

FREEHOLD BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2023

MONTHLY MEETING

The monthly meeting of the Freehold Borough Planning Board was held on Wednesday, January 25, 2023 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Barricelli stated that this meeting was provided in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act, by providing a copy of the agenda to the official newspaper and posting same on the official bulletin board of the Municipal Building.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT	Mr. William Barricelli
PRESENT	Mr. Paul Ceppi
ABSENT	Mr. Michael McCabe
PRESENT	Mr. Michael Wildermuth
PRESENT	Ms. Shealyn M.S. Crombie
ABSENT	Ms. Caridad Argote-Freyre
PRESENT	Ms. Brianne Van Vorst
PRESENT	Councilwoman Margaret Rogers
PRESENT	Mr. Garry Jackson
PRESENT	Mr. James Keelan
PRESENT	Mayor Kevin A. Kane

Ronald D. Cucchiaro – Oath of Office, James Keelan

Mr. Barricelli read Item No. 3 on the Agenda as follows:

Approval of Reorganization Minutes from Planning Board Meeting January 11, 2023.

Mr. Wildermuth made a motion to approve the minutes, Mr. Jackson seconded.

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, Wildermuth, Crombie, Van Vorst, Councilwoman Rogers, Jackson and Mayor Kane
No	0	
Abstain	1	Keelan
Absent	2	McCabe and Argote-Freyre

Mr. Barricelli read Item No. 4 on the Agenda as follows:

Approval of Minutes from Planning Board Meeting January 11, 2023.

Mr. Jackson made a motion to approve the minutes, Councilwoman Rogers seconded.

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, Wildermuth, Crombie, Van Vorst, Councilwoman Rogers, Jackson and Mayor Kane
No	0	
Abstain	1	Keelan
Absent	2	McCabe and Argote-Freyre

Mr. Barricelli read Item No. 5 on the Agenda as follows:

Review Resolution No. 51-23 Resolution of Mayor and Council of the Borough of Freehold, County of Monmouth, New Jersey Referring to the Planning Board for Review and comment A Redevelopment Plan Entitled "Downtown Freehold: Hometown Redevelopment Phase I Block 35 Redevelopment Plan" Pursuant to the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1, et seq.

Mr. Cucchiaro – to set the board for what we are here to do tonight, we have done this recently; under the local redevelopment and housing law and area has been declared in need of redevelopment, the Governing Body has the ability to draft a redevelopment plan; similar to a zoning ordinance; finds what the permitted uses will be, has design standards, bulk standards; like a zoning ordinance, the local redevelopment and housing authority requires that plan to be referred to the planning board; again, like a zoning ordinance the role the planning board plays tonight is to determine whether that plan is substantially consistent with the master plan; a public hearing will take place to adopt the redevelopment plan at the governing body level; our role tonight is to determine whether it is substantially consistent; regardless of liking or not liking redevelopment, agree or disagree or lots should be redeveloped, that is not for this today, today is simply substantial consistency with the master plan. The public hearing will be before the governing body;

Mr. Barricelli – members of the public, we will open to the public for questions;

Stephen J. Gallo – Business Administrator, we have tonight the plan as described; our planner Andrew Janiw, Beacon Planning; we have had public input, public meeting in advance of this meeting tonight; discussion with various stake holders;

Mr. Barricelli – thorough report, pleased;

Andrew W. Janiw, P.P., AICP, - we are located in Colts Neck on Rt 34, 25 years; our practice is public and private planning, represent numerous municipalities across the state; also have done a lot of redevelopment work across the state of New Jersey; one of our first assignments was the Cookman Avenue Redevelopment in Asbury Park, we have a strong background on redevelopment; look forward to working with Freehold Borough and seeing this through;

The report before you, presents culmination of approximately 8 months of work, internally as well as stake holders and public presentation; what is before you is a road map of redevelopment parcel; just west of Throckmorton between Main Street and Broad, encompassing the former municipal building and properties west and north; revitalizing modern housing as well as opportunities for retail and restaurants and commercial activity; a nice new extension of Main Street, hopefully in the future the new museum at the fire house will compliment; we have elements that encourage and incorporation of courtyards combining the uses; this is a guideline; this will go out to the development community to solicit proposals for redevelopment and for developers to share their vision of how they interrupt these guidelines; those visions will be scored based on what we prioritize; a committee created to review the redevelopers responses, score sheet, looking at how they incorporate façade, walk-ability, access to public transportation, and housing; hopefully they interrupt with the intent in mind and scored based on vision and how vision translates to what we are hoping to achieve; also part of the process is looking at

the master plan; page 41 summarizes the consistency with the master plan; we hope there are other redevelopment projects adjacent to this; we hope to create a certain type of housing, we discussed at the meeting last week the type of residents we anticipate, housing being proposed here, younger millennials and people looking to retire stay in the borough and don't want to maintain a single family home; we think we meet the points within the master plan; any questions or comments;

Mr. Barricelli – quick review of plan;

Mr. Janiw – this lays out basic uses standards; we are envisioning here a multi-story, multi-family dwelling, parking under the building, also public parking and creating bulk standards, height standards, capping density with 400 units, looking to create Main Street as continuation of retail corridor, building access is from the rear; intending to compliment future state of redevelopment along Broad and Throckmorton; intent for why it is configured in that method; concepts and photos of what we are thinking, types of façade, court yards, amenities, internal to the building and outside the building; public space and private space for the residents, like roof top decks; best way is to have you ask questions and we can discuss;

Mr. Cucchiaro – there is open space requirement and that applies to redevelopment as well; while it is a redevelopment project, it is for the entire community;

Mr. Wildermuth – parking, structure and public components, is that in writing here why not included; how would the developers know this is a goal;

Mr. Janiw – page 13, j/k – pick up and drop

Mr. Cucchiaro – also in j there is reference to RSIS standards, governs the number of parking for residential portion;

Mr. Barricelli – letter j/k, you use the word 'shall' and k, becomes the greatest extent possible;

Mr. Janiw – I mentioned in my preamble, we are looking to create creativity, giving guidelines and goals but they may have an alternative, transportation available, bus lines, bikes; studies show building this close to public transportation depending on patterns of use may warrant parking relief; we will review and look at traffic studies presented and look from the to meet RSIS;

Mr. Cucchiaro – if the applicant comes to this board, this is the document we have that lays out the development standards, the extent we are promoting flexibility and creativity is it anticipation, when the project comes in you will reevaluate the redevelopment plan to incorporate that in or do they need to seek relief from this board;

Mr. Janiw – we would ask them to prepare a shared parking study or parking relief study and ultimately what we stipulate here that the final parking configuration will become the redevelopment agreement; if this board is in agreement and we are in agreement their presentation has substance and that ultimately would be the redevelopment agreement and what they will be required to provide;

Mr. Jackson – Anthony have you calculated what the parking requirement would be for 400 units;

Mr. Maltese – that is calculated on the number of bedrooms; if one and two bedrooms and some affordable with three bedrooms; 1.5 spaces per unit, you are looking at approximately 600 spaces;

Mr. Janiw – we anticipate two levels of parking;

Mr. Maltese – any thought of the percentage of general parking and residential parking;

Mr. Janiw – if you look at how much commercial will be predicted, look at general parking as being there to facilitate commercial along Main Street; parking demand will be driven by proposal set forth and should consider the retail and restaurant use and anticipated along the street as well; there are creative ways to do parking, using internal lifts, stacking cars;

Mr. Cucchiaro – Long Branch recently approved something similar; Hoboken also built something similar, basically hollow with the lifts and stacking;

Mr. Gallo – people have their cars, store them for the occasional use;

Mr. Jackson – that is not happening in Freehold Borough, won't know if the developers comes in with a plan;

Ms. Crombie – I appreciate the creativity with parking, I lived on Cookman, and like the scooters there but in Freehold Borough, we need bike lanes and space; people in Hoboken are going to NYC; people in the Borough are going to Marlboro, Manalapan to work; little different;

Mr. Janiw – we have an idea, some people in the building will be from the borough and some won't;

Ms. Crombie – do you have a traffic study professional in mind; I know some base data on phone data, actually get real time pings;

Mr. Janiw – the developers will provide a study, we will recommend the Borough obtain one as well;

Mr. Wildermuth – page 13, letter h, refers to a fifth and sixth floor, set back requirements; I don't recall a redevelopment document with a sixth floor; if I am wrong;

Mr. Janiw – the sixth floor is measured from the Board Street side; the front will be four or five stories, the back will be five or six with parking, lower parking coming in; doing that is essentially the limit of wood frame construction; the wood frame limit is about 70 feet;

Mr. Gallo –when we first started discussions, we had some ask if they could build a ten story building and we denied them;

Ms. Van Vorst – what is the height of the top of the Hall of Records; is that under 70 feet;

Mr. Janiw – not sure of height; probably under 70 feet;

Mr. Wildermuth – page 29/30, table #2, maximum impervious coverage, 90; then page 30, landscape open space requirements, #1, minimum 20% of sites land area shall be devoted to landscaped... is this language contradictory;

Mr. Janiw – no, footprint of 90% impervious coverage, looking for roof or courtyards to be landscape to provide green area; those may be elevated planting beds, green roofs;

Ms. Van Vorst – pg 30, signs – reads regulations associate with B-2 District; shouldn't it be the Center Core District sign standards, which is what we use in that area; which are a bit more esthetic and historic, generally better;

Mr. Janiw – looking for creativity here, don't know what signs will look like, part of treatment to see what will be presented; developers look to brand a concept; given potential size and height on Main Street, you could lose signage; this won't be street level signage, something taller, visibility, branding of building;

Ms. Van Vorst – 100 sq. feet is a big sign, no matter the sign of the building;

Mr. Janiw – we limit the height to 5 feet;

Mr. Wildermuth – 1977 plan the town has about traffic flow; one thing in the property now is a cut through between West Main and Broad; unofficial cut through, next to old Borough Hall, where the ATM is located; locals use this, if there is no way to travel between these two roads, you are left with Throckmorton, intersection is a nightmare, or all the way down to Manalapan Avenue; a long stretch to go; should some kind of consideration be made to have a cut through; unique opportunity to fix something; I see Throckmorton intersection becoming worse;

Mr. Barricelli – explain why no access to Main Street;

Mr. Janiw – Main Street, we envision being pedestrian friendly; museum proposed, court yards, pocket parks created, we don't want to disrupt with car traffic; we focused all traffic access to rear of the building, Broad Street; we have had extensive conversations about and having a study for Throckmorton and what needs to be done;

Mr. Gallo – sometime ago there was a ring built around the Borough, to encourage trucks and heavy vehicles to not come down the center of town but rather go around the perimeter; you could easily bypass downtown; the problem is, google maps and other wayfinding haven't gotten the message; it is not a good smell when dining out downtown with the truck traffic that comes through; the Mayor wants all truck traffic that does not have a local delivery to bypass the Borough and use Kozlowski, Rt. 9 roads meant for truck traffic; we already have ordinances on the books;

Mayor Kane – we are also going to be reviewing the delivery schedules of existing and new businesses;

Mr. Gallo – Abbington has been awarded a contract to do certain intersection enhancements, Throckmorton and Main, coming up with creative ideas and will get some public comments; also looking to refurbish Throckmorton too;

Mr. Ceppi – thank you for the report and echo the chairman's comment, very well done, illustrated perfectly; I was part of the Vision Plan some years ago and I am supportive in theory; talk to me about the eminent domain aspect of the plan or that is included in the plan and how that fits in with the master plan;

Mr. Janiw – the eminent domain is there as what I call, option of last resort; we encourage everyone to acquire properties through negotiation; what we have learned, our first project, acquisition of 113 separate properties; took four years, through private transaction; knock on doors, people talk, have a better understanding and negotiate to have space in the new property constructed;

You may be familiar with holdouts and then the develop around the one property; that is when eminent domain comes in;

Mr. Cucchiaro – our master plan, does not have a section of a matter of how a property is acquired but has sections about how property can be used and developed;

Mr. Janiw – correct;

Mr. Gallo – we listened to the board and the property owners and removed those not interested for the most part; a few calls from the property owners that wanted out, and now asking to be in;

Mr. Ceppi – my prior comments in prior meetings regarding eminent domain, the laymen would read, eminent domain the right of government or agent to expropriate private property for public use; talk to be about the public use of this project;

Mr. Janiw – eminent domain is available in NJ in two instances; first for public purpose, if you need a parking lot and need to acquire property, you can use eminent domain for public purpose; the local and redevelopment housing law also permits eminent domain for acquisition for redevelopment because ultimately if it meets the criteria that study found that the properties in the area met one of the eight criteria's that deemed underperforming, underutilized and is deemed in the eyes of the state as public purpose to acquire those properties for redevelopment to bolster tax revenues, activity, development initiatives in the Borough; that is technically public purpose and in the local redevelopment and housing law; we hope we don't have to use but is available;

Mr. Ceppi – I appreciate the thorough explanation; thank you;

Ms. Van Vorst – master plan, you spoke of shared public space – will there be a band stand or public theater; those uses are not listed on page 10, are they mentioned elsewhere and I missed;

Mr. Janiw – we have a photo of what we would like to see there;

Ms. Van Vorst – you don't have to write out as a permitted use;

Mr. Janiw – no, that is part of the objectives and certainly something we are grade the applicants on;

Mr. Jackson – page 12, e – laundry facilities; does the plan take into account the strain on the Borough infrastructure; who will be responsible for upgrades;

Mr. Janiw – we look to create a higher end housing and a signature of that is having in apartment washer and dryer; infrastructure, that is on the redeveloper;

Mr. Gallo – that is a general rule, new residential construction is required to do the same; we are currently assessing our connection fees; that will be a charge for the developer too;

Mr. Wildermuth – parking; this is going to be adjacent to proposed museum, how does necessary parking for the museum factor into this;

Mr. Janiw – long term planning, part of the thinking here is another redevelopment palm across Broad here and there is a vision for that to include public parking; we will have some here but the next phase will have substantial public parking, didn't want on Main Street;

Ms. Crombie – other examples of redevelopment, example Asbury – Cookman, the sidewalks have been kept very clean even though the increase in residents; is that the developer or the town cleaning that;

Mr. Janiw – both; they create SIDS, downtown develop groups, businesses and property owners and pay toward maintenance and upkeep;

Mr. Gallo – I think it is important to point out, this will be a multimillion dollar project that will increase retail in town and generate significant new tax revenue to offset our expenses; including additional public works employees, police officers, for everything we do on a daily basis; when I say that every year when we put the budget together we struggle to put together we struggle to find \$100 to \$200 thousand in new money, everything goes up; this project has the potential to generate up to a million dollars in new tax revenue; that's a lot of money to do a lot of the things we want to do;

Mr. Keelan – what type of school age population are we thinking;

Mr. Janiw – two studies used to generate school age; one is the Livingston Study, Rutgers Univ. professor which takes into account economic and geographic and the second is a 2018 sponsored white paper done by the university where they had participation of developers of large scale and took surveys; those numbers show we anticipate, if a 400 unit building with mix of 1 and 2 bedrooms and affordable mixed with 1, 2 and 3 bedroom requirements the school age will be 40 to 60 children, across K-12; we also spoke with superintendent and report showing school population 2017-2023 declined by 56 children;

Mr. Barricelli – I applaud the relocation of displacement; I don't like, page 40 – how do we know there will be opportunities for relocation of businesses, how do we know;

Mr. Janiw – we have reviewed the vacancies along Main Street, there is space available, there is ample opportunity to relocate in the vicinity;

Mr. Barricelli – I am not concerned about the owners of the building, the tenants, the rent;

Mr. Jackson – school population has declined by 56, is that K-8 or K-12;

Mr. Janiw – K-8

Ms. Crombie – by chance, with the 56 extra students where they overly packed;

Mr. Janiw – a board member at a public meeting stated that was about 12 years ago, overly populated; the population of school age has stabilized; they weren't overly concerned about new children coming in;

Councilwoman Rogers – the schools now have the money to address the situation if needed;

Mr. Gallo – also new students, some may go to private schools; also some of the school age to move in may already live in the Borough;

Councilwoman Rogers – also the misconception of affordable units is just what it states, does not mean you have to be at poverty level; just means you have to have a certain income level, they are pretty generous, to be able to qualify; a lot of people are saying we will have another rug mill, that is not the case; these are young professional that will qualify for the affordable units, there are health care works that can qualify; we have people who are in that middle space that will be able to find an affordable place to live and not have to go to south jersey to afford to live in a decent way;

Mr. Cucchiaro – adding to the list, 1st and 2nd year teachers;

Mr. Gallo – everything coming to this board will have affordable housing; this administration is 100% committed to comply with the law;

Mr. Ceppi – as a sitting board of education member and two former board of education members to my left, we are in the process of trying to put a small addition on, so I wouldn't say in confidence the overcrowding issue has been solved although there is likely a reduction in head count; when being built for capacity for what we had, still underside for what it was; small additions proposed in the future, not sure if sizing issue is fair to say it is not an issue; affordable housing, I agree with Councilwoman, it will allow for an opportunity for public service, working government; also a component of scale, 35% of AMI, should be a wide range of building a better community across the board;

Ms. Van Vorst – design standards – pg. 32, 3.6, second paragraph,
“To the extent practical, these standards should be considered for any building that will be rehabilitated; however, architectural design standards shall not be mandatory for any building seeking rehabilitation.”
To understand, any existing building in this parcel that might be maintained, correct;

Mr. Janiw – yes, if someone is looking to incorporate the existing and we encourage them to do and will grade them but not mandating them to do;

Ms. Van Vorst – why wouldn't they have to follow the design standards, they are going so far in steps to retain the building, why would you do the preservation; by definition rehabilitation is a preservation action, right; and you have to have a set of standards by which to grade that, so why wouldn't you keep the windows, etc. listed here if the building is being retained;

Mr. Janiw – if the intent is the building is being retained it should be consistent with façade treatments, the building should incorporate;

Councilwoman Rogers – I don't understand your question;

Ms. Van Vorst – this sentence says if an existing building is going to be part of the developers plan to be rehabilitated, so kept and used in another way, that they do not have to follow the design standards in this plan; why change a building if you are not keeping any of the architectural;

Councilwoman Rogers – what about keeping interior;

Mr. Cucchiaro – what does rehabilitation apply to, is it broad in prospective;

Ms. Van Vorst – changing the interior is not an issue, design standards are massing roof, windows, planting, all exterior, all outside;

Mr. Janiw – we are looking to have the building to be brought to individual standards but not sure we want them to change the character of the building; keeping that historic building there is to maintain the character; if going to stay should not be significant alteration;

Ms. Van Vorst – I agree, but this sentence does not say that; am I misunderstanding you;

Mr. Janiw – maybe we need to reword that;

Ms. Van Vorst – prohibited materials – can we add vinyl siding, it is not permitted in the Center Core and seems with this new building it should be eliminated;

Mr. Janiw – my apologies – vinyl should have been included in the prohibited list; we do not encourage this on this type of structure;

Ms. Crombie – I think it is important to clarify, that Freehold Borough stands historically we have such great character, we want to maintain the character while elevating the redevelopment; example; current Penn Station, if you saw the original, gorgeous; it was developed over and is a sin, look at pictures;

Mr. Wildermuth – page 11, permitted accessory uses, dog washing station; what is this do we want this;

Mr. Janiw – yes, it is interior to the building, tenants only and for pet friendly residents, it is an absolute must because you have people washing their dogs in the tub, clogging drains; these are very specific rooms, fully tile, stainless steel tubs with walk up ramps, shampoo dispenser;

Mr. Jackson – page 14, reference historic center, can you clarify; are there any buildings protected, not protected, could be protected with consultation with HPC, confusing;

Mr. Janiw – there are none that are protected, some older structures that have character;

Mr. Jackson – referencing back to beginning of this process, 32 Broad Street, and labeled as Historic District Overlay Key Resource; protected or not protected;

Ms. Van Vorst – I am not understanding how this redevelopment zone works with HPC ordinance, because now anything in the zone, that is in an historic district, comes to the HPC for exterior changes and certificate of demolition; I don't know how that will work out, if someone bought the Broad Street school and wanted to take down if they would have to come to HPC for certificate of demo, if HPC does not want to grant then they come to you, here;

Mr. Cucchiaro – there is a section that talks about HPC is going to play and it appeared to be advisory rather than having to obtain any formal approvals;

Ms. Van Vorst – the board is advisory, so everything works that work correct;

Mr. Cucchiaro – you spoke about the HPC having the right to approve demolishing buildings;

Ms. Van Vorst – the certificate of appropriateness can be appealed because it is advisory;

Mr. Cucchiaro – the certificate of appropriateness is binding and if you don't like it, then you appeal it; you would not appeal if purely advisory; this is saying, in no more clear terms is prior to coming here, an applicant will go to the HPC, HPC will issue comments that you will have as a board when the applicant comes here for site plan approval or whatever they need; there is not anything they need to obtain, CA or demo permit from the HPC;

Ms. Van Vorst – that is just in this new redevelopment area;

Mr. Cucchiaro - yes – that does not speak to anything else outside of this redevelopment area;

Ms. Van Vorst – that is not what we discussed

Mr. Jackson – that is diminishing the role of the HPC for this zone;

Mr. Goode (Borough attorney) – with regard to the HPC, it is advisory anytime there is a major site plan that will come to this board; the HPC, giving a CA would not be relevant to someone coming in this type of major site plan, they will present to the board, the HPC will give advisory opinion to this board, what the development is or not;

Ms. Crombie – without knowing futuristic plans, if they take up extra room;

Ms. Van Vorst – the other phases of redevelopment are not in historic districts now; it would not go to HPC; HPC on Throckmorton, goes up to Broad;

Mr. Jackson – diminishing what the HPC has been doing, is that consistent with the master plan; You are changing what we have been doing;

Mr. Goode – it is still advisory; anytime a developer comes to seek approval from this Board, the HPC is advisory; to the extent of, someone coming to building in this redevelopment area, their role is still advisory; it is not diminished, not enhanced it is what it is, and what it has been; this board can say, thank you very much, we disagree with you or thank you we agree, lets incorporate;

Mr. Janiw – we included this section specifically so the developer does consult with the HPC, we do value your opinion and want your input with façade, appearance and colors; my understanding is as Mr. Goode, said advisory and you are one of the stops along the way of redevelopment for review and advise the board;

Mr. Jackson – if demo what do they do;

Mr. Janiw – the plan directs them to consult with the HPC on things like façade, architectural;

Mr. Cucchiaro – what she is saying, there is no approval for demolition that is required from the HPC;

Ms. Van Vorst – because in other applications we denied for demolition – 55 E Main Street last year; there was no appeal, he decide to do something else; I don't know how the CA fits into this; I guess we don't do for redevelopment;

Mr. Cucchiaro – most times for CA is done when changing windows, siding, exterior in nature and no application to the land use board; for the preliminary and final site plans, section 110 of the MLUL requires if a lot is within a historic district or designated historically significant in the master plan then it gets referred to HPC for comment and those comments are sent to planning board; much the same as an environmental commission or shade tree commission; depends on how your ordinance is written, Newark you are required to go to the HPC for a demolition, even if in a redevelopment area; when Prudential was doing there new headquarters there, the owners of Gateway Center sued the HPC of Newark because they argued that the demolition permit should not have been granted; the function of how your ordinance is written; here the redevelopment plan would define it;

Mr. Jackson – if they want to demo a building, they come to this board;

Mr. Cucchiaro – this board is bound by the redevelopment plan and the MLUL, you don't evaluate what you are taking down, you evaluate what you are putting up; do you comply, if you don't comply, make your burden of proof; here they call it exceptions and waivers for other applications it would be variances and waivers; we are checking to make sure you comply and if you don't, have you satisfied your burden of proof;

Mr. Barricelli – thank you to the board, appreciate your input and questions; will someone give a motion for this redevelopment plan being consistent with the master plan;

Mr. Wildermuth made a motion, this redevelopment plan is consistent with the master plan;
Councilwoman Rogers seconded;

Yes	8	Barricelli, Ceppi, Wildermuth, Crombie, Van Vorst, Councilwoman Rogers, Jackson and Mayor Kane
No	0	
Abstain	1	Keelan
Absent	2	McCabe and Argote-Freyre

Mr. Barricelli does anyone have anything else for discussion, Councilwoman Rogers;

Councilwoman Rogers – nothing at this time;

Ms. Van Vorst – Court Street / Monument Area, the residents have requested to be a historic district; part of Broad Street is now a Historic District; this will be on our agenda next month, if we all agree, we will ask Mayor and Council to also designate Monument Area as historic district, that came from the residents;

Mr. Maltese – we have a plot plan we are currently reviewing on Court and Monument Streets, vacant lot, proposing a single family house; there is no ordinance for a sight triangle easement on corner lots; at this location, I am recommending they provide; we do not have an ordinance for sight triangle easement and we did not bring up at the end of the year but I think it is important for corner lots to maintain a sight triangle easement;

Mr. Cucchiaro – Class I and Class III to bring back to the Council;

Mr. Barricelli motion to adjourn, all in favor – aye (all), nay (none);

Meeting adjourned at 8:19PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dominica R. Napolitano