did not think that it should hold up this benefit to the businesses that we are targeting to assist. He said that there is a place where we would probably have signs on both sides of the street and that is at the Meyersville Circle, simply because when you enter the circle the sight lines to the other side of the road pass through the center of the circle and you couldn't possibly see the signs and so that would be a judgment call for the engineer to permit a sign post on each side of the street. Otherwise, he said that the PEC has agreed that two signs on one post will work and that seemed to be the consensus of the Board the several times we have talked about it recently.

Mr. Roshto said that if this ordinance had picked the locations of the signs and we said that there are a finite number of locations where we are going to put these signs up, he would feel more comfortable with it. That way he would know that we are not going to just add another one now that a new business comes in that we are not aware of. He asked if that was something that the PEC explored.

Mr. Sandow replied that they explored it and believe that it is a ministerial issue for the officials that are empowered to grant the permit. Secondly, he said that this language says that all permits will be installed only upon approval by the PEC, which means that reluctantly they will wind up being the arbiter of whether or not a particular sign gets installed. He suspected that it will be obvious who the qualifiers are (retails, restaurants, etc.) and said that there are not any places in town that we don't know about and because of the way our zoning is configured, all of our business zones are pretty much on the main roads. He said that it is only weirdly that we have the dentist office on Warren Ave. and the Poplar Dr./Bay St. area, otherwise they are on the main roads and so this will be de minimis and apparently this ordinance will give the PEC the right of veto anyway. He said that that is not to say that some other business could not come in for a site plan review and ask for a variance from this ordinance and that would be up to the Board as to whether they would grant a variance to have the sign installed at some other point. He said that they tried to constrain this to a dozen businesses, including Hillview Farms for example, because they are not at the circle and the Board thinks that the circle is the delineating point and not all of Meyersville Rd.

Mr. Arentowicz asked Mr. Sandow to recap what he did on Valley Rd. and what the signs would be on the Meyersville Circle and then, in summary, to total throughout the town how many directional signs today are we talking about?

Mr. Sandow replied that there are 3 at the intersection of Poplar Dr. and 1 at the intersection of Warren Ave. for the dentist. He said that there are no retail businesses off of Main Ave. or Central Ave. at this time. He said that it is arguable whether or not Humphrey's on Union St. is actually off of Main Ave. because his entrance is in the back – but that would be another one.

Mr. Aroneo noted that there is a hair salon on Main Ave.

Mr. Sandow agreed and said that it is at the intersection of Morris St. and all the other pieces of that strip office building are commercial or industrial, and so she would not qualify. He added that the hair salon has a sign on its Main Ave. side anyway. He said that there are two businesses on Stonehouse Rd. that would qualify (the gymnastics school and the door salesman who has a retail showroom there) and they would have a sign on Division Ave. approximately in front of the Country Farms. There is a farm stand on Meyersville Rd. and the Copper Springs complex which would qualify for signs at Meyersville Circle, but they were the only businesses that he could think of that are off of Meyersville Circle. He also noted that Barton's Pub on Plainfield Rd. would qualify for a sign on Valley Rd. at that intersection.

In response to Mr. Aroneo, Mr. Sandow said that the farm stand on Morrystown Rd. is already covered by a different section of the Ordinance and that whether or not you want to bring him into this or not is the Board's business. He noted that right now he has a much larger sign on the ground than he would qualify for, although according to the Ordinance he is only allowed to have that sign outside for 6 months of the year.

Mr. Arentowicz said that, based upon what Mr. Sandow had just said, he calculated 10 signs.

Mr. Sandow replied that that would be the most – if they all are interested in buying them and he did not know if they will. In terms of sign posts, he said that it is probably more like 5 or 6 separate sign posts in the whole Township.

Mr. Aroneo asked about the businesses on Mountain Ave.

Mr. Sandow replied that the PEC did not put Mountain Ave. on the list, although they probably should have. He said that there is the hair salon (formerly a catering business) and there is the insurance broker and the car repair shop on the other side of the street which would be 3 more that would qualify. On the north side, there is the antique shop that was formerly a barber shop and it has been closed down for a couple of months. He said that if you wanted to eliminate the sign on Mountain Ave., you could add Mountain Ave. to the list. He noted that it is a County road and said that he did not care one way or the other.

Mr. Smargiassi thought the whole purpose was to not include roads such as Plainfield Rd. or Mountain Ave. and that it was to include more roads that we would view as side streets and dead end roads and to help those businesses. He said that, as Mr. Roshto suggested, maybe the ordinance should specifically note at which intersections it would be allowed and they would be the only ones. He said that he would not be in favor of businesses on Plainfield Rd. and Mountain Ave. since those are what he considered more major through streets and they are not in line with what he understood the Board is trying to accomplish.

Mr. Sandow replied that Mr. Roshto's point of view is well taken and he was sure that Mr. O'Brien could add Plainfield Rd. and Mountain Ave. to the list quite readily.

Mr. Aroneo asked how it would be received by the barber shop on Main Ave., for example, when there is a sign on Valley Rd. pointing traffic to a different barber shop, so he can't have one on Valley Rd. but the other barber shop can.

Mr. Sandow replied, "The same way you deal with that barber shop when he says how come I have to pay extra for garbage and the residents in town who pay the same tax rate get garbage for free". He said that there is always some element of discrimination based on the public good. He said that our choice here is to encourage the businesses that are off the main drags because it helps develop lots that should be developed. He said that if you look at the block between Magnolia Ave. and Bay St., which contains a totally vacant lot with a big pine tree and is now a construction storage yard in the back.....

Mr. Aroneo said that the equalizer there is that they paid less for their property because they have no Valley Rd. frontage.

Mr. Sandow replied that they do have valuable frontage on Poplar Dr. He said that if that lot was to be developed, he was sure that they would ask for a sign also. In fact, he said that the availability to put a sign out may increase the value of their lot.

Mr. Aroneo agreed and added, "Perhaps at the expense of another business somewhere else in town".

Mr. Sandow replied that you can't please all of the people all of the time and did not consider it to be discrimination.

Mr. Cilino said that a gentleman appeared before the Township Committee a month or two ago who proposed structures behind the Millington Train Station. He did not know if he will surface again or some other company might take a run at that same spot. In the event that that happens, he asked Mr. Sandow if he would consider that off the main drag. He said that most people would not go through Long Hill into Millington and down unless they had specific business there.

Mr. Sandow replied that the first paragraph of the revisions refers to specific zones that exist today where the signage would be permitted. If that development were to take place, he said that the existing LI-2 Zone would disappear and would be replaced by some mixed multifamily transit village zone yet to be named and defined, in which case it would be outside the scope of this ordinance and the Planning Board, and at the time they suggest creation of the new zone, they would have to grapple with this problem also. He did not see it as a problem that we can grapple with now because it is entirely hypothetical what might ever happen there. He said that it is simply that we have restricted this to particular zones which exist now, today, and which we can inventory today.

Mr. Connor asked if it would take care of the problem if we excluded all County roads.

Mr. Sandow replied that the Meyersville Circle sits at the intersection of two County roads and yet we would want to permit signage at the Meyersville Circle for those few people who might get lost going around circles. He said that it sounded a little imprecise because then somebody is going to have to figure out where the County roads are and he thought we would rather name them. He said that the fact that they are County roads is because they are through and high traffic roads and all permit trucks, for example. He said that County roads are a good way of viewing this, but he felt the streets should be named because that will make the ordinance that much more readable.

Addressing Mr. Sandow, Mr. Aroneo said that if you are in earnest really trying to do a public service and direct people to their destination, you are doing them a disservice by leaving out Main Ave. because the Stirling Hotel is a place that people visit from great distances and they do have charitable events there and he felt that, to leave them out, is doing a disservice.

Mr. Sandow replied that he would love to agree with Mr. Aroneo, however the reality is that there are other retail establishments on Main Ave. which are clamoring to get more traffic, specifically the gluten free bakery and the adjacent jewelry shop.

Mr. Aroneo replied that we are not talking about getting them more business, we are talking about directing the public to their destination.

Mr. Sandow said that he did not know how to frame it and there is a case of real discrimination where will decide which businesses on the street are big enough and popular enough to allow signage, but not the others. He said that, if we have our way with Main Ave. and the Main Ave. Development Plan, there should be a whole lot more places on Main Ave. that would like signs.

Mr. Aroneo said that, judging by the look of Railroad Ave. and their parking lot at 5:00 PM and 6:00 PM on Friday and Saturday evenings, or even Thursday evenings, they don't need to pull people in off the street. But if we are trying to direct people from out of town to the destination, they should be included.

Mr. Sandow replied that he was with Mr. Aroneo on that one, if that is their purpose, but he did not know how to prevent the discrimination and that is a much more blatant form of discrimination.

Mr. Connor felt that if people google the Stirling Hotel or enter it in their GPS, it pops right up. If, however, they are looking for a gluten free bakery, they are never going to put in the name of the gluten free bakery shop.

Mr. Sandow cited The Primavera as an example and said that most of their clientele does come from out of town and it does come from a one off event like a wedding reception and thank God they are right at the curb with big signage because as guests enter town they have no idea where they are going. He said that The Primavera would be another exciting candidate but how could you allow The Primavera without all of the other restaurants on Valley Rd.?

Mr. Connor said that the counter is that those are a couple of very popular places that a lot of people are aware of and they are much more difficult to miss than some of the smaller establishments off the street. He said that Murphy Landscaping is quite large but you don't see it and he felt that they are truly disadvantaged by being off of Valley Rd.

Mr. Sandow said that we could do 100% signage on Warren Ave. but the clutter would be terrible and he certainly did not want to do that. He said that we have enough signage as it is in this Township that nobody pays attention to. He invited members to drive down any road and count the number of neighborhood watch signs, no littering signs, and pooper scooper signs. He said that you drive past them and never even see that they are there, but if you look for them you will find more than enough and they are not communicating with the public because nobody reads them. He said that if we took some of those non-essential signs down we might have a little more room for meaningful, useful signs.

Mr. Cilino said that, from his standpoint and what he heard this evening, he felt that there is a little more thinking that needs to go on. He said that one of the things he hasn't heard is what are other towns that are adjacent to us are doing – how are their signs affecting off main road business. He said that one is Berkeley Heights and one is Basking Ridge. He asked if we have explored and talked to their Township people to see how they have dealt with this issue and maybe they have some ideas that would help us out.

Mr. Connor knew that previously we had looked at a number of other communities on what their signage looked like and it was basically given over to Mr. Sandow to have the PEC look at. He asked what sort of process they used to come up with their recommendations.

Mr. Sandow replied that they viewed the needs of this community and what our signage already looks like. They did not survey surrounding towns. He said that at the last meeting Mrs. Raimer had mentioned Chester and he did not get to look at their signage. He said that he has looked at the signage in Garwood and South Bound Brook and each one has an entirely different style suiting an entirely different need based on how much money either the town or the businessmen had to spend. He said that they could continue to look into that but our specific problem is quite obvious – we have some businesses that we would like to help out by giving them a little more visibility. He said that the size, shape, style and color of that signage is pretty much cookie cutter although he was sure you could find variations in color schemes. The fundamental intent in the town is to give a little support to those businesses. He did not know how Berkeley Heights does it and did not know how many businesses there are on their side streets. He said that Bernard's Township's is a mess because they've got several main areas. He offered to survey it if the Board felt it would do any good. He asked if we find that they haven't done this, does that mean that we should stop also.

Mr. Cilino replied, "No", but said that it would give us more information so that we could point to 4 or 5 towns and come back with some ideas that would help us out. He agreed with the concept of helping businesses that are out of the way. He thought about himself driving through a town and if he wanted to go to a pastry shop, for example, he would call the pastry shop up and ask where their shop is located. However, he said that if he is driving through a town and does not want any pastries, he is not looking for a business that is off site. He said that if you want marketing, that is one thing but marketing should really be done by the business and whatever method they can afford and works for them.

Mr. Connor said that that is what started this 5 years ago. He said that if you are on Valley Rd., it is pretty easy to market – you put up a sign. If you are Murphy's and you are putting in a new flower shop and nursery, you put up the sign on Valley Rd. and now you are equivalent with the other businesses, however we don't allow permit off site signage and, in fact, when they did that they were told that they were in violation and to take the sign down. He said that what you really say is if you are on Valley Rd. you can market your business on Valley Rd. but if you are one lot off of Valley Rd., you are precluded from marketing onto Valley Rd. – the same as all of your other competition.

Mr. Cilino said that a good example is that there was a gun store off of Union Ave. and you really had to know where you were going to get there. However, he said that gun owners gave the owner a call and got directions. He said that his point is that on a Thursday or Friday night or a Monday morning, if you are going down Valley Rd., you are not looking for this particular store. If you are shopping on Saturday, either you know where it is or you don't and you know where it is because of word of mouth or you have seen the advertisement and you are going to be in this locale and want to go there. He said that you are not going to just drive by at 11:30 AM on Saturday morning and see a sign there that says "drugstore" and pull in.

Mr. Aroneo agreed. He said that, in at least the last 18 years, anytime he gets in the car to go somewhere he is not familiar with, he has used MapQuest, Google Maps, and now GPS. He did not feel that anybody just gets in their car anymore and searches for locations. He did not think people even call anymore for directions, you just naturally go for a computer, I Phone, or I Pad.

Mr. Sandow said that Yahoo Maps has Murphy Garden Center in the wrong place. He has written to their map keeper trying to point out to them exactly where Murphy Garden Center is and he has got the numbering on Magnolia Ave. backwards.

Mr. Aroneo said that that is why he uses Google and he just found it in a second precisely in the right spot. He said that he also just found the gluten free shop in one second. He said that it is out there. He said that we talked about this at the Planning Board in 2010 and one of the members asked for information about other towns that have done this and Mrs. Wolfe had reported to the Board on a seminar she had attended and included photos.

Mrs. Wolfe said that the photos she had presented were of what are called “wayfaring signs” which she had taken in Lawrenceville and that the names of the businesses were not given. For example, one said “Bakery” with an arrow directing you to a bakery, etc. She said that she still had the photos and would forward them to the Board members again.

Mr. Connor said that Mr. O’Brien also provided information and asked if he still had it.

Mr. O’Brien replied affirmatively.

Mr. Sandow said that there used to be a florist shop on Main Ave. up until about 3 years ago. The building was then vacant, then contained a hair salon, and now contains a party store. He said that, obviously, a florist business wasn’t very good on Main Ave. He said that Mr. Murphy came into town and offered some competition, but that was the only competition in town, *we think*. But then the Board allowed the two supermarkets to display flowers all across the front of their buildings. He said that, if you are driving down Valley Rd. looking for a florist and then turn your head and look at Shop-Rite, you are going to see an enormous, beautiful, colorful collection of flowers right out there on the sidewalk which the Planning Board has permitted by ordinance. He wondered if permitting Shop-Rite to display flowers on the sidewalk isn’t a form of discrimination against Murphy’s Garden Center because he doesn’t have a sidewalk or a frontage on Valley Rd. to display his flowers.

Mr. Aroneo suggested reviewing 1-800-flowers over this same period and see what you come up with. He said that that is what killed the business and it happened nationwide.

Mr. Sandow understood, however, he said that the point is that the Shop-Rite, by being allowed to display flowers all across its front façade, has got a tremendous competitive advantage for its floral department over Murphy’s Garden Center who cannot even put a little sign put up.

Mr. Smargiassi said that at the core of this is that, at the end of the day, location is key to retail and somebody paid for that frontage and they paid more and every business has an opportunity to locate whereas they so choose and, for whatever reasons, people locate in different locations. He felt no obligation whatsoever to try to help anyone gain additional advertising or roadside frontage and to said to sit here and talk about how this business can do this and that business can do that, he did not really care and did not feel that is why we are here. He said that, if there are a couple of intersections or a couple of streets where we want to help via some directional signing, then so be it, but felt that the rest of this discussion is irrelevant. He said that there are just a handful of intersections and his feeling was that maybe we should just name those intersections, if you even want to do that, but that is where he would feel comfortable. He did not feel comfortable about many of the other intersections such as the County intersections and others that have been named. In his opinion, there are only a handful of intersections where you would want to do this and felt it has to be very limiting. He said that the idea that it was more wayfaring, such as a bakery without specific names, maybe that is something that would be a compromise for some people. He did not really care about this discussion about what people can display on Valley Rd. and one has a sign and one cannot.

Mr. Sandow felt that, as a practical matter, the fact that we have defined these to the business zones means that you could look at a zoning map and see the intersections which would qualify. Because our business and industrial zones are on the main streets and the fact that we have further conditioned it so that it is walk-in traffic only and not pure industrial or construction yards almost makes it easy for anybody to pick those intersections out. He said that, if you exclude Main Ave., on Valley Rd. you’ve only got Warren Ave. and Poplar Dr. between there and Morristown Rd. He said that, if we are going to put Plainfield Rd. and Mountain Ave. into the mix, there are only 3 intersections on Valley Rd. within a mile that would qualify. Similarly, with Division Ave., he said that there is only one side street off of Division Ave. Off of Long Hill Rd., he said that there are no commercial zones. He said that he mentioned it to cover the bottom end, but on the bulk of Long Hill Rd. there is no opportunity for signage.

Mr. Roshto said that it sounded like Mr. Sandow would support the idea of naming the intersections.

Mr. Sandow replied that, if that is what it takes to get this passed, then “Yes”, he would support coming up with a list. He said that he was sorry to say that each time it has come up in the past 5 years, there is a new list of “show stoppers” and asked what else it would take.

Mr. Arentowicz was in favor of restricting it to those intersections. He said that we are talking about 10 signs and are trying to help these businesses that are off the beaten path. If there is expansion down the road, maybe it will be 12 or 13 signs. He suggested restricting it to those cross streets and said, “Let’s get this done”.

Mr. Connor said that that sounded like a fairly good recommendation and said that he would like to poll the Board.

Mr. Aroneo noted that one business owner on Valley Rd. had left the meeting.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Ms. Michele Cavett said that she runs the karate studio that is actually on Valley Rd. She was present in support of the Chamber of Commerce and knew that this topic has gone on for some time prior to her even getting involved with the Chamber, however it seemed to her to be quite compelling. She said that she has been here for 10 years and did not even know that Dr. Garafolo's office was located on Warren Ave. and, therefore, felt that there is very compelling reason not to market businesses, but to help people find their way in a clear cut way. Addressing Mr. Aroneo, she said that she did not have an I Phone, an I Pad, or a GPS and does not normally ask for directions. She felt that there are others like herself and that the proposed signage would help support businesses by directing people to those businesses that they are looking for.

Mr. Roshto asked Ms. Cavett how she would feel about the concept of wayfaring signs that was discussed, as opposed to naming the businesses.

Ms. Cavett replied that, from a practical point of view, the Board's point of view, and from looking at the development of the Township, she would think that is the right thing to do. From the Chamber's point of view and if she was one of those businesses (which she confirmed she is not), she said that she would absolutely, positively want her name up there and from a practical point of view she felt that that is the right way to do it.

As someone who is running a business on Valley Rd., Mr. Aroneo asked Ms. Cavett if she would want to have directional signs on side streets such as, for her business, on Mountain Ave. and/or Morristown Rd. or other roads directing people in her direction.

Ms. Cavett felt that that was an interesting question, noting that her karate studio is the only one located in the general vicinity except for one in Berkeley Heights or one in Basking Ridge. She said that she is pretty much near the intersection of Mountain Ave. and Valley Rd. and, in all honesty from a business perspective, she would think "How do you get that sign there?". She said she would guess she would come to the Board and ask how do you that sign there and the Board would reply that for 5 years they have been coming here and trying to do this and, if you want to do something different for your business, this is the process you would need to go through and the people that you would need to get in front of. She said that she would look at it in that way.

Dr. Rae said that, to him, that is a problem because where do you really draw the line and we have created precedent here that can be used. He felt that it makes it very difficult to ultimately say "No" to other businesses who, quite rightfully, want the same. He felt that that is the main sticking point of the ordinance and from the discussion he heard tonight.

Mr. Aroneo agreed and said that, if we do this, it is telling him that we have to get it right, especially if it is something that could grow around the town in the future. He felt that we should be sure that we get the dimensions, look, and feel exact.

Mr. Sandow said that we have a standard sign ordinance for Valley Rd. and it calls for wood carved and a certain size and, as you drive down Valley Rd., count the number of signs that actually meet that. He said that the Oceana Grill said that they needed a bigger sign because people are moving fast when they go past and Shop-Rite has their own big sign because they are big and all the gas stations try to outdo each other with back illuminated signs which are forbidden and none of them has a wood look because that is a marketing thing. He said that we have made exceptions for businesses because we want to help them brand themselves or be identified and Valley Rd. is "pretty garish" when it comes to signage *in spite of* our Ordinance. He said that there are very few wood look signs of the proper size. He said that we are talking about a little bitty thing here to help the businesses that are off of Valley Rd. and to say that we want to create a standard belies the fact that we have a standard and nobody follows it and we are continually granting variances. Referring to the final Resolution on Walgreen's when it comes out, he said it too will be non-standard. He asked why this is the place where we have to create and enforce a standard when we haven't enforced the standard to date, even in cases of recent Board variances on signs.

Mr. Cilino said that the philosophy of not enforcing the standard or making it better from this point on because it hasn't been done in the past doesn't quite balance out for him.

Addressing Mr. Sandow, Mr. Roshto said that you are actually making the opposite argument. He said that you are saying that *this* could get out of control. He said that we thought we were doing the right thing when years ago when we set up the sign ordinances for Valley Rd. and, apparently, we didn't. To Mr. Aroneo's point, he felt that we have to get this right and he was not sure we are there yet.

Dr. Rae said that he was not sure if we can get it right because we are potentially opening the door as was discussed. He did not know that the good we are doing necessarily justifies it because most people can find there way to businesses and that is just the way things are nowadays. For him, it is a fatal flaw and he just did not think that we could make it tight enough.

Mr. Connor said that we started this 5 years ago with the idea that we wanted to stimulate the right kind of businesses within the Valley Rd. business district and within the Township and those areas that were off the main roads were difficult to attract businesses, particularly if we wanted commercial businesses. He said that that was the objective of

trying to help the right kind of business development and that was still his objective. He said that he has seen lots of proposals and there is no “silver bullet” or it would have been done a few years ago.

Mr. Aroneo said that there may be a reason it wasn't done in the last 5 years and that might be a part of it – that the Board couldn't agree on what it should look like and what the limitations would be.

Mr. Connor said that some of that was true and then it got pushed behind because if there were other higher priority items. He said that the Chamber pushed as to why there isn't such signage and it finally made it back on to the agenda, but only because we had finally completed some of the higher priorities. He said that it wasn't necessarily disagreement that we shouldn't do something.

Mr. Cilino said that we have talked about several items and he did not think that the issue here is to let this go out until September of this year, but we discussed how many signs and where they would be placed and we want a better view of where they would be placed and how many signs are in the surrounding area and what that would do to the topography of the land. He noted that we have been discussing this topic for the past 50 minutes which he felt was pretty exorbitant for something as simple as a sign. He felt that if we got that information back by the next meeting and spent 10 minutes looking at it, we could just vote on it, “Yes or No”. He said that there is no need to debate it anymore and he felt that we all know where we stand. He said that, maybe there isn't a solution, but to continue discuss this and come back at the next meeting and discuss it again, he felt is a disservice to our time and to everyone.

Mr. Connor felt that that was a good suggestion. He said that the major issue is whether we even want it. He felt that the issue is a single sign versus a 2 part sign and, given what he heard, a single sign is preferable if we do something forward. He said that there is a question of do we want to define “professional” in such a way that professionals may be limited to dentists and physicians, or just use “dentists and physicians” and not use “professional”.

Mr. Aroneo said that, if we are going to do it, he wouldn't object to any commercial adding that a welder could be just as sought after as a dentist.

Mr. Connor agreed and said that dentists and doctors could be considered under any commercial businesses. He said that another item was to specifically name the intersections where signs would be allowed, and, finally providing all of the Board members with background material that is available. He did not think that new research is needed because he knew that some of that was done. He said that, if Mrs. Wolfe and Mr. O'Brien would look in their files and send out packages containing what was presented over the last 5 years, that should allow the Board to review it.

Mr. Cilino said that he would just like a list of the streets. He said that he would take his own time to go out and see what they look like and envision how they fit in to the streets. He said that that is all he needed and he would come back and say “Yeah or Nay”, based upon what he was seeing and how it worked. He said that he has driven hundreds of thousands of miles throughout the country and can envision what another post would look like where it is sitting and how it is going to affect the area.

Mr. Connor felt that the material is useful and noted that it is available. He added that it gives an idea of what some surrounding towns look like.

In response to Mr. Roshto, Mr. Connor said that he did not mention the concept of wayfaring signs. He said that that is another item to decide – wayfaring signs versus specific signs for a commercial establishment.

Mr. Aroneo asked about the maintenance of signs after they are installed.

Mr. Connor replied that there was a long discussion on it.

Mr. Aroneo said that, if it is going to happen, he would like to see some provision when it is in there.

Mr. Arentowicz asked if the issue had been resolved concerning a business on Valley Rd. and whether they would want a sign on Mountain Ave. pointing to Valley Rd., or are we not addressing that?

Mr. Connor said that, by this ordinance, it would not allow that and it is not allowed in the current ordinances. He said that, if we get into wayfaring signs, it tends to be a different issue because wayfaring signs could be appropriate and noted that they are much more all encompassing.

Mr. Sandow asked, if you take one of the businesses with the deepest pockets in town such as Millington Bank, what if they said that they would like a sign coming in from Berkeley Heights pointing in its general direction, and then another one at the intersection of Long Hill Rd. and Division Ave. They might say that putting a wayfaring sign at our local intersections doesn't do us any good because all our neighbors know where they are and so we want a sign down by Berkeley Heights and that is why they have tried to avoid that by saying that qualifying businesses get exactly one pair of signs – period. He said that this could get out of control. He asked what if Burger King said that it wanted a sign at the Meyersville Circle and all along the way? He said that you could extend that argument, although it looks clean at the intersections along Valley Rd., some of the other major intersections in town along County roads could get pretty complicated, especially at the intersections where there are no stop signs to slow traffic down to read these signs.

Mr. Connor felt that the examples that we have contain both types of signs. He said that it is an issue that will have to be decided, but opening that discussion now would take a while longer. He suggested moving on to the next agenda item.

Before moving on, Mr. Cilino asked if there has been any assignment as to who will do these tasks.

Mr. Connor said that Mr. O'Brien will have the brunt of providing the material and Mrs. Wolfe will also provide the material that she provided previously.

Mr. Sandow said that he would also survey the surrounding towns, take some photos, and get some counts from their Chambers of Commerce. He said that it may not be ready for the next meeting.

Mr. Connor said that he could not guarantee that this will get on the agenda for 2 weeks from now in any case. He asked Mr. Sandow to provide his material to Mrs. Wolfe for distribution.

X X X X X X X X X

DISCUSSION

VALLEY ROAD REVISED MASTER PLAN ELEMENT – NONRESIDENTIAL ISSUES

Mr. Connor said that when we last left off, we had looked at the Master Plan and had come to some agreement on the residential wording and now we will go through the other wording that was on the document which was non-residential.

Mr. O'Brien said that a draft was distributed to the Board and at the bottom in very small type it says "Nonresidential revisions by PB with res changes from 042412 050312". On the next page, he said that he explained that all of the residential entries that the Board directed to be removed from the document at our last meeting were removed and all of the nonresidential changes that were either questions, comments on, or an item of concern by any of the Board members that expressed an opinion, were identified in the current document. He did not go through and list author by author, but rather took everybody's suggestions and comments and put them in there for the Board to look at as a whole.

He said that there were none on Pg. 1. On Pg. 2 under Item IV under Board Recommendations, No. 1. Business Development, he said that there are two items that were tagged by Board members.

Mr. Cilino asked what a river related business is.

Mr. O'Brien replied that when this was developed, the Board wanted to encourage river related businesses as in a possible canoe livery or somebody providing services to people who would be on the river, such as a canoeist or a kayaker. He said that, under Item 1. Business Development, there was an item that a Board member tagged "Review and change regulations to make the land use process more attractive, less expensive and quicker for developers with appropriate projects while also ensuring that sound environmental practices are followed". He asked the Board if it wished for that to be removed or what its pleasure was.

Mr. Connor said that it seemed to him that that is an appropriate objective for business development that increases municipal revenue. He said that he had a hard time disagreeing with that and suggested leaving it in if there is no further comment.

Mr. O'Brien said that the one item directly underneath it was to "Include business owners in the defining and developing of business friendly practices and appropriate incentives for new construction and remodeling".

Dr. Rae recalled discussing it at one of the meetings and it was found to be somewhat redundant because they would be included along with everybody else. He did not see why we would single them out.

Mr. Connor said that the reason it was put in was to indicate that we were trying to be business friendly and make sure that they were included when we developed the business district.

Dr. Rae replied that, even so, they shouldn't be given more voice than anybody else in the community and it seemed to suggest to him that their opinions are somehow more valid than others in the community. He said that he would like to see it removed.

Mr. Cilino concurred and saw it as a way to slow down processes instead of speeding them up. He said that the more people you add, the more people with a vested interest in what they are discussing and the slower the process and more diverse that process becomes.

Mr. Smargiassi referred to the first deleted bullet and asked Mr. O'Brien, by specifically noting that our goal is to make it less expensive, quicker, and more attractive, if it exposes the Board to an argument down the road that we haven't done these things (in someone's opinion).

Mr. O'Brien replied that he did not think that it does because of the back language to that which is "the appropriate project and sound environmental practices". He said that that is a qualifier to anything that anyone could bring in. He said that this is a Master Plan goal and is *not* a recommendation for an ordinance, so we are not suggesting that

the ordinance be rewritten in such a way that it says business owners or developers get some kind of preferential treatment and get pushed through. Instead, this becomes part of that visionary goal for the Township as a whole where we would like to use regulations that encourage an appropriate development application to come to the Board or to the Township. He felt that there is enough back language to that that qualifies it and preserves the Township's position.

Mr. Connor said that this is one of the things that we have actually implemented in some of the recent things that were passed.

Mr. O'Brien felt that Mr. Smargiassi is making the point that you don't want to "encourage" people to come in unless there are appropriate safeguards for that encouragement.

Mr. Aroneo agreed with Mr. Smargiassi and said that every application or change in the Master Plan always provides for a public comment period where the business owner, developer, or whomever could come before the Board.

Mr. O'Brien said that every application that is affected by this district has to have site plan approval.

Mr. Aroneo agreed and said that they already have access to this Board in a friendly way.

Mr. Cilino did not see the necessity for that paragraph. He said that it is a given, based upon what we are talking about. He said that, hopefully, that is what we are trying to do – to make it easier for the people who qualify to come in and not put obstacles in their way but to help them build a bridge across those obstacles. He said that it helps us and helps them to join a partnership in our Township and if we are not doing that, there is something wrong with our process.

Mr. Connor agreed that we need to do that under any circumstances. He said that whether we keep it in or take it out, it is up to the Board.

Mr. Cilino said that his point is that this should be something that is a given. If it is not, whether you have the language in here or not, we are missing the boat and something is wrong and we need to address it and move forward. He said that we can leave the wording in there, but he just did not think it is relevant given our processes and in any entity at all.

Mr. Connor felt that everyone agrees and said that the question is whether to leave it in or not.

Several Board members suggested taking it out.

Mr. O'Brien said that, unfortunately, in terms of municipal land use, unless it is spelled out as a goal or some type of statement in a Master Plan, no one can use this statement.

Mr. Cilino said that he was looking at the language in the "Business Development" and everything points to change prohibited uses of the land use Ordinance to ensure that all appropriate business activities are encouraged, allow business and commercial uses to coexist with offices, etc. He said that this is all business friendly. He said that this paragraph is also, in a different way, talking about business friendly, it is just not saying the same thing. It has less expensive thrown in which really may or may not be under our control. He said that, at a larger level with less detail, we should put things in there that are in our control and we don't have expenses as in our control. He said that we may *try* to keep expenses down, but making it less expensive – he did not know that you can put that in. Also, quicker for developers – he said that that is not under our control either. He questioned what we could possibly put in there unless we say that the Township should be as efficient as possible in handling or working with developers. He wanted to change the language around and said, if we are going to put a paragraph in there, then let's put something in there that is in our control and these things are not.

Mr. O'Brien replied that within the last year this Board has actually taken two actions that did specifically reduce expenses for developers. One was to institute a Zoning Permit which clarified a lot of processes and regulations and made it easier and cheaper for people to navigate the system. He said that another thing was the Checklist that has recently been adopted by the Board and Township Committee which also did pretty much the same thing, so there are some processes that are within your control and there are a lot of others that are not, particularly on the developer's side and what they choose to do.

With regard to quicker for developers, Mr. Roshto said there are things we could be doing, for example, automation, tools, permits, etc. – we could use this language to drive ordinances to make our permits available on line. He felt that it is a valuable thing to leave in.

Dr. Rae asked if that wasn't something that we would do in the normal course of business. He said that it seemed obvious to him and that is why it did not seem right to him that it is in there. He felt that that is something that we should be striving to do in the normal course of business.

Mr. O'Brien said that it is up to the Board and, if the Board feels that this is an obvious statement and that it truly believes in it, then it should be here because this is something that you need to communicate on paper to somebody who looks at the Master Plan and Ordinances. If it is something that you don't believe in or feel is redundant, then he felt it should be taken out.

Mr. Arentowicz said, if it is in our normal course of business as Planning Board members and we try to do this in everything we do, then we don't need to state it.

Mr. O'Brien replied that it is a Board decision as to whether it wants to state it or not state it. He said that he was just saying that if the Board believes this is its policy, then it is better off stating it in the Master Plan, but it is up to the Board.

Mr. Roshto said that he would argue that this is *not* a normal course of business, this is a typical thing that highly efficiently run businesses would like to do. He felt that what we are really saying is that this is the kind of way we want to run or manage our Township going forward.

Mr. Aroneo said that the word "developers" to him was troublesome. He said that, in the few areas we are talking about, it looks like they were designed to service developers, whereas he wanted to provide the same service to everyone, whether they are a resident who needs a deck or a developer who seeks a full site plan.

Mr. O'Brien replied that it could be changed to "applicants".

Mr. Connor liked "applicants" better and said that this is the Valley Rd. Business District and, if we wanted to make it for everybody, it would be at the head of the Master Plan overall. He felt that "applicant" makes it generic and is better.

Mr. Aroneo said that if it is the Board's goals, maybe it should be at the head of the entire Master Plan instead of in the Valley Rd. component.

Mr. Cilino referred to Item 111. "Vision Statement" and said that that should be driving our process in this Board. For him, it has a greater scope than just the "Business Development". He said that we should have language in there driving everything – reviewing and trying to make it easier.

Mr. Connor agreed. He said that, if we were going to redo the whole thing, we might reword this and look again at the overall Master Plan for the entire community. But right now, he felt that we are trying to take the Valley Rd. Business District and use it as a base and make construction modifications to that and not start over again.

Mr. Cilino replied that he was not suggesting that we start over or go back to the Master Plan. He said he was suggesting for the Valley Rd. Business District Element if we want to insert something more far reaching in the Master Plan, that would be great.

Mr. Connor suggested for now leaving it in and changing the word from "developer" to "applicant". There were no objections. He then referred to another deleted item on Pg. 2 where he had reworded it to read "Include the community and business owners in defining and developing friendly practices and appropriate incentives for new construction and remodeling". He questioned if the Board would like to have that in at all and, if so, would they like it reworded?

Mr. Roshto said that he would like to see it removed. Others agreed.

Under Item 3. "Environmental Best Practices", Mr. O'Brien said that there was a comment about adding a goal concerning flood mitigation as well as the item above that about bonus lot coverage and the comment was to remove that as well.

Mr. Cilino asked for help in understanding how we can mitigate in every situation in an area that has a very high water table and a very solid footing in terms of shale and clay where the water does not penetrate the ground easily. He understood that this is to absorb but, if we get an event, that water is going to traverse over whatever we put in there and continue on its way. If it is not, and comes down like a light rainfall, then that might help but it is also going to be absorbed into the ground at a slower rate because the rate of fall is slower. He said that he understood and agreed that we can't just allow waters to go anywhere they want, but by the same token, is this too complex for the area that we are in?

Mr. O'Brien said that the language is fairly all encompassing in that it points out several options and then says "other best management practices" which we know from previous discussions refers to a State Manual and it discusses whatever is appropriate for stormwater management. So each individual case should be judged individually with whatever is appropriate for that individual application.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that there are a number of things you can do with stormwater depending upon what your development is. If it is a detached garage for one car, it is relatively small and you might be on a 3 acre lot and then you could probably deal with it on site with a surface water infiltration area, a drywell, etc. If you have something like a retail facility going up with 50% impervious cover, you are going to need something more substantial such as a controlled detention basin. He said that it is true that the soils are a limiting factor, but he felt that the point of the statement is to say "do what you can with it".

With regard to the comment "Add goal concerning flood mitigation", Mr. Connor asked if there was a recommendation on what that goal should look like.

Mr. Smargiassi said that he may have been the one to mention that during previous discussions. He said that if Mr. O'Brien feels it is covered in other places, that is fine, but an acknowledging comment was added that this area is essentially surrounded by both the floodway and flood plain of the Passaic River and certain parts of this area have flooded recently and we would just flag it.

Mr. Arentowicz said that you would want to encourage flood mitigation practices in this area.

Mr. Butterworth felt that that is all you can say and it should be very general.

Mr. Lemanowicz agreed and said that the NJDEP has the jurisdiction over a flood plain, so you can say something but you can't really tread too much on their jurisdiction.

In response to Mr. Roshto, Mr. Aroneo agreed that we can do the 15 Point Plan but added "and other practices" to help with the flood mitigation and go *beyond* the NJDEP's requirements.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that all he was saying was that the Board is not the sole jurisdiction when you get in to flood plain matters.

Mr. Aroneo agreed that the NJDEP is the jurisdiction but said that we can encourage other practices.

Mr. Lemanowicz agreed and said, in fact, the Ordinance has a Flood Damage Protection section for that purpose.

Mr. O'Brien added that there is a Stormwater Element to the Master Plan which should really address on a town-wide basis all of our concerns and solutions. He said that this merely refers to Valley Rd., so putting in a comment about flood mitigation would certainly be appropriate as it is in any area with a flooding problem. But to go really comprehensively, he thought should be something addressed in the Stormwater Element (which he believed it is).

Mr. Connor agreed and said that given that if Valley Rd. is going to continue to be a reasonable commercial area, we have to focus on flood mitigation there because, without it, the viability is compromised.

Mr. Aroneo felt that Mr. Connor's statement was a good one for the Master Plan and said that that was an excellent way to phrase it.

Mr. O'Brien noted that something to that effect is in the Stormwater Element. Referring to Item 3 "Environmental Best Practices", he asked if it was the Board's intention to leave "Provide bonus lot coverage in exchange for higher landscaping requirements for new buildings" out? Several Board members answered affirmatively.

With regard to signalization, Mr. Smargiassi did not feel that more traffic lights and signals should be added to Valley Rd. and that we should use the intersections that we currently have to funnel any additional traffic.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that what he was concerned about is in order to install a signal, you need to satisfy warrants (which are essentially proofs, but the NJDEP calls them warrants) in order to have the signal go in. So, if the warrants are satisfied but the Township is taking the position that we don't want it, that may now put you on the liability side to say the warrants are satisfied but if you don't put it in, you are ignoring the safety issues set forth by the warrants.

Mr. Aroneo replied that that might be true, but he thought that you could find warrants for signalization at just about every intersection on Valley Rd. He said that they do it by traffic counts and they are pretty low. He felt that this statement is trying to say that we don't want to stop 10 times in the business district and we don't want 1/10 of a mile increments where there is a light. He said that people want to drive straight through unless they have to stop. He felt that the dominant direction wants to keep flowing and that when you have this type of development there could be a propensity to add signals at every possible intersection to allow people to enter and exit which would make sense in certain areas, but not every area. He said that you see a lot of towns putting up unnecessary signals and it is a nuisance.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that one of the design criteria is also the distance between signals which would go in favor of the way Mr. Aroneo is talking about it. He just wondered if it should be softened.

Mr. Aroneo said that that would be part of the application but does it need to be part of the Master Plan? He said that someone who wants that will present that.

Mr. O'Brien said that, perhaps, the Board might want to use the word "discourage" instead of "avoid". In that way it is discretionary on the Board's part and he said that much of it is out of our hands anyway because the County DOT will be making that decision with our input.

Mr. Smargiassi suggested adding "Encourage use of existing signalization and discourage new signalization". He noted that across from Plainfield Ave. one property is directly across from it but there are multiple properties that may or may not have some future development on them and you would want all of those properties to somehow tie into that one signal.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that you could almost have a service road that goes behind it.

Mr. Smargiassi said that last year, in the case of the property across the street, the property had access to Morristown Rd. but was not going to use it to access the traffic signal which seemed like something we would want to encourage. He said that, if you add “Encourage use of existing signalization and discourage...”, maybe that helps us.

Mr. Butterworth felt that was better.

Mr. Connor agreed.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the bullet would read “Discourage new signalization of intersections on Valley Rd. while encouraging use of existing signals and providing for traffic calming strategies, etc.”

Mr. Arentowicz suggested reversing it to encourage existing and discourage new.

Mr. O’Brien suggested “Encourage use of existing signalization for new development, discourage new signalization of intersections on Valley Rd., while providing for traffic calming strategies”.

Dr. Rae asked what a traffic calming strategy is.

Mr. Lemanowicz replied that, instead of putting in a speed bump or a stop sign, there are a number of traffic calming strategies. He said that some places will put in a circle, but in N.J. we are getting away from them because we have learned. He said that there are also areas where you would have parking on both sides of the road in two lanes and they will just not allow the parking in a short stretch and narrow the road. He said that it is not as direct as a stop sign or a speed bump, it is more of a strategy of visual that will encourage you to slow down and make you pay attention a little bit more. He said that he could provide some examples.

Mr. O’Brien added that things could be used in the pavement such as rumble strips or speed humps (or bumps) that also physically slow vehicles down. He said that when people look ahead and see a narrower roadway, they slow down.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that there are also “speed tables” that go up and then come back down again. It is very subtle rather than like a speed bump. It is calming rather than stopping you and is not a restriction.

Dr. Rae noted that if you were to exit the Stirling Fine Wines store on a Saturday afternoon, it can get backed up. He asked if you had traffic calming strategies in place, wouldn’t that exacerbate the situation?

Mr. Lemanowicz replied that, if you have a backup, that is not what a traffic calming strategy is for. He said that it is to slow down the traffic on the through road so that people can get in and people waiting in line can get out quicker because vehicles are not going 45 mph or 50 mph pass that driveway – maybe they are only doing 30 mph. He said that you can avoid accidents better because people aren’t going as fast and there are more spaces.

Dr. Rae asked if would actually make a situation worse because now you have more of a backup?

Mr. Lemanowicz replied that you would have to take a look at the traffic to see the actual traffic pattern and what is appropriate.

Mr. O’Brien said that each problem has a unique solution.

Mr. Roshto asked Mr. Lemanowicz to explain the last sentence which reads “This will change Valley Road from a through street to a destination”. He asked how those two things are changing us to a destination.

Mr. Lemanowicz replied that the idea is if you are traveling down Valley Rd. at 35 mph, you are not really paying attention. If you are traveling slower, he said that you have more time to take in what is going around you, theoretically, which allows you to pull into an entrance rather than to realize that you missed it.

Mr. Cilino said that we should also keep in mind that Valley Rd. is a through thoroughfare just by its location. He said that we do need a calming affect but he was not sure that 35 mph does it. He believed that the speed limit in the center of Basking Ridge is 25 mph and said that it is also a thoroughfare and the tendency is to speed. He said that the speed is set at 35 mph and you may be pushing it at 40 mph which preempts what Mr. Lemanowicz spoke about slowing down. He said that, if you really want to slow down traffic, you have to go to a lower speed limit. He said that, if you look at the Master Plan on how we want to develop Valley Rd. with additional businesses and not as much driving back and forth, then there have got to be some walkways and a way to transition across the street. In order to do that, he said that you’ve got the yield issue and it does slow down traffic and causes some bottlenecks. As far as the last sentence goes, he said that he did not particularly care for it and did not see it adding any value.

Mr. Connor said that Valley Rd. is a connection of two roads that are more country like. He said that when you come in from Berkeley Heights, you get in to a residential area which you would normally slow down on and then you get into the business district and you’ve got sort of a fast highway and then the next thing you know you are on another little road that is a residential road and so you’ve got this 1 ½ mile strip of road that looks like a highway but on both sides are residential roads. He saw the calming effect of saying why can’t you continue the feeling of that residential road all through the middle of the Valley Rd. Business District through some sort of calming because it is an anomaly. It is just a small piece of Morris County road connecting two other counties and it ought to look a

little more rural than it does. He felt that trying to change the look and feel of Valley Rd. into something that is not so highway looking would be appropriate.

Exiting Poplar Dr. from the Shop Rite, Mr. Cilino said that the number of people going through a red light or last minute amber light exceeds 50%. He said that that tells him that they are going fast and they want to go faster (which is the tendency) as the light either changes or turns red. He was not sure what the strategy from a traffic control philosophy is but he was sure that it has to be looked at as well.

Mr. Aroneo said that he sort of agreed with Mr. Cilino. He said that he heard one traffic engineer speak one time and what he said was in response to residents trying to limit traffic (but not necessarily calm it) and he said that the best thing to do is keep it moving. He said that there is a tremendous amount of volume on Valley Rd. and described it as a highway and said that we must keep it moving. He did not know how practical it is to discourage drivers from using Valley Rd. as a thoroughfare to push them onto Rt. 78.

Mr. O'Brien replied that you don't have to do that – they will do it themselves. He said that either Valley Rd. or Rt. 78 works for them and they will make the choice.

Mr. Connor asked the Board if it wanted to leave the entire statement in with the changes that Mr. O'Brien had suggested. He also asked if "Restore Valley Road to a 2 lane road with appropriate turning lanes and designated parking areas" should be kept in the document or dropped.

Mr. Cilino suggested "This should increase business visibility" as opposed to "Diminish the through street and a final destination".

Mr. Connor suggesting leaving it in (with the suggestion that Mr. Cilino had made) and during the public hearing we can always make a final modification.

In response to Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Cilino said that this should increase business visibility or awareness.

Mr. Roshto felt that it should be removed and the two sentences are stronger by not having anything there.

Mr. Cilino said that he agreed that it is a first shot but it seemed like there was a little resistance, so he wanted to put in some different language.

Mr. Roshto replied that he had not heard resistance on this side.

Mr. Cilino said that he would prefer to remove the sentence.

Mr. O'Brien said that the first sentence still reads then "Encourage use of existing signalization for new development, discourage new signalization of intersections on Valley Rd., while providing for traffic calming strategies to reduce the speed of vehicles".

Mr. Cilino said that he thought the suggestion was to put the calming strategy first.

Mr. Arentowicz replied that "encourage" was going to be first and "discourage" second, as Mr. O'Brien had read.

Mr. O'Brien read the bullet in Item 4 which states "Restore Valley Road to a 2 lane road with appropriate turning lanes and designated parking areas".

Mr. Arentowicz said that there was discussion at the last meeting that, when this was drafted several years ago, we did not have the turning lane and now we've got the turning lane and it is a 2 lane road.

Mr. Connor said that we have met the Master Plan requirement. He suggested that it read "Retain Valley Rd. as a 2 lane road with appropriate....." so that if the County someday wants to put in a 4 lane road, we can turn to our Master Plan that says to retain it as a 2 lane road.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked about the designated parking areas since there is not parking allowed on Valley Rd.

Mr. Connor felt that we could just stop at "appropriate parking lanes" and get rid of "designated parking areas". The Board members agreed.

Mr. Connor said that "Encourage street parking where appropriate" was deleted. He said that this doesn't just say Valley Rd. and would mean off of Valley Rd. He had a problem with removing it entirely and felt that it should be removed certainly from Valley Rd. and Plainfield Rd., but on some of the side streets (in particular on Bay St.) he felt that it *is* appropriate.

Mr. Aroneo suggested "Encourage street parking on appropriate side streets".

The Board members were in favor of his suggestion.

Mr. Cilino referred to the bullet stating “Use the tree-lined ambiance and pedestrian and bicycle presence to help slow and calm traffic”. He said that he read it as that we are using pedestrians to slow traffic. He said that he was looking at it from a litigation standpoint if someone gets hit and looks at this. He said that, if it were him, he would get the best attorney he could find and probably win a lot of money.

Mr. Aroneo said that we should almost slow the traffic for the benefit of pedestrians and bicyclists.

Mr. Connor said that the objective was for having some walkways and bicycle paths to get them *off* of the street rather than on the street as they are now.

Mr. Roshto said that it really belongs under calming and we already discussed calming.

Mr. Cilino suggested that it just be removed.

Mr. O’Brien said that the Board might want to think about the “tree-lined ambiance” part because of the Shade Tree Commission’s presentation to the Township Committee 2 years ago about a tree-lined Valley Rd. and how that in and of itself would be one of many traffic calming strategies, as well as to restore an ambiance to the street.

Mr. Aroneo did not have an objection to using the “tree-lined ambiance”.

Regarding pedestrian and bicycle presence, Mr. O’Brien said that where there is activity, people slow down because the roadway is narrowed. He felt that the original Board, when they talked about this, considered that if you can get people to park at Valley Rd. and be able to walk to the other stores, shops, or whatever else they were going to do, that increased pedestrian activity which increased overall activity on the street which, in itself, served as a traffic calming measure.

Mr. Aroneo said that that might be true and this Board is trying to be forward thinking but, in reality, a child was killed on Valley Rd. on a bicycle, so he felt that we should see the calming first and then encourage pedestrians and bicyclists. If that actually happens in 5 or 10 years in a review, he said that then it could be added in.

Mr. Roshto noted another bullet/goal which is to create paths for pedestrians and bicyclists and that is more safety oriented and will serve the same purpose. He said that the Township Committee recently passed a Resolution supporting Complete Streets. He asked Mr. O’Brien if he could provide any information on complete streets.

Mr. O’Brien replied that the program is one that was started by the NJDOT to encourage all users to use a street. He said that it is to encourage everybody to be able to use the street, so there are trucks, busses, people, bicyclists, cars, etc. and everybody gets to use the roadways safely.

Mr. Aroneo added that it is in different ways and that some of it is a hard separation where it is appropriate and some of it is just signage or a stripe – whatever it is to encourage everyone to use the street together and share the roadway.

Mr. Roshto said that examples are also tightening up the road and the angles of roads where they curve. Complete Streets talk about making sharper turns because apparently that slows traffic down somewhat rather than allowing them to go through. Also, to build corner grassy areas – all kinds of ideas that calm the area and encourage pedestrians, bikes, etc. He asked the Board if something should be added in support of that, driving towards those goals.

Mr. Connor said that that might be a good replacement for using tree lined ambiance, although it is not the same thing.

Before adding something, Mr. O’Brien asked to go back to “Use the tree-lined ambiance and pedestrian and bicycle presence” and asked if that item is in, out, or what we decided upon.

Mr. Aroneo replied that he thought that the pedestrian and bicycle presence is out and the tree-lined ambiance is in, but the bicycle presence may be replaced by a Complete Streets strategy, as adopted by Resolution.

Mr. O’Brien suggested taking out “pedestrian and bicycle presence”. He said that it could read “Use the tree-lined ambiance to help slow and calm traffic”. He said that another bullet could be added on the Complete Streets which might be more appropriate.

Mr. Cilino understood the concept of Complete Streets. For example, he knew that on Valley Rd. you could paint a line next to the curb for a bicycle lane. But he could not see all people, for example, a lady with twins in a stroller walking down the bicycle lane. He did not know what defines “Complete Street” and said that it might be different for each member who reads it or has the vision of what it might look like.

Mr. Roshto said that one of the first things it talks about in Complete Streets is that it doesn’t fit everywhere. He said that it will work in some places, but not all, so he felt that including it helps us make those determinations and drive to that.

Mr. Connor suggested that, since Mr. Roshto knows about Complete Streets, either he, Mr. Aroneo or the Township Committee provide one bullet point that they would like to see added and put in the proper words to make it

consistent with whatever the Resolution states. He said that the other good thing is that, if we have it in the Resolution and Master Plan, that reinforces what we want to do. He asked that the suggestion be provided to Mr. O'Brien to include in the draft.

Mr. Cilino said that he really liked the ideas of including those triangles where you have to turn. He said that he was thinking that as he pulls out of the Shop-Rite parking lot where you stop at the street cross intersection. Then you go back 10'-15' where you stop because of the severe turning instead of the round turning (or arc turning). He said that he has been waiting for it to be repainted going back another 20' because where it is right now, they are almost knocking the paint off his car. He felt that those grassy triangles will enhance the slowing down and provide a better turn on the corners.

Mr. Connor said that the next item to be deleted might need to be slightly reworded. He referred to the bullet under Item 6. "Building Standards" which states "Allow parking only to the rear of buildings for buildings that front on Valley Road". He said that it was clearly put in because if we do have new development, we'd rather have something in front outside of a huge parking lot.

Mr. O'Brien added that the Ordinance itself, currently and for a number of years, has not allowed parking in a front yard.

Mr. Connor said that, rather than "require", you may say "encourage" if you don't want this to read that you have to do it. He said that there may be instances where parking in the rear is not appropriate, but he felt as a goal we should try to keep the parking lots behind the buildings.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that there are areas where having the parking lot in the back doesn't quite work, particularly if there are loading docks in the back. He said that you don't want your customers running around the back of the building to look at loading docks, but that is not always the case.

Mr. Connor suggested changing "require" to "encourage". He said that he did not think we will be building any more backwards buildings since we already have our share already.

Mr. O'Brien referred to the second to the last bullet item in Item 6 "Building Standards" .

Mr. Arentowicz said that he brought this up and there were two issues. He said that with the water table as low as it is on Valley Rd., he would not want to be parking below ground and, because of security issues, he would not recommend two levels of parking, especially at night.

Mr. Connor recalled that when the Board had looked at this, it was thinking of the north side of Valley Rd. and across the street up on the left hand side where it is higher and drier to the extent that we had commercial development and, if we could have below grade parking, it would essentially allow us to pave over less of the open space, if it was appropriate.

With below ground on the north side, Mr. Cilino asked if that still wouldn't require some intricate mitigation of water such as a sump pump and pumping station/area.

Mr. Connor was unsure and said that, for example, the Elks site it is reasonably high.

Mr. Cilino said that he was just thinking that, since we have a high water table all around, the ground doesn't absorb the moisture. He said that, if you jettison it down the hill, then we have the problem at Morristown Rd.

Mr. Roshto felt that the sentence is so weak that it is almost irrelevant and we should probably remove it. He said that "consider allowing" is about as weak as you could probably hit in a statement. He said that it is probably not a practical solution in that area and it is not going to happen with this kind of language. He said that we would either want to strengthen it and leave it in or just take it out.

Mr. Connor agreed and suggested "allow where appropriate", noting that "modify or consider" is like a "double weasel" word.

Mr. O'Brien felt that, when this was being written and considered in 2007, the Board was reacting to an application before the Zoning Board of Adjustment which called for structured parking underneath senior citizen residential. When the Board had that idea in mind, they came up with this language and he believed that they deliberately made it weak because they didn't want to allow it, but they also didn't want to say "absolutely, no way" because there may be places that it is appropriate.

Mr. Connor suggesting getting rid of it unless there was a disagreement. (There was no disagreement).

Mr. O'Brien referred to Item 6 at the top of Pg. 5 and Pg. 6 – "Township Committee", "Planning Board", and "Zoning Board of Adjustment". He said that he received a comment that said to eliminate all of the names (which reflect the original document at the time it was written).

Mr. Connor suggested putting it two parts. He said that Items 1 – 1V is really the Master Plan and the maps need to be there. Once you get to the Background Studies, it seemed to him that if you wanted to memorialize the Board

members names on who did this, it should go there, but not between the last page of the conclusions and the maps, which are clearly necessary.

Mr. Cilino said that Mr. Connor's suggestion was to make it a "two-parter". He said that Part 1 was the actual Master Plan Element and Part 11 was the supplemental information.

Mr. Connor said that the Township Committee and Board members is history and not the Ordinance. He said that he would put it there somewhere.

Mr. O'Brien said that that would be consistent with our other Master Plan Elements, particularly the area studies that were done. They are background documents in the Master Plan, but in the background study section.

Mr. Connor said that if there is no disagreement, we will do that. He asked if there was any further discussion of the draft.

Mr. Arentowicz referred to Pg. 11 where it states that "The goals of this revision will include: Best Management Practices.....". He said that the second sentence states "The Valley Road corridor is bounded by wetlands or flood plain..." Based on the map that Mr. Roshto prepared and had printed, he said that Valley Rd. is not *bounded* by the wetlands and the flood plain – in places it is *in* the flood plain, so he felt that that might be somewhat misleading. If you look at the map, he said that Valley Rd. at Main Ave. is *in* the flood plain. He noted that Mr. Roshto's map needs to be confirmed by the engineers, but FEMA has confirmed the 100 Year Flood Plain and the 500 Year still has to be finalized.

Referring to the map he prepared, Mr. Roshto said that this data is the FEMA 2010 preliminary data. In terms of accuracy, he said that the preliminary FEMA results are reflected in the map and he was confident of that. He said that the statement he had made about the 500 Year Flood Plain (the areas in purple on the map) was that it wasn't quite clear to him and he had doubts as to whether that is really a 500 Year Flood Plain and, given the fact that the FEMA FIRM is stated clearly as preliminary, the only thing this map could be used for is a *preliminary* discussion. He encouraged those reviewing it to be careful and said that the floodways and the 100 Year Flood Plains are accurate and he overlaid our current FEMA FIRM maps against that and they are almost right on the money. Therefore, he said that he would say that the 100 Year Flood Plain and floodways are correct, but he questioned FEMA's 500 Year Flood Plain.

Mr. Lemanowicz referred to the 500 Year Flood Plain area on the bottom center of the map and noted that the 500 Year abuts the floodway and there is no 100 Year between them.

Mr. Roshto replied that there is, except that you can't see it, it is very fine.

Mr. Lemanowicz replied that that leads you to believe that either there is a *very abrupt* change in elevation there, or something is missing.

Mr. Roshto agreed and said that that is the kind of thing that concerned him.

Mr. Connor said that it is very questionable behind the Valley Mall and, in the northern part, there are some places where he had to believe that the 500 Year Flood Plain are still going to flood.

Mr. Roshto agreed.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that you would expect to see a band of pink on the uphill side of the blue cross hatch. He said that you won't always because maybe it *does* come up abruptly.

Mr. Connor said that the point is well taken and that is that there is no doubt that it is in the 100 Year Flood Plain and he was not going to worry about 500 years under any circumstances.

To address Mr. Arentowicz's comment, Mr. O'Brien said that to the back of the Element are studies that were done over the course of several years. Rather than to go back and change one of their findings, he suggested going towards the front of the document in the current Master Plan Element and try to strengthen some language there that would emphasize that this is the policy of this Board.

Mr. Connor felt that there is no reason not to include the map. If the map is included, he said that you can add notes/words indicating that the 2010 FEMA Flood Plain Map is attached which indicates that a majority or significant portion of the Valley Rd. Business District is in a 100 Year Flood area which is now background to this study. While it may be a discontinuity between what this says and what the old study says, those are just the facts. Since they should be in chronological order, he felt this map should go first.

Mr. Arentowicz replied that that was fine with him and accommodates his need.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that we just have to carefully note that it is *general* background because he didn't want someone to come to the Board and claim that it says he/she is not in a flood plain.

Mr. Connor was confident that Mr. Lemanowicz could supply the right words.

Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Roshto if he would be able to zoom in on the Valley Rd. study area and eliminate the rest of the Township.

Mr. Roshto replied affirmatively.

Mr. Connor suggested a paragraph of introduction.

Mr. Roshto said that he would let someone else prepare the paragraph. He asked the Board if it would like to have the 500 Year Flood Plain removed from there. He said that he could make it more like the actual FIRM that exists today (not the preliminary).

Mr. Lemanowicz said that we could take the actual FIRM and put that in there.

Mr. Aroneo said that he liked having the 500 Year Flood Plain included.

Mr. Connor said that you don't have to call it a 500 Year Flood Plain.

Mr. Aroneo asked if it is actually a 500 Year Flood Plain.

Mr. Roshto replied that FEMA says it is, but he did not actually believe it is from his analysis. After further discussion, he said that he would leave the map as it is, with words added to it.

Mr. Arentowicz said that he had another comment. Given the fact that we changed the Element and removed the residential component, he said that he would like for his predecessors to have some record that we state in 2011 that there were two public presentations by Green Hill Development who presented a conceptual plan, with residential on Valley Rd., and the meeting was well attended by the public and they were very outspoken about *not* having residential on Valley Rd. He said that he would like that document in there so it is not as if this group of 7 or 9 members said in 2012 that they were eliminating residential with no support as to why they did that.

Mr. O'Brien replied that it would be best not to refer to a specific application, particularly one that has not been judged by the Board for fear of someone taking those words and saying that the Board has made a judgment on an application that has not been presented to us.

Mr. Arentowicz said that when he came to those meetings, it was a conceptual plan. He said that he wanted to say that there were some presentations that presented residential and the residents came out in mass and said that they did not really want that on Valley Rd.

Mr. O'Brien suggested something along the lines of, when public discussion of residential uses along Valley Rd. was initiated, that the public spoke strongly against it – in a more general way, but reflecting that there was input.

Mr. Arentowicz said that that was fine with him.

Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Arentowicz where he would like it to go. He said that the prior background studies laid out the process that the Board went through, so what we should do is add another chapter that reflects what this Board has done under the current circumstances and perhaps that is a place where we can look back and say over the past several years there have been public opportunities for people to speak and they have annunciated their concerns – somewhere along those lines.

Mr. Arentowicz noted that it was not a hearing.

Mr. Connor added that there was public comment on the concept plan and agreed that a strong majority spoke against residential uses on Valley Rd.

There was agreement that another chapter on this Board's process will be added, including the things it considered.

Mr. Arentowicz said that, in the same category, it could state that input was received from the Township Committee in the letter which Mr. Aroneo drafted and presented to the Board.

Mr. Connor and Mr. O'Brien agreed that that was a good idea. Mr. O'Brien suggested that, as part of that, the flood map and its introduction should also be *there* because it is a background that this Board has found.

Mr. Connor agreed that it should be kept in some sort of chronological order. There being no further suggestions, he asked for a general motion that the Board direct Mr. O'Brien to incorporate the changes that have been recommended by the Planning Board into a new draft Valley Rd. Business District Master Plan Element. He said that a date for public hearing will have to be set and questioned if it should be set now or if the Board prefer to look at the draft and then set the date.

Mr. O'Brien asked the Board if it felt that there will be any further substantive changes, or if it was in agreement that what has been decided so far will be the focus.

Mr. Aroneo replied that the latter was his position.

Mr. Connor asked if anyone disagreed, in general. He said that, even though we may not all approve it, it does reflect the will of the Board as a whole.

Mr. O'Brien said that he thought that the Board should look at the changes at the next meeting, regardless of whatever is done, because there is some language being left up to the consultants and they want to be sure they have it right. He said that we basically need 30 days to get a noticed Master Plan hearing and get all of the paperwork out to adjoining municipal clerks and the County and that would get us to the first meeting in June (the 12th). He said that Tifa has confirmed that they will be here for that night for the redevelopment study. Also scheduled for that evening is the request by Indoor Soccer for a rezoning, although it has not been confirmed by them at this point. He asked the Board if it would like to move forward on the 12th and serve notice for that meeting.

After further discussion, it was agreed that the Tifa presentation will be considered from 8:00 PM until 9:00 P.M., followed by the public hearing on the Valley Rd. Business District Element of the Master Plan.

Mr. Roshto made a motion to direct Mr. O'Brien to provide a final draft of the Valley Rd. Business District Element of the Master Plan to the Board no later than May 15th (which will include the date and a file name) and to schedule a June 12th meeting for a public hearing (and to use the draft that is prepared for the 15th as part of the public notice to the County and to the public, as a preliminary draft), which was seconded by Mr. Butterworth.

A roll call vote was taken. Those in favor: Dr. Rae, Mr. Arentowicz, Mr. Aroneo, Mr. Butterworth, Mr. Cilino, Mr. Roshto, Mr. Smargiassi, and Mr. Connor. Those opposed: None.

The meeting adjourned at 11:03 P.M.

DAWN V. WOLFE
Planning & Zoning Administrator