## APPEARANCES BIRDSALL & LAUGHLIN, L.L.C. BY: DAVID A. LAUGHLIN, ESQ. 1720 State Highway 34 Wall, New Jersey 07719 Attorney for the Borough of Allenhurst. McMANIMAN, SCOTTLAND & BOWMAN, ESQS. JENNIFER L. CREDIDIO, ESQ. BY: 75 Livingston Avenue Roseland, New Jersey 07068 Redevelopment Attorneys for the Borough of Allenhurst.

```
(Assembled body recites the Pledge of
 1
 2
    Allegiance.)
 3
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN:
                                    Good evening,
 4
    everybody. Donna, can you take the roll call,
 5
    please.
 6
                 MS. CAMPAGNA:
                                Sure. Commissioner
 7
    McLoughlin?
 8
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: I'm here.
                 MS. CAMPAGNA: Commissioner Bolan?
 9
10
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN:
                                       Present.
11
                 MS. CAMPAGNA: Mayor McLaughlin?
12
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN:
                                     I'm here.
13
    requirements of State Statute have been satisfied
14
    by delivering our notice to The Coaster and The
15
    Asbury Park Press, posting of the notice on the
16
    board in Borough Hall and filing said notice with
17
    the Borough Clerk.
18
            Donna, do we have any communications?
19
                 MS. CAMPAGNA: No communications.
20
    announcements, except for the Easter Egg Hunt and
21
    the breakfast were a huge success. As usual the
22
    Fire Company and the EMS Company did a great job.
23
    So we just want to thank everybody for that. And
24
    I think all the kids enjoyed it.
25
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: It really was.
                                                     Ι
```

```
don't know if people realize this but folks are
 1
 2
    donating their personal time to come in and do
    this. You know, the office staff, all the girls
 3
    from the office came in and worked it. And again
 4
    the Fire Department, First Aid, they were all
 5
    there. So again we thank you all very much
 6
    because it really was a very nice event. We had
 7
    Loch Arbour and Interlaken there. It wind up
 8
 9
    being a very nice afternoon.
10
            I again we can move on. Commissioner?
11
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: I would
12
    like to offer Consent Agenda Resolutions 2019-112
13
    through 119, I'll offer it.
14
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN:
                                      Second.
15
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: All those in
16
    favor?
17
                 COMMISSIONERS:
                                 Aye.
18
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: Resolution
19
    2019-120, approving bills and payroll totally
20
    $257,491.34. I'll offer it.
21
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN:
                                      Second.
22
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: All those in
    favor?
23
24
                 COMMISSIONERS:
                                Aye.
25
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: I do just want to
```

```
mention some gratitude, I have some people that
joined the Allenhurst First Aid Department. I
would like to thank those three individuals for
joining. We really do appreciate your service in
joining the department.
```

COMMISSIONER BOLAN: It's a Squad.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: The Squad. Before we begin with the traffic study, which Peter Avakian is going to review that was prepared by Dynamic Traffic and John McCormick, we have Alex Arnold in the audience. He's a District Representative from Congressman Pallone's office. He would like to read a statement regarding the

Allen Avenue railroad crossing. So with that I will invite Alex to come on up and he can read the statement. We thank you for coming, Alex.

MR. ARNOLD: How's it going? My name is Alex Arnold. I'm a district representative from Congressman Frank Pallone's office. The New Jersey Department of Transportation in 2017 upgraded two railroad crossings. A third railroad crossing on Allen Avenue was set to close permanently, if the Borough did not find funding to pay for the initial cost of upgrading the crossing and the cost of yearly maintenance.

In addition to the traffic problems this closing would present, the Congressman has serious concerns for pedestrian safety especially during the busy summer months. The Congressman and his staff along with Senator Vin Gopal have been working with Mayor McLaughlin, Commissioner Diane Gutierrez-Scaccetti with the NJ DOT and Governor Phil Murphy's office over the last year to resolve this issue.

We have asked the NJ DOT for two specific action items. First we have asked that NJ DOT allow for more time on a final decision so the Borough can settle the JCP&L Redevelopment Zone proposal, and a proper assessment of increased traffic in the summer can be completed. Second, we have asked the NJ DOT to reconsider funding all or part of the necessary upgrades and yearly maintenance as they have with the other two crossings already completed.

Congressman Pallone will continue to work closely with Mayor McLoughlin and the Board of Commissioners on this important issue.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Alex. COMMISSIONERS: Thank you, Alex.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: I just want to

take this time to mention Congressman Pallone and Senator Vin Gopal have been just wonderful helping the Town with this issue. Just a quick recap on the Allen Avenue, back in 2017 the Town was alerted that they were closing Allen Avenue. They upgraded Corlies Avenue and Spier Avenue. At the time when they did the upgrade we were told those upgrades cost roughly about \$650,000. had two traffic studies done just to justify keeping open the Allen Avenue. They still had come back in September of 2017 and said, hey, we're still going to close it. 

So we have gone down to Trenton a couple of times. Congressman Pallone has gone down with us to try and urge them to reconsider. Where it stands now is they have come back, they had asked us, you know, basically they want us to pay for the upgrade on the railroad crossing, which is almost \$900,000. And with our soft cost it comes up to a million dollars.

The other thing they were asking was for us to pay an ongoing maintenance fee for that crossing. So that's too burdensome. But the Congressman has been wonderful trying to work through a possible solution on this issue. So

we'll keep you posted as to what's happening.

So with that before I open it to the public for any questions, we're going to introduce Peter Avakian. He's the Town Engineer. Peter is going to run through the traffic study that was prepared for the Borough by Dynamic Traffic. John McCormick is the author. And Peter will just run through the traffic study as it pertains to the redevelopment area, okay, and parking. All right, Peter.

MR. AVAKIAN: Thank you, Mayor,
Commissioners and our friends here. I'm doing
this tonight for timing purposes. Mayor asked for
traffic information to be prepared as it relates
to the impact of the Redevelopment Zone. And it's
very appropriate to ask for that. Normally it's
done during the Planning Board review process,
which this will have to go through. But as we are
discussing the Redevelopment Plan now and you're
having numerous public hearings to review the
component parts of the Redevelopment Plan, we
thought it was important to not slow the process
down but to speed the process up a little bit.

So I've worked with John McCormick from Dynamic Traffic for about ten years in a variety

```
of capacities. He's is a traffic consultant on a
 1
 2
    number of planning boards that I work with. And
 3
    when the Mayor said we needed something done, I
 4
    asked if John was available, which he was. He's
    familiar with the area. He lives in the area.
 5
 6
    And he works in Lake Como. So he immediately
 7
    undertook this. So I did not author the plan.
 8
        But I'm here to present it to you because
 9
    he's on vacation now, which is where a number of
10
    us would probably rather be. But we're here. And
11
    I'm going to --
12
```

COMMISSIONER BOLAN: So he's not caught in traffic, is what you're saying?

MR. AVAKIAN: Yeah, I'm going to present to you his findings but it's not a traffic study per se. And I talked to him about this as he was preparing it. It's a trip generation study. It evaluates what used to be there. The structures still are but the JCP&L use and how JCP&L utilized the building and the number of trips generated by that use, which we all remember, and compare that to the Redevelopment Plan, the residential, the retail, the commercial components of the Redevelopment Plan and how those traffic related impacts compare to one another.

I found the findings very interesting but I'll provide that to you.

His overview is that the product that he prepared is an assessment of the traffic generation potential of the Redevelopment Plan, an assessment of the parking requirements generated by the Plan, and then he also provides some general comments regarding the traffic and parking design that we get into in his findings.

I don't have to say this to anyone in this room but traffic congestion is a seasonal issue here obviously. He evaluated it in a seasonal manner. What John did was not having enough time to actually go out and do traffic counts, he utilized existing information. DOT has information. Various other sources have information. So he utilized those traffic counts to create a table of a volume comparison between the JCP&L site and the proposed redevelopment site.

JCP&L was here for many decades with buildings dating back a hundred years. The buildings on Main Street within the Redevelopment Plan used to house what we call the Central Regional Headquarters.

The activities there were office space and we used to come -- I know Joe is here, we used to come and meet with JCP&L in this building. It included material storage. It included vehicle storage.

And probably one of the more visual aspects of it was the maintenance operations. The trucks used to come in and out of this facility on a daily basis. We knew any number of employees that worked there. Some worked for the County. Some were local politicians and they worked at JCP&L. We knew them and they were kind of part of the community as well. A tremendous amount of traffic generated from that facility on a daily basis.

So what John did was he reviewed the previous uses and calculated peak hour traffic for a week days and peak hour traffic for weekends and compared to the proposed uses of the Redevelopment Zone. And the Redevelopment Zone he used the townhouse residential district, which has been reduced to 28 townhouse units on the east side of Main Street.

And the parking requirements developed for the townhouse use are from what we call the

Residential Site Improvement Standards. If you have been to any planning board meeting and heard a residential development application you know what they are.

But just to summarize the Department of Community Affairs in New Jersey created these probably almost 20 years ago now, and they are residential standards for site improvements. And they were created in collaboration between the builders lobby, the municipal engineers and associated people from the League of Municipalities in order to provide a more uniform standard of review within municipalities with the state of New Jersey.

Developers were frustrated because they go town to town and the development standards were so different that they had projects that, you know, spanned over municipal boundaries and they had to have something more uniform. So we use these now.

And what they is they generate specific numbers in this particular case for parking depending on the type of use that you're providing. It also includes in the residential standards your guest parking. So they have already done the work for you and for any number

of residential types of development townhouses in this case for three bedrooms they require almost two and a half spaces per a three-bedroom townhouse. So that's how the parking standards have been developed.

The Adaptive Reuse District, which is the west side of Main Street has 80 apartment units planned and that relates to 155 parking anticipated parking spaces.

And then there are commercial and residential components of the Redevelopment Plan that also provide for parking in accordance with our ordinance or the Redevelopment Plan.

I think it might be appropriate to give a couple of comments on this plan and then go right to his findings since they're the most important part of this plan.

One of the comments that John makes in the study is really from the Redevelopment Plan itself. And it says that it is envisioned that this development will be self-sufficient with regard to parking.

Meaning the parking supply will satisfy the RSIS standards and be adequate to accommodate the parking demand anticipated. And that's very

1 important because we need to know that as a Town.

2 We need to know that the development occurring on

3 | the east side of Main Street, the development

4 | proposed on the west side of Main Street, the

5 | residential components, the retail components and

6 | the commercial components all have adequate

7 | parking spaces provided so it does not have an

8 | adverse impact on the municipality.

The commercial space contemplated a restaurant in the Redevelopment Plan approximately 8,000 square feet of area, as well as a 3,000-square-foot retail space. There are no provisions for parking in the Redevelopment Plan, but there are requirements in our ordinance regarding those components. The retail space requires four parking spaces per every 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

So if there was 3,000 square feet of retail space that the Redevelopment Plan contemplates there would be 12 spaces for that use. Likewise the restaurant would require one space per every ten seats. And again -- I don't know that it's appropriate to interject this here now, but we're a little ahead of ourselves in terms of presenting this to the public because

this type of plan is usually presented when you have a site development plan prepared by the redeveloper. The redeveloper is going to be required to come to the Planning Board and present a plan for a public hearing, and review, and discussion, and a vote by the Planning Board. at that time you hear very specific details on the site grading and drainage, the site development, the compliance with the Redevelopment standards. And at that time you also hear parking, traffic, stormwater management and other typical engineering standard testimony.

That's really not happening yet but this is superseding that by a bit of time, so that we have a level of comfort with the type of traffic generated by this use.

Another statement made by John in this report is that it is envisioned that the parking for the Adaptive Reuse District, which is the west side, will be accommodated within a parking structure at the north end of the property. The structure was evaluated, I believe John and -- both Johns, planner and traffic engineer evaluated the structure based on its area and determined that it would accommodate approximately 60 parking

spaces per floor. So it will be easy to calculate the number of spaces the structure would provide, if we determine how many floors would be in the garage structure. Likewise there are some design considerations that John considered or recommended including on the concept plan an illustration of angled parking along the east side of Main Street adjacent to the townhouse use, which he thought would allow for additional on-street parking on the Main Street corridor.

So with that, and I hope you understand, I mean I haven't been present at all the public hearings but I did read the Plan, I know what's contemplated by the Plan and these are his traffic findings that he determined based on his review of the Plan and his review of the traffic generated by that Plan.

There will be an increase in traffic volume and traffic congestion which will be primarily a seasonal condition in the Borough and obviously will be during the summer months particularly on the summer weekends. The JCP&L property, which was previously the Central Regional Headquarters included more than 100,000 square feet of space, which as I said was office

space, material storage, vehicle storage and maintenance operations, and the facility generated a fairly significant traffic and parking impact on the Borough. The week day traffic associated with the proposed Redevelopment Plan is anticipated to be less than what JCP&L generated. JCP&L's use was primarily during the week days.

It's interesting to realize that based on John's calculations the proposed residential component of the Redevelopment Plan along with the minor retail and commercial space will generate less traffic during the week than JCP&L generated. However the weekend traffic associated with the proposed Redevelopment Plan is anticipated to be somewhat similar in the morning and afternoon hours, but over the course of the entire weekend the commercial and residential activity will be higher than what was there previously. And we can really, if you think about what was there previously you would understand that.

Traffic associate with the proposed

Redevelopment Plan is much more compatible and

similar to the type of traffic that is generated

by today's land uses along Main Street in

particular and within the Borough as a whole then

was generated by JCP&L. You won't have that constant activity of trucks flowing in and out but you will have a constant activity of residential users going in and out. And that's why he finds this to be much more compatible with our land uses in the Borough.

The provision of mixed use development and residences along Main Street will fill a gap in the streetscape and improvements will contribute to the downtown vibrancy that's exists to the north and the south through the Borough. The concept plans anticipate accommodating the parking demand for each redevelopment parcel on their respective site.

The parking requirements again for the townhouse residential district are governed by RSIS. Additional common space parking should be considered to accommodate seasonal demand anticipated. The parking requirements of the Adaptive Reuse District are governed by a combination of Residential Site Improvement Standards and a shared parking requirement. This is generated by the Urban Land Institute. John utilized some I guess technical data at his disposal for traffic analysis, and when he did

that he really made a recommendation that a consideration be given to a shared parking, maybe an off-site parking, maybe utilizing the train station at later in the day where there's no parking demand at the train station after a certain time of night, when the restaurant use would be more active. Something like that is a very viable component part of our Redevelopment Plan.

The Adaptive Reuse District should accommodate the required parking in the parking structure. And he gave some recommendations on access to the parking structure, through an access drive shared by the utility district. And again we thought that the number of parking spaces would be 60 per floor.

There's a plaza in the Adaptive Reuse

District and he thought that that

pedestrian-focused plaza would be very appropriate
to be utilized for a traffic drop-off and pickup

zone. And in this plan I didn't really focus on
it but he did talk about the advent of Lift and

Uber really gives another component to his traffic

analysis. We've talked about it in other

locations. Having that, is great. Having

accessibility to that service, is great. It greatly reduces the demand for parking spaces.

But it creates another component part of any traffic study, and that is you have to have some type of zone to allow those vehicles to easily access, and pick up, and distribute the users, or you will have some kind of negative impact on the surrounding area.

Typically we see it in residential zones, where there's a pre-existing use of a bar or a restaurant and it's utilized heavily in the seasonal activity, maybe in the summertime you get a tremendous inflow of patrons and this type of pick up and drop off has a negative impact on the surrounding residential property owners. So John thought it was very appropriate for us to have some sort of drop-off area dedicated so that you would not have that kind of impact off site.

He made some design considerations and recommendations can or cannot utilized them but talked about on-street parking along Main Street via angled parking on one side of the road, which could be considered. Considered intersection bumpouts for traffic calming. We use that as a method to slow car down. Sometimes it works. I've

seen it not work. You put an impediment in front of a driver and a driver tends to hit it. The purpose of curb bumpouts is to push the travelled way lane a little narrower, so that the vehicles use the travelled way lane rather than drive to the right of the lane, and it causes a little smoother transition of the vehicles through the zone.

And finally there are two other districts in the -- actually three but there are two other component districts in the Redevelopment Plan, the South Gateway District, the southern side of town that not in the Adaptive Reuse or the townhouse zone and the Public Works District or Public Park District, which is what I call Benson Park on the westside of the railroad tracks, they have specifically not been reviewed as a part of this traffic evaluation. He was simply reviewing the residential, the retail and the commercial component parts of it.

That's really the extent of his report.

There are tables. There are by trip generation calculations. There are vehicle counts that were calculated. I specifically didn't go into them because that's more in John purview specific to a

traffic engineer's study, but certainly if anyone has any questions or comments on them, I can address those as well. But, Mayor, that's really the extent of his report. And I'm sure John will be available in the future, if we need him to come and report further.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Peter.

One thing I just want to point out to the audience that Peter touched on, some of you might have come before the Planning Board already and maybe did an addition to your house, or done some work. One of the questions that is always asked is this parking standard, which there's a set standard for the number of bedrooms, you have on site, number of parking spaces on your property. And it's basically known that during the summer nobody uses their driveway. We all know that. The Board has been looking at this. You know, two years ago we were considering no parking on the street at night, because I think it's a safety issue. There's just so many cars on the street.

We are considering doing that.

Interlaken does it right now. It's been very successful. They haven't had any problems with

it. There are certain mechanisms that they have, if you have a guest you have to call and get permission, give the license plate number. And then there's some homes in town that don't have driveways. There's a way around that. We can give parking stickers for those individuals. But these are some of the things that we've been looking at just in connection with this.

And the other thing I just want to point out, this is on the developer. In other words they have to figure out the parking on site for these units. This isn't the Town's obligation. They have to sit there and figure out where they're going to put all the cars. There's a standard, a formula that they go by. And they have to figure out the parking there.

So with that I'll open it to Chris or Terry, do you guys have any questions.

want to remind everyone of just a little history of the Redevelopment Zone as it happened. In 2007 when JCP&L announced they were leaving, the Board of Commissioners at the time decided to create a Redevelopment Zone to protect the tax base of the 2.2 acres. So that heaven forbid someone walked

in, who's not a taxpayer, which was the sole goal of creating the Redevelopment Zone in the first place. We sat there and in the final Redevelopment Plan, and some people have been calling on this number, they have been saying, you know, the original Redevelopment Plan had 55 units. And that's true. What people don't remember though is that 55 unit was based on nothing more than trying to get consensus, because without consensus of the subcommittee that was formed, we could never have proposed it to the Planning Board in order for them to pass to protect the Redevelopment Zone.

It wasn't based on an engineer's studies. Wasn't based on any architectural studies. It was based on consensus of 12 residents of Allenhurst, who were saying we want low density.

Having said that Gordon Gemma, who was the consultant we hired to walk us through this whole process, who was an urban planner and an attorney, after we passed it and put it forward to the planning board, turned to me and congratulated me, said, great you've protected your tax base. And you don't have a single person, who is ever going to bid on this at 55 units. Just so you know.

It's not worth it. The density is too low. No developer is going to do that.

That is where we are here. This is why
the Redevelopment Zone, which is open to anybody
who has a project in town, you have a problem, you
don't have a variance, you want relief, this is
the mechanism by which you do it.

So that's why we're all here discussing it. But I just wanted everyone to just have the historical context of how we got here, and to keep that in mind as we're discussing moving forward.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Terry, do you have anything?

COMMISSIONER BOLAN: No, I'm just waiting for the audience's participation.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: With that, I'll open it up for the audience. Raise your hand, we'll call on you. If you could just give us your name and your address. I just want to point out as a reminder from the Town Attorney, anybody that is on the Planning Board can't participate in the meeting because you are ultimately hearing the application. Okay, so I'm going to ask you to refrain.

```
MALE VOICE: Are there questions just
 1
 2
    about the traffic study?
 3
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: You can ask about
 4
    anything. Okay. With that, I'll up it up to the
    public.
 5
                 MR. RARUS: I'm Victor Rarus, 238
 6
    Elberon Avenue. Are the figures set for the
 7
    number of condos and apartments?
 8
 9
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: As the plan
10
    stands right now and what the developer has
11
    proposed yes. When they first came to the Town,
12
    they had about 140 is where they were at.
13
    number where it sits now is 28 townhomes on the
14
    east side, and 80 apartments. So we're at 108
15
    units total.
16
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Are you asking if
17
    a plan has been approved yet? No.
18
                 MR. RARUS: And then the number of
19
    bedrooms, because in this it says that there will
    be a minimum of three bedrooms in the townhomes or
20
21
    condos.
22
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: Not in all.
23
    I don't think they have come -- and this is Jen
24
    Credidio, our Redevelopment Attorney, who is
```

sitting in the front row there. I do not believe

25

they have come to the exact number of one, two and 1 three bedrooms. 2 3 MR. RARUS: Yeah, but it says a minimum of three in this --4 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: That's fine. 5 MR. RARUS: -- I mean it says, right, 6 7 you know that. 8 MS. CREDIDIO: For the stenographer, Jennifer Credidio, C-r-e-d-i-d-i-o, from the law 9 10 firm of McManiman, Scottland & Bowman located in 11 Roseland, New Jersey. This is the start of the 12 Redevelopment Plan and what the Borough in 13 consultation with the public and the Planning 14 Board feels like is appropriate law uses for the 15 area. At that point we entered into an agreement, 16 which has yet to be negotiated with the developer, 17 which will include specifics as to their project 18 in the envelope that is set forward in the plan. 19 So no, we do not have the specific approved unit 20 mixes, et cetera. This is sort of the outside 21 perimeters that are being established during the

MR. RARUS: Sure. What it says right here, if I may -- inaudible -- the number of units has not been identified, however, it is

planning process right now.

22

23

24

25

```
anticipated that the units will provide a minimum
1
   of three bedrooms. So you know what the problem
2
   is, is the town is caught in a tough situation.
3
4
   Everybody wants it developed. But not over
   developed. You know what I'm saying. And they're
5
   profit driven. You can't blame them. But they
6
7
   also owned the property already today; correct?
                MAYOR McLAUGHLIN:
8
9
```

MR. RARUS: Yeah, so they own the property isn't it on them if we just tell them — and I'm playing devil's advocate here, I'm sorry, guys, originally 55. You knew that going in.

It's 55. And we don't want townhouses. I want you to stay. Because townhouses are not part of this town. It's not why I moved here because you have a lot of nice townhouses. It had a lot of nice old houses. So you follow what I'm saying.

I'm just playing hard, you know, total devil's advocate. They own it. It's on them. Tell them to build houses and —

MR. AVAKIAN: I think I can answer the question regarding your bedroom number.

Simply because I know how John developed this report. So I'm going to do something I said I wasn't going to do tonight. I will not

```
editorialize on John's report. But I will tell
 1
    you that he used three bedrooms because he had to
 2
    use a number to calculate the number of parking
 3
    spaces for the townhouses. So he used a minimum
 4
    of three bedrooms. That's not to say that's
 5
    what's going to be the plan.
 6
 7
                 MS. CREDIDIO: But the footprint that
 8
    is --
 9
                 MR. AVAKIAN:
                               Supports that.
10
                 MS. CREDIDIO: -- that's set forth
11
    right now in the document that we're considering
12
    and I mean it supports a three bedroom -- at least
13
    a three bedroom. Because they are what? 2,500
14
    square foot units.
                 MALE VOICE: Estimated.
15
                 MS. CREDIDIO:
                                Estimated.
16
                 MR. RARUS: See that's the thing.
17
18
    It's we're supposed to make all our plans and
19
    they're all estimated. And you know they're never
20
    going to go down. They're only going to go up.
21
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN:
                                       They have
22
    already gone down.
23
                                They can't go up.
                 MS. CREDIDIO:
24
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN:
                                       They have
25
    already gone down. They can't go up once we
```

approve x-number of townhomes. If that's the 1 outside that we allow, they can't go beyond that. 2 MR. RARUS: No, I understand that. We 3 were talking actually the number of bedrooms. 4 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: They are 5 limited there too because there's a certain amount 6 7 of square footage that they have to fit into. MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: So in other words, 8 9 for argument sake --MR. RARUS: You know what I'm saying. 10 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: I do get your 11 point. 12 MR. RARUS: I'm talking long term 13 where all of a sudden, you know, I mean it all 14 sounds good until it isn't. You know, and so they 15 build these things and, you know, they're 16 17 beautiful, whatever, and then they have a lot of bedrooms and they're not selling. And so then 18 19 they start dropping the price, you know what I'm 20 saying? Because now you have 31 -- you know, it's 21 supply and demand. Like, the town has to just be careful. And I know you guys all know this, you 22 know, you what I'm saying. It's just like 23 everybody wants -- well I want it developed of 24 25 course.

```
MAYOR McLAUGHLIN:
                                    Right.
 1
                 MR. RARUS: We live right down the
 2
    block. We would love to see -- but it's just --
 3
    you know, I think you get where I'm coming from.
 4
                                    No, we do.
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN:
 5
                 MR. RARUS: And I'm sure the traffic
 6
 7
    will work out, the parking and all that stuff.
    It's just really about home values and the what
 8
 9
    the town is all about itself. You know, why I
10
    moved here and -- inaudible --
11
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Anybody else?
    Yes, Pam.
12
13
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: Take your
14
    time.
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: I'm sorry we're
15
16
    making you walk all the way up here.
17
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN: Let's go.
    March.
18
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Take your time.
19
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN: No, you have to
20
21
    come up here so we can hear you.
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Please sit right
22
    here. We're going to put you in the front row.
23
                 PAM:
                       When I came to the Planning
24
    Board they were talking about 69 apartments and
25
```

```
1
    two bedrooms. Now I see we have 80 apartments and
    some three bedrooms. And I think the comment in
 2
    the letter a large part of the apartments would be
 3
    vacation, weekend homes. Inaudible -- Now that
 4
    Allenhurst has a decent school system, I can see
 5
    people with kids moving here in those apartments.
 6
    I mean, if I lived in a town that was so
 7
 8
    borderline and it's a lot cheaper here right now
    then some of the other towns, I think -- inaudible
 9
    -- so I think that's something that should be
10
    considered.
11
12
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you.
    Anybody else? Wow, it's quiet tonight. Anybody
13
    else?
14
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN: Peter did a
15
    "fantabulous" job. Thank you, Peter.
16
17
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Really, you
    knocked it out of the park.
18
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN: Either that or
19
20
    everybody is asleep.
21
                 MALE VOICE: So is this "the" study
22
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: It's the study for
23
24
    the traffic so far.
                 MR. AVAKIAN: I would say that maybe
25
```

```
1
    when a more formal plan is submitted that would go
    before the Planning Board, we would have the
 2
    opportunity -- I would review the plans on behalf
 3
    of the Planning Board and there will certainly be
 4
    at least one if not more than one public hearing,
 5
    and at that time you will review all the
 6
    component parts of a site development plan. You
 7
 8
    will review the impact on the roadway system.
 9
    number of vehicles generated during construction.
    The number of units will be finalized at that
10
11
           If the developer asks for something in
12
    greater number than is in the Redevelopment Plan
13
    that does require a variance. The planning board
14
    has to listen to the testimony and make a
15
    decision. I'm sorry that I keep looking at Joe
    when I talk about the Planning Board because he's
16
17
    the chairman.
18
                 MALE VOICE:
                              The one thing in the
19
    study that I didn't see is how many employees
20
    worked there on a daily basis at JCP&L.
21
                 MR. AVAKIAN:
                              I don't know if he knew
22
    that but that's something we can certainly look
    into.
23
24
                 MALE VOICE: It's how many people are
```

going to live. You know it's very, like -- it's

25

```
very similar and anybody that didn't work there
 1
    but visited, it's just like a regular business --
 2
    inaudible.
 3
                 MR. AVAKIAN: It was such a mixed use
 4
    there for their -- I mean it wasn't a typical
 5
    business. It was a public utility.
 6
                 Inaudible.
 7
                 MR. AVAKIAN: One building was
 8
 9
    offices or two of the buildings were offices.
    they had their vehicle maintenance there and they
10
11
    had areas for that type of work too.
12
                 MALE VOICE: You know at one time
13
    every building -- inaudible -- you could have 225
14
    employees working there.
15
                 MR. AVAKIAN: Downstairs yeah.
                 MALE VOICE: Inaudible -- could have
16
17
    a truck come up everyday.
                 MALE VOICE: So you're saying 225
18
19
    people worked in that building.
20
                 MALE VOICE:
                              Yes.
21
                 MALE VOICE: And so how was traffic?
22
                 FEMALE VOICE:
                                It was a circus.
    would sit on my porch and just watch it. But
23
    there was two parking lots. They had this lot
24
```

here, and the one on the other side. I mean there

25

was --

Inaudible.

COMMISSIONER BOLAN: And then there's people like Dave screeching through town 'cause his bill was late. Didn't want to get his lights turned off.

COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: But also conversely, just to keep in mind, ten years ago — I mean the last census we had 496 year-round residents. Ten years ago we had almost twice that many. I mean the number in the town, we have a higher seasonal population, but the population of the town is actually decreasing.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: You make a good point but you know what it is too, there were a lot of the service trucks and stuff were parked at the end of Elberon Avenue. So you had guys who would come and park and take the trucks out, and go and do work and then you had them also doing repairs in one of the buildings. But I think it's a good question. We will find out how many people were there. We'll get an approximate number.

Inaudible.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: It was very busy.

I mean you had enough foot traffic to support

- 1 | Cindy's Cozy Kitchen, which was always busy.
- 2 There were four or five businesses there that were
- 3 | busy because of the foot traffic. You know, it
- 4 | supported it.
- 5 MALE VOICE: Well the reality of it
- 6 | is this is coming.
- 7 | MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Something is
- 8 coming.
- 9 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: Something
- 10 | is coming.
- 11 | MALE VOICE: I just want to get, you
- 12 | know, as close to reality of what it's going to be
- **13** | like and --
- 14 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Something is
- 15 | definitely coming.
- 16 | MALE VOICE: And I think the main
- 17 | concern is property value.
- 18 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: I think the
- 19 | reassuring thing for you to remember is, whatever
- 20 | the site plan is going to be, it has to go to the
- 21 | Planning Board. And the Planning Board has to get
- 22 | really down in the dirt and go through the whole
- 23 | thing, and they will sort through every little
- 24 detail. You know where's your stormwater
- 25 | management? Where's your on-street parking? How

```
1
    is this design meeting with our design code?
    Historic Preservation. If you have historic
 2
    elements for the townhomes or homes, all that
 3
    stuff gets picked up in that -- you know, it's
 4
    like a second bite at the apple.
 5
                 MALE VOICE: Are you anticipating
 6
 7
    that they're actually going to look to knock it
 8
    down?
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Which?
 9
                                             That
10
    building?
11
                 MALE VOICE: Yeah, on the west side.
12
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: No, they're --
13
                 COMMISSIONER BOLAN: They're reusing
14
    that building.
                 Inaudible.
15
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: The middle section
16
17
    I think they're going to demolish partially.
                 MS. CREDIDIO: Closest to the liquor
18
    store because that's where they're putting the
19
20
    parking.
21
                 MALE VOICE: Is it going to be a
22
    parking garage?
23
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: Yes.
                 MS. CREDIDIO:
                                Yes.
24
                 COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: They will
25
```

have an on-site parking garage, three level.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: But just to

emphasize, they have not shown us any plans or

5 have a parking obligation, and they said hey,

anything. This is just because they know they

6 | we'll work out parking with a parking garage.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Verbally they said, they know that they have RSIS standards they have to meet and they have said verbally that their intention is to build a parking structure of three levels that would accommodate their parking needs.

MALE VOICE: And did they get the approval -- remember they talked about going one level higher. I think five stories. Remember they talked at the last meeting -- inaudible.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: We talked about but again nothing has been finalized yet.

COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: What they said in going back and forth and hearing the comments, and as I said when they first came in they were almost at 140 to come down and to get down and knowing -- when they came before the Planning Board and the Planning Board spoke to them and they had, you know, seven units or eight

units of five and six town homes, and the Planning Board said that doesn't fit. Most townhouses are like four. So they cut that down to be seven units of four to make 28, and then the 80. And they know that that's the number, and now they're trying to figure out -- because they haven't even drafted the plans yet because until such time as we can approve them doing anything, they are not going to spend any more money drafting anything.

MS. CREDIDIO: Just a couple of things, if I might just clarify. The west side building the current draft of the Redevelopment Plan allows five stories. It is anticipated that a portion of the structure may be five stories.

numbers that are in the Redevelopment Plan when it's finally adopted are the maximum density numbers. That's not something that they can come back and say it's not 80, it's 90. It's not 28, it's 40. It's the maximum density numbers that are set in the plan. It's not something that the Planning Board can give relief from. It would require this process that we're going through right now to happen all over again.

So I know there was a couple of statements

about what if they want to do more. That's not possible.

MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Quick question for you though, when they go and they do their site plan they can't meet the parking standard, the Planning Board can't give them a variance on that, or can they?

MS. CREDIDIO: The Planning Board can give them certain deviations. But there are deviations that statutorily are prohibited. So density, increase in the number of units, increase of height or certain percentage are statutorily prohibited.

MALE VOICE: Everyone is for lower density and you know, the less the better. But is there an easier way to maybe go about it, if we can determine how much it's going to cost for them to do remediation? If we figure out how much the remediation is, or maybe we determine how much they're allowed to build after we find out what the cost of remediation is, then we can determine the maximum density.

COMMISSIONER McLOUGHLIN: I would love that. It's remediation but then it's also they're owners and as much as I would like to say,

```
you know what, x-number of dollars seems like a
 1
    fair number for you make. No one is going to pull
 2
    down their pants and show you the financials of
 3
    what they think they can get. So the best case
 4
    scenario for us is what do we think can work on
 5
    the property in conjunction with what they want to
 6
    do, in some compromised fashion. Or don't and
 7
    then risk something else coming in. That's the
 8
 9
    scarier scenario.
10
                 I'll call out the nightmare scenario.
11
    The scary scenario -- no, all right. Go ahead.
12
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN:
                                    Is there anybody
13
    else? Anybody else have any questions?
14
                 (No response.)
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: I urge you all as
15
16
    things come up and you think of something, you
17
    have a question or a concern, email us. Just
    email your question or concern and we'll address
18
19
         So if you have any questions or comments that
    come up afterwards, just send them to Borough Hall
20
21
    and we'll take a look at it.
            All right. Anybody else have anything?
22
23
                 (No response.)
                 MAYOR McLAUGHLIN: Okay. That's it.
24
```

I think we have to go into Executive Session on

25

## CERTIFICATE

I, MICHELE A. MAC PHERSON, Transcriber and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, hereby certify the foregoing to be the truest and most closely verbatim record able to have been rendered by me, at a time subsequent to the original audio taping of same.

Michele a. Man Herson

MICHELE A. MAC PHERSON,

Transcriber

Dated: June 21, 2019

My Commission expires:

February 7, 2021