

MEETING MINUTES

TOWNSHIP OF OCEAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

APRIL 27, 2016

5:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

- ROLL CALL

Dan Collamer X Tina Wetter Absent Dennis Tredy X

FLAG SALUTE

OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT – PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW JERSEY OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT, ADEQUATE NOTICE OF THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY PROVIDED BY SENDING COPIES OF THE NOTICE OF MEETING TO TWO NEWSPAPERS, THE ASBURY PARK PRESS AND THE PRESS OF ATLANTIC CITY. THE NOTICE WAS POSTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE TOWNSHIP CLERK AND ON THE BULLETIN BOARD OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING.

REGULAR MEETING

NEW BUSINESS

- Coastal Redevelopment Partners – Block 41, Lot 36.01
 - Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan
 - Dunkin Donuts with a Drive thru window

Vincent D’Elia, Attorney Representing Coastal Redevelopment Partners. This is an application to make amendments to the Redevelopment Plan concerning a Dunkin Donuts. The Redevelopment Committee is familiar with the site and its components. Mr. D’Elia introduced David Lisa. Mr. Lisa will give the cliff notes version of the project.

David Lisa, Coastal Redevelopment Partners, is sworn in by Township Attorney Gregory McGuckin.

Mr. Lisa discussed this application is the relocation of Dunkin Donuts from a space within the shopping center to a new location on the corner of Volunteer Way and Route 9, so the new building can accommodate a drive-through and have its own identity. Mr. Bori, the operator of the existing Dunkin

Donuts, is here tonight. Originally, when the project was approved, this pad location had on it a 4,500 square foot sit down restaurant. Over the past six years, Coastal Redevelopment has been unable to get a project for this pad. There were discussions with Mr. Bori about Dunkin Donuts moving to the pad. Those discussions resulted in an agreement and a lease agreement subject to approval. Coastal Redevelopment's intention is to reconfigure the 4,500 square feet, if it is approved, into a building that is a little less than 4,000 square feet that would accommodate two tenants. One tenant in the corner would be Dunkin Donuts and the second tenant is not signed yet.

Mr. Lisa discussed the Coastal Redevelopment agreement is Mr. Bori needs to maintain certain signage and Dunkin Donut standards in order for Dunkin Donuts to approve relocation to the corner pad. Part of the application includes signage along the corner and a complete redesign of the corner, with the landscaping and to bring the pad back up to standards and to put in line the original concept which is a series of step retaining walls and a much cleaner look. The current landscaping there is simply a placeholder to keep it neat and clean.

Mr. D'Elia discussed the T&M Engineering review letter dated April 6, 2016.

Stan Slachetka, T&M Engineering, requested the applicant begin with the project's consistency with the Redevelopment Plan and the nature of the use.

Mr. Robert F. Yuro, Professional Engineer, Yuro Engineering, Howell, NJ, is sworn in by Township Attorney McGuckin.

Mr. Yuro discussed practicing for 30 years and testified before this Township on the original application. Mr. Yuro has testified in front of numerous municipalities throughout New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania for both planning and engineering testimony.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the applicant is proposing a pad site with two components. One being a proposed Dunkin Donuts store and the other being a retail store, to be determined in the future. Pursuant to the operative redevelopment plan, which is the Phase I Route 9 Redevelopment Plan as amended, fast food restaurants are permitted in association with a pedestrian oriented commercial center, as long as such restaurants provide for outdoor seating and dining areas and provide linkage to the adjoining pedestrian and bike path network. Drive-through businesses, except as permitted within a pedestrian oriented commercial center, are specifically prohibited. The overall Shop Rite shopping center is considered a pedestrian oriented center, pursuant to the requirements of the Redevelopment Plan. This pad site is located within that area. The key issue the applicant needs to address is to make an affirmative determination that this use is permitted within the confines of the Redevelopment Plan and that the project is a pedestrian oriented use and is consistent with the overall pedestrian oriented center and provides linkages to the bikeway path, as required pursuant to the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Yuro discussed with the original application the main focus was the pedestrian access to the property. In working with the County, there is a bike path that runs parallel to Route 9 and the entire frontage. There were several key points of connecting to the center itself for pedestrian access adjacent to Ocean First Bank. There is an access path that goes directly from the County bikeway to the parking field. Further south, where the current Dunkin Donuts is located, there is a whole plaza that was created in that corner, step down plaza for events and continual linkage from the County bikeway via steps or continuous sidewalks from Route 9 into the property. All of the uses on the property are all connected via sidewalks and crosswalks between the Shop Rite building and various parking fields where the existing Dunkin Donuts is currently located and also the sidewalk connections to Volunteer Way to the retail stores that are located in the northwest portion of the property.

For this specific site, the applicant is proposing to build a 4,000 square foot building to replace the originally approved sit-down restaurant. The applicant is providing outdoor seating, outdoor patio to the east of the proposed Dunkin Donuts. This plan doesn't show individual chairs and tables but it will as the applicant moves forward to the necessary site plan phase. The project will have some protection fencing around it so pedestrians are not stepping off into the drive through lanes for the Dunkin Donuts. An actual pedestrian connection is not shown for this specific pad. That will be provided as the applicant moves forward with this application. More than likely it will be located at the entrance to the drive through lane adjacent to the handicap parking stalls in front of the Dunkin Donuts staff.

That connection is going to connect easterly to the existing bikeway. The applicant will try to create a sidewalk that will connect along the slopes. Depending on the grading and slopes, there may be potential requirement for steps. That will be determined when the applicant starts engineering the revisions for this corner property, at which time the applicant will be in touch with board members and professionals to ascertain the proper way to proceed with that connection of the northeast corner property.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the applicant is indicating they are going to provide the connection that is required pursuant to the plan. That will be presented before the Planning Board as part of the Planning Board application and site plan review. The applicant will need to deal with the slope issues. When the applicant does their evaluation, an important aspect would be the bikeway path on the County property is both pedestrian and bikeway access. Mr. Slachetka inquired if the applicant is affirmatively presenting testimony that in fact this will be presented as part of the Planning Board application.

Mr. Yuro discussed that is correct.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired how bike access will be obtained with steps.

Mr. Yuro discussed the sidewalk will have to run parallel to the slope and tie back into the County bike path, as opposed to being directly 90 degrees from the handicap parking spaces.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if it is going to be a ramp or steps on the plan.

Mr. Yuro discussed it will be a ramp.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed that is the condition the Township would want before the applicant goes to site planning. The Township does not want to see something different at site planning.

Committeeman Collamer inquired if it is necessary for that access to be capable of being bicycle access or is it okay for it to be just foot access.

Jim Oris, T&M Engineering, discussed the bike path is actually a multipurpose path. People walk and bike on this path. In the context of meeting the intent of the Redevelopment Plan, where by-throughs are permitted if associated with a pedestrian link of use, providing a ramp or steps would meet that condition because it is pedestrian-link that the Redevelopment Plan requires. Either will meet the intent of the Redevelopment ordinance, however, the Redevelopment Committee would like to know the applicant's intent so it is understood what the applicant is proposing. It is on record the applicant is proposing a ramp.

Mr. Yuro discussed it will be a ramp, as testified. It may not be 90 degrees to the existing path. It may be angled slightly away from it, in order to pick up the existing slopes that are there. It will be a ramp.

Mayor Tredy discussed if it is due to the grading that steps are needed, a bike rack could be proposed.

Scott Taylor, Taylor Design Group, discussed there really isn't any room immediately around the building for a bike rack. The bikeway user could dismount and walk across the crosswalk and into the store. The County will have to approve that alignment as would the Boards.
Mayor Tredy discussed proposing the safest way for the bike path user.

Committeeman Collamer discussed there is a considerable grade difference from the bike path area. The steps are a safer way.

Mr. Taylor discussed bikes would not be crossing the drive-through lane. It would be safer for a bike path user to park on the rail trail then walk into the store.

Mr. Oris inquired if Mr. Yuro's professional opinion is that this proposed use, with the pedestrian access link, is consistent with the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Yuro discussed yes it is consistent.

Mr. Oris discussed the testimony has addressed comment number one (1) of the T&M review letter.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the testimony has addressed some of comment number two (2). Mr. Slachetka inquired if there will be some sort of crosswalk or other way for pedestrians crossing over the drive through lane.

Mr. Yuro discussed there will be a painted crosswalk across the drive through lane and throughout the parking lot.

Mr. Oris discussed the applicant has provided testimony for the last comment, "the applicant should provide testimony regarding the pedestrian link, which is in the bikeway link".

The applicant should address the comments in Mr. Taylor's letter "address the landscaping, hedgerow and treatments". The next comment is "deciduous tree plantings and landscaping" and "applicant has not provided detailed site landscaping plan and lighting". The applicant should provide testimony with regard to the number of parking spaces the applicant is providing on the site and an overview of the parking provided and needed for this pad site, as it reflects to the overall site and in conjunction with the other site that Dunkin Donuts is vacating. The applicant should provide testimony on a net parking evaluation.

Mr. Yuro discussed based on the original application, this was a sit down restaurant which needs excessive parking. The applicant is now coming back with a small retail space and a drive through Dunkin Donuts. The parking numbers are going to be much less. The Township is not eliminating any of the parking spaces. The intent was parking has already been constructed and built in the accordance with the original approvals that there will be excess parking on the property for the uses. The applicant does not anticipate eliminating any parking spaces.

Mr. Oris inquired when the applicant proceeds to the Planning Board for final site plan approval, will there be a recalculation of parking.

Mr. Yuro discussed at final site plan approval, the applicant will provide a recalculation of parking. A parking breakdown will be given to the Planning Board.

Mr. Oris discussed if that is acceptable to the Redevelopment Committee, it is acceptable to defer the parking matter to the Planning Board. The secondary use to the Dunkin Donuts still hasn't been determined. The net evaluation of parking can be made at the Planning Board level. Committeeman Collamer discussed there is adequate space available.

Mayor Tredy discussed the overall design included other entities on the site. There is plenty of parking.

Mr. Yuro discussed the applicant will provide a formal use-by-use breakdown, which will be shown on the site plan as the applicant moves forward to the site-plan phase.

Mr. Oris discussed comment number six (6) of the T&M review letter indicated additional testimony is needed regarding landscaping and buffer and access to the linkage. Landscaping and buffer needs to be taken a little further when addressing Mr. Taylor's review letter. Comment number seven (7) is regarding the proposed drive through is fifteen (15) feet away from the closest portion of the rail trail. Please provide additional testimony regarding the functionality of the actual drive through lane and if there is any issues or concerns with that setback.

Mr. Yuro discussed the drive through lane is set back at the perimeters of what the applicant already has for parking that was around the existing building. The limits of pavement is not going to exceed any further or encroach any closer to either Volunteer Way or Route 9 than what is there today in the parking that was already constructed.

Mr. Oris discussed paving isn't moving closer to the rail trail.

Mr. Yuro discussed that is correct. It will be consistent with what is out there today at its closest point. It will not getting any closer to the rail trail, nor will it be closer to Volunteer Way with any of the asphalt.

Mr. Oris discussed any landscape treatment will be discussed further when the applicant reviews Mr. Taylor's letter.

Mr. Yuro discussed correct.

Mr. Oris discussed comment number eight (8) is regarding detailed measurements of the signage of the site. The Township does not have details as to what the applicant is proposing. That also includes façade signs.

Mr. Yuro discussed façade signs will be incorporated on the architect renderings. There will be more testimony on the façade signs.

Mr. Oris inquired if the signage and the location of the drive through window will be labeled on the plan as a diagonal slash.

Mr. Yuro discussed that is correct, right next to the outdoor seating. It is adjacent to the drive through lane on the east side of the building, adjacent to the patio.

Mr. Oris inquired how the stacking will work with the pedestrian crossing at that location.

Mr. Yuro discussed there is a two-car stack at that point, before it starts approaching to the parking field. The anticipation is a 2-3 minute transaction, at the worst case. There is a six-car stack from the window itself. There will be two cars stacked from the sign until you hit the parking field. The total stacking distance from the window will be about six cars, which is acceptable for a drive through lane. There will be potential pedestrians crossing from the bikeway, as with any other drive through entity. Any site in the state will have to be driver caution as they are approaching. The applicant will provide the necessary signage for crossings so drivers are aware there is a crossing point coming from the bikeway. The crosswalk will be painted on the asphalt to highlight this area of pedestrian access. It is a confined area. There will not be vehicles with too much speed. It will be a controlled access point. It will be just driver/pedestrian mitigation there.

Mr. Oris discussed comment number ten (10) “the architect and the applicant can provide additional testimony regarding design concept statement”. Comment number eleven (11) is regarding the siding and building exterior. Mr. Oris inquired if the applicant would like to defer these comments to the architect.

Mr. Yuro discussed those comments will be deferred to the architect.

Mr. Oris discussed architectural designs are discussed in comment number twelve (12). Comment thirteen (13) is regarding any impacts on stormwater management or any other infrastructure.

Mr. Yuro discussed there will be no impact. All the existing utilities have already been installed on the property. There will be no impact with the utilities within the public right of way. Any utilities that come into this building will come from the interior. The stormwater management has been designed to incorporate a 4,500 square foot building with associated sidewalks. At the time the applicant hopefully moves forward to the site plan phase, a formal statement will be prepared applying the increase, if there is one, or the net reduction in the flow for the impact of this development.

Mr. Oris discussed the applicant has addressed most of the comments in the T&M review letter with the exception of the items deferred to either Mr. Taylor’s letter or to the architect for additional consideration.

Jeffrey W. Kusmick, Registered Architect with the State of New Jersey and also licensed in New York and Pennsylvania. Mr. Kusmick has been licensed in New Jersey since 1987 and graduated from the Institute of Technology in 1981 with a bachelor of architecture degree. Mr. Kusmick has been practicing for almost 35 years. Mr. Kusmick has given expert testimony before numerous boards of planning and board of adjustments, as well as expert witness work and has testified in court.

Jeffrey W. Kusmick is sworn in by Township Attorney McGuckin.

Mr. Oris discussed there were a few remainder items from the T&M review letter regarding architectural comments, specifically comments 8, 10, 11, 12 and 13. The comments are relatively small. Item 8 is “the applicants to provide detailed measurements of the signage and assure they are in compliance with the requirements of the Redevelopment Plan”. Mr. Oris inquired if the applicant is proposing any ground mounted signs.

Mr. Kusmick discussed he has not seen the T&M review. Mr. Kusmick discussed one ground mounted sign would be the monument sign discussed in Mr. Taylor's letter for the corner of Route 9 and Volunteer Way. That is the proposed, two-sided, LED sign, which was also to provide digital signage display for various tenants and also could be used for community notices. The building signage is noted on architectural drawing Z-02 and Z-03 for the Dunkin Donut tenant. Tenant "A" signage is noted on the drawings and "Tenant Sign". There is no specific tenant identified. There is a general square foot area for the unidentified tenant signage noted on the drawing.

Mr. Oris discussed the monument sign on the architectural drawings is indicated to be 50.6 inches wide, 29.8 inches high, LED, double-sided sign.

Mr. Kusmick discussed some of the LED manufacturers make different sizes. The applicant will make it the size noted on the drawing, which is 10.7 square feet per side.

Mr. Taylor discussed as part of the Willows application, they were at the maximum number of freestanding signs for the site, when the additional free standing sign was put in. The LED signs are not specifically permitted within the Redevelopment area. The applicant should provide testimony on the flashing LED signs at the intersection.

Mr. Oris inquired how much of the sign would be LED and if the entire sign is an LED sign.

Mr. Kusmick discussed just the area depicted in the elevation, the full 10 square feet. The rest is stone work.

Mayor Tredy inquired the purpose of the LED sign for this site.

Mr. Lisa discussed the Redevelopment zone now permits one sign per street frontage. Presently, Coastal Redevelopment has one large monument sign on Route 9. The Willows came in for a sign on Memorial Drive. The concept of this sign on the corner is an LED changeable reader sign that is part of what is now permitted, one-sign per frontage, which is Volunteer Way. Coastal Redevelopment wants to do what is done north along Route 9 in Lacey Township. There are many LED changeable lighted signs. Coastal Redevelopment's concept is to provide time, spread out to each of the tenants within the shopping center, identifying sales, specials and Township events.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if there are digital signs along Route 9 in Waretown.

Mr. Lisa discussed not being sure. Lacey Township does.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed this strip mall was designed to not be like other towns along Route 9. It is hard to understand this is part of the Redevelopment plan.

Mr. Lisa discussed Shop Rite has voiced interest in this sign, who is competing with the newly opened Acme in Barnegat. Coastal Redevelopment is trying to keep up with the competitive times of competing with businesses up and down Route 9, to keep the tenants in the shopping center viable.

Mr. Lisa spoke to the Shop Rite Operational Manager two hours ago. Shop Rite did take a hit from the Barnegat residents and is trying to stay competitive.

Committeeman Collamer inquired if the Township is in a position to discuss the sign if it is forbidden in the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Taylor discussed the original Redevelopment Plan did not even allow backlit signs. It was exterior illuminated signs. Then there was modification to the sign ordinance that allowed some additional signage. If it is not expressly permitted by the Redevelopment plan or the ordinance, then it is prohibited. Committeeman Collamer inquired if the applicant would be able to seek a way to have the sign at the Planning Board level.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed the Township approved an amended Redevelopment Plan to permit it.

Committeeman Collamer discussed the Township is not in any position to allow the sign.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the amendment to the plan that was made in 2005, did specifically allow for one free standing monument sign per street frontage. That is the type of sign that would be permitted. The applicant then would default back to the various standards regarding signage in the original Redevelopment Plan to identify the types of designs and standards. The LED sign the applicant is proposing is not consistent with the Redevelopment Plan. That aspect of the design is one of the critical components of the overall requirements of the Redevelopment Plan. The Redevelopment Plan would need to be amended to allow that type of sign. The Planning Board could not allow that sign by variance.

Mayor Tredy discussed the Township never wanted those types of signs in town. Dunkin Donuts is going to be well-noticed on the corner and will have their sign and an additional sign on the building.

Mr. Lisa discussed the sign is not unique to Dunkin Donuts. The sign is for the whole center. The tenants within the center would have time on the display throughout the day.

Mayor Tredy discussed the LED signs are distractions for drivers, especially when the signs are set up for the highway.

Mr. Slachetka discussed this is a key location. Volunteer Way and Route 9 is a key visual point within the whole complex.

Mr. Collamer discussed the Redevelopment Committee has to make its decision based on the existing plan.

Mr. Lisa inquired if the ordinance is clear about the square footage permitted per road frontage per sign. Mr. Lisa inquired since Willows received sign approval, does that mean Coastal can never have a sign on Memorial for the shopping center.

Mr. Taylor discussed on Memorial Drive, to the extent that is not specified in the Redevelopment Plan. The municipal sign ordinance would apply with respect to size.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the permission for signs states that tenant panels shall be permitted on one of the signs, which implies that on the other sign tenant panels are not permitted, just identifying the center. It also says such signs shall be designed in the manner that coordinates with the architectural design of development. There is a clear linkage to the overall design in terms of the signage.

Mr. Oris discussed the current Redevelopment Plan provides for one monument sign at each street frontage location, which is what the applicant is proposing. Mr. Oris suggested the applicant propose the

signage meet the current Redevelopment Plan requirements, in the absence of saying it would meet the Township ordinance requirements, which currently do not permit LED signs. That is something the Redevelopment Committee would need to consider if they are going to vote favorably.

Mr. Lisa inquired since Willows received sign approval, does that mean Coastal can never have a sign on Memorial for the shopping center.

Mr. Oris discussed the one monument sign at that location meets the intent of the Redevelopment ordinance. The Willows required Coastal Redevelopment to be a part of that application, as a sign was sited on the Coastal property. Willows and Coastal coordinated efforts as to what the sign would say. Therefore, only one monument sign is permitted at that location.

Mr. Monahan requested to interrupt regarding tonight's second application.

WITHDRAW APPLICATION – Mr. Thomas Monahan

- Mackres Family LLC – Block 41, Lots 37, 38.02 & 39.01
- Minor Subdivision

Thomas Monahan, representative for the Mackres Family LLC, withdrew the Redevelopment application at this time and does not want to be heard tonight. The applicant will have to come back another time.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if the reason for withdrawing is the business matter that was discussed or for another reason.

Mr. Monahan discussed the reason and for several issues.

RECONVENE - Coastal Redevelopment Partners – Block 41, Lot 36.01

- **Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan**
- **Dunkin Donuts with a Drive thru window**

Mr. Oris discussed the Redevelopment Committee is looking for a design concept statement identifying the significant features that supports the reason behind the architectural and site plan proposed, with respect to the architectural component.

Mr. Kusmick discussed the architectural components in the overall design. The applicant tried to allow the building to recognize that the Dunkin Donuts franchise has specific design criteria for branding elements. The applicant tried to break up the footprint plan as well as the elevations into two tenant spaces and architectural characters.

The Tenant "A" area next to the Dunkin Donuts will be designed in an architectural context to the Ocean First Bank, which is part of the Redevelopment plan. The applicant took the elements that are existing now at the Ocean First Bank, which had a small masonry stone base and a little water course detail, as well as white trim board that accentuates the corners and a clapboard siding expression. The color is

consistent at least for Tenant "A" with the Ocean First Bank in a gray pallet. The top part of the building introduces decorative cornices and changes in the parapet height that would allow more architectural character to exist on the façade. The top part of the cornice was taken from the First Ocean Bank, which has a 2 foot 6 inch, almost 3 foot, decorative reeves that is just below the eave line and cornice line. This is what the applicant is trying to accomplish as far as the Dunkin Donuts.

Dunkin Donuts' specific branding element is the monolith on Drawing Z-02, which is featured on the corner where the entrance is. It wraps around the side, which would be facing the parking lot and the side of the bank building.

The applicant provided at least two service entrances to service the Dunkin Donuts. One on the front side primary façade which faces the parking lot area and one on the driveway side. The applicant continued the clapboard siding expression across to the Dunkin Donuts. The applicant used an earth tone pallet of colors that are consistent with Dunkin Donuts branding elements.

The monolith sign has a typical nine color pallet of gradation, which may be seen more frequently today with their sign element and their window having an eyebrow element above it and wrapping along the side and terminating at the monolith. That is the orange band. There is also a small shed-type fabric awning canopy that is just under the eyebrow over both windows.

The drive through window elevation drawing, as far as Tenant "A", which is next to the Dunkin Donuts, the applicant tried to create the same expression so the building has two fronts, even though it is facing the drive through window side or the Dunkin Donuts tenant space. The applicant included additional mullions on the windows that are similar in character to the Ocean First Bank building so the architectural expressions are consistent with what is already being provided in the context of the retail complex.

As far as the Dunkin Donuts side of the tenant space, the applicant repeated the monolith element again, although it does not have the color degradations in the window and the little eyebrow piece. The applicant has indicated the Dunkin Donuts signage on the elevations. All of the square footage for those areas are called out upon. Over the drive through window there is a two-sided blade sign that is very small and modest, consistent with the Dunkin Donuts element that will sit above the canopy overhang that is right above the drive through window.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired the purpose of the blade sign.

Mr. Kusmick discussed it is part of the Dunkin Donuts branding element to establish identity of the drive through window.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if customers are not going to know where the drive through window is.

Mr. Kusmick discussed that orientation is towards Volunteer Way. It does provide a small amount of signage from the street intersection.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if the other brand is visible from that same street.

Mr. Kusmick discussed yes.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if the current facility has the orange wraparound detail.

Mr. Kusmick discussed no. That unit is part of a multi-tenant strip. Mr. Bori will explain the tenant space and operation.

Mr. Taylor discussed while the clapboard signage materials are generally consistent with the rest of the center especially the Ocean First Bank and this building, and now that the Committee can see the color presentation, the configuration of the orange bands, coffee colors and multiple colors in those towers are not consistent with the rest of the center. It was also noted that all the other buildings in the center have pitched roofs, which is a more common form in the Township. The corner of the Dunkin Donuts is a more modern looking structure than what was portrayed on the plans. The materials are acceptable for the façades. The introduction of pitched roofs and a more subdued color scheme like the rest of the center would be more fitting. Mr. Taylor just successfully worked with Dunkin Donuts on a visible location in Medford Township, where the color gradations were not done in those forms. They did a more traditional looking building with pitched roof elements. That would be much more appropriate and fitting for the rest of the center.

Committeeman Collamer discussed not taking away too much of the branding for the success of these businesses. The pitched roofs are acceptable. There is an element of branding with these businesses the Township has to cope with, in terms with the distinction of the Dunkin Donuts logo. To make it generic is not the right thing to do.

William Bori, Owner, Dunkin Donuts, is sworn in by Township Attorney McGuckin. Mr. Bori discussed owning 23 Dunkin Donuts throughout Ocean and Monmouth Counties, and has testified before the Planning Board for the original application. Mr. Bori is the original owner of the Dunkin Donuts in Waretown. Mr. Bori is looking to move the store from its current location to a drive through location. Mr. Bori tries to configure to what the Township's needs are. Dunkin Donuts needs a certain element of its identity. That was never achieved in this shopping center, as far as the signage, awnings and color scheme of the building. It does not fit the Dunkin Donuts image. The store gets lost in the shopping center with just the gray tones. Dunkin Donuts needs more of a destination-oriented location where people will see it better than it is now. Mr. Bori has struggled within this center, especially since the drive through location opened in Forked River.

Mr. Bori is looking to move the Dunkin Donuts to the new site, which is a much more visible site. Mr. Bori will certainly work with the Township of toning it down. This is a much more toned down look, compared to Dunkin Donuts 8-10 years ago. It is a more earth-toned building. Dunkin Donuts still needs its identity, which is something the store has struggled with in this specific site.

Mayor Tredy discussed the Dunkin Donuts design shown tonight and inquired if Mr. Bori has any objection to building the store that way.

Mr. Bori discussed most of the units with this type of monolith is better for sound. It keeps the equipment backed off from the sound issue. The color scheme is much better than just putting shingles with the roof there. It does not help identify the building.

Charles Jakuboski, Director of Construction, Dunkin Donuts Franchise, is sworn in by Township Attorney McGuckin. Mr. Jakuboski has built over 55 Dunkin Donuts stores among other shopping centers. Mr. Jakuboski built the original Dunkin Donuts store in Waretown, the chiropractor store, landlord work for the Chinese Restaurant and landlord work for the vitamin shop.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the pitched roof issue is Dunkin Donuts has a lot of rooftop equipment that goes on the roof, such as refrigerator and freezer compressors, air conditioning units. The air conditioning unit for a Dunkin Donuts is very large. It is not like a normal retail store. It cannot be put on a pitched roof.

Mr. Yuro inquired where is the equipment now.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the current store only has a faked pitch on the front. The rest of the roof is flat.

Mr. Taylor discussed it is common for Starbucks and Dunkin Donuts to have faux pitched roofs on two or three sides. Most CVS stores have the same thing. It looks like a full pitched roof but in the center there is a flat roof and mechanicals on there. CVS's rainwater drains through the middle of the store.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the new store has views from all sides, so the faked pitch cannot be hidden from one side of the building.

Mr. Taylor discussed unless it was done on all four sides, which is how CVS is.

Mr. Lisa discussed having built four CVS stores. CVS is somewhere between 8,800 and 12,000 square feet. Faux pitched roofs can be created and still leave enough area in the middle to hide things. This is a 2,000 square foot store. There is not enough room when you put pitched roofs on four sides. The ugliest thing is seeing rooftop equipment.

Mr. Taylor discussed the Redevelopment plan calls for a more traditional architectural form. Flat roofs are permitted. All of the rest of the center has pitched elements and from a consistency standpoint that would be an improved aesthetic. The left side of the building, even though it has a flat roof, fits in. The right side of the building, combined with the branding, signage or striping, it becomes a more modern form. If there are some efforts that can be made, whether it is a traditional or a pitched roof or other modifications, that corner becomes completely different than everything else in the center and different from everything else the Redevelopment Plan has envisioned going back 10-12 years. The branding can be maintained, as done very successfully in other stores.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the one thing the applicant would like to stick with is the monolith. That is the element that recognizes the store as a Dunkin Donuts a mile up the road, then drivers can prepare to turn. Mr. Jackuboski discussed carrying the detail over and maintaining the monolith. That would be fine.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed if there is a faux pitched roof on three sides, but left the side open above the other store, nobody would see the equipment.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed having a pitched roof on three sides does not leave any room in the middle for the equipment.

Mr. Taylor discussed the monolith could have a pitched roof. Starbucks has a similar model with a corner monolith. It could be a pavilion or four pitched roof, decorative cornice and parapets around the other side. It has a more traditional feel. The drawing shows a modern looking building that is not what the Township has envisioned in terms of the LED signs. There is a significant amount of internally illuminated signs. That is what people will see from a quarter mile in each direction.

Committeeman Collamer discussed Mr. Taylor is suggesting a pitched roof on the taller part of the building.

Mr. Taylor discussed and a decorative cornice on the remainder. Another strikingly modern feature is the orange band. If the Committee is okay with the coffee colored stripes on the monolith, the orange band is the most striking, modern form on the building.

Mr. Collamer discussed any contrasting color there would serve the same purpose to cause the L-shaped piece to stand out from the rest.

Mr. Taylor discussed if it was just an orange awning, it would portray the corporate image. A standard awning is a traditional architectural form. The band is an orange stucco L and a little less typical. If there were a couple of orange awnings, that would be inappropriate.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed there are orange awnings that set inside the window, underneath. The orange band stands about 8-9 inches and there is an awning that comes down underneath that.

Mr. Taylor discussed it is that extra hunk of building that pops out from the wall in the back.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the applicant would be hard-pressed to prove spending on this illuminous project without enough identity. There is a recently built store in Ship Bottom. This is toned down from what used to be a much brighter orange and pink. The goal is to have a building that looks good. Maybe there is something that could be done with the roofline that carries a portion over to make it look as one. Putting a roof on three sides is not a viable option.

Mayor Tredy inquired about the square footage needed on the roof for the equipment.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed there would be two air conditioning units that are 7-8 tons each. That size air conditioning unit is 5 feet x 8 feet. They cannot be put on top of each other due to the current codes. A certain percent of fresh air has to be draw into the buildings. The units would have to be separated with some distance between each other, so when the units are exhausting the hot air, it is not being drawn in by the next unit.

Mayor Tredy discussed these units are just for the Dunkin Donuts and inquired about the other building.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed that is a retail space that requires much lower air conditioning. Dunkin Donuts has to put in one ton for every 125 square feet of space. A normal retail store does one ton per every 400 square feet.

Mayor Tredy inquired what is stopping Dunkin Donuts from putting the air conditioner on the other building.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed whoever leases the space will be prohibited if they have certain requirements. The other reason is the duct work comes down out of the bottom of the unit and into the space. If the air conditioning unit is put on the other tenant's roof, the duct work would have to run through the other tenant's ceiling.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed some of the cornice could be brought over but as far as the orange band and the monolith, that is a Dunkin Donuts requirement.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired what the phrase, "Dunkin Donuts requirement" means.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed Dunkin Donuts has a design criteria for the applicant that has to be followed.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed the Township has an ordinance about the design criteria the applicant has to follow.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed what will happen is Dunkin Donuts will not allow the store to be built.

Mr. Bori discussed with CVS, Dunkin Donuts or Wawa, the applicant has to go to Corporate and get approval. If Corporate doesn't approve it, then the applicant cannot build. There are certain branding requirements. CVS has photo development services that if those items cannot be put on the building, then Corporate simply rejects it. The Dunkin Donuts representative, as well as the gentleman in construction, stated this is one of their requirements. Dunkin Donuts buildings have to meet certain minimum requirements. If the Township ordinance does not allow the orange band and it is presented to Corporate who rejects it, then the space is empty.

Mayor Tredy inquired if the current Dunkin Donuts has the stripes.

Mr. Bori discussed at the time, the current Dunkin Donuts was approved under the Township ordinance, or it would not be there. Now it is 2016 and Dunkin Donuts does not have the pink anymore.

Mr. Taylor discussed when you work for a national franchise, Corporate has an ideal prototype, in terms of the number of signs and the sizes of signs, as well as an ideal prototype for the architectural façade. Then there are multiple iterations after that. If the Township's ordinances, Master Plans and objectives require something different, Victorian or Colonial, whatever it is, all Corporate franchises have the ability to move off of the prototype. Mr. Taylor inquired if that is Mr. Bori's experience with all the franchises.

Mr. Bori discussed, no. There are different deals for different tenants.

Mr. Taylor discussed the Dunkin Donuts that is under construction in Medford does not have the orange band.

Mr. Bori discussed Dunkin Donuts had to get into Medford doing that.

Mr. Lisa discussed there are certain financial requirements, too. There's a consideration of balance, how much is spent on the building relative to the revenue volume and rent that can be paid. Here there is a minimum identity that has to be established for the tenant to be approved.

Mr. Taylor inquired if the requirements are based on location.

Mr. Lisa discussed, absolutely. It is flexible based on the location.

Mr. Taylor discussed this a flexible requirement. It is not something that Dunkin Donuts requires.

Mr. Bori discussed Dunkin Donuts wants 24 hours. If it's not 24 hours, then the site is not approved. Then the applicant goes back to Corporate and states the store has been there many years and 24 hours is not approved by the Township. This is the toned down version. The applicant tries to incorporate what

the town needs and what the applicant needs so the business is successful, the guests like it and the store fits in the town. This is a toned down version of some of the options Dunkin Donuts has.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if being open 24 hours a day is in the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the 24 hours issue has not been addressed.

Mayor Tredy discussed the Township does not want a 24 hours Dunkin Donuts. There is a Wawa that is open 24 hours.

Mr. Bori discussed he is not interested in a 24 hour store and was just showing the variation.

Mr. Taylor inquired if Dunkin Donuts requires 24 hour stores.

Mr. Bori discussed they do, but has to go back to Corporate and tell them the Township will not approve 24 hours and if Dunkin Donuts wants to be in that Township, this is what has to be done. Everything is a negotiation.

Mr. Taylor inquired if Mr. Bori chose not to be open 24 hours.

Mr. Bori discussed probably choosing, way back when, not to be open 24 hours. No one else in the center is open 24 hours. It does not fit into the area. It is the balance of running a business that has an identity. The store should have as much Dunkin Donuts identity as it can, but also fit into the center.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed it is the decision of the Township Committee. The question is, is it the Dunkin Donuts brand that will define the Town Center for 1,781 square feet or the branding that the Township has on the Town Center for 200,000 square feet. This is a key location in the entire Town Center. The Town Center center has been developed in a certain manner. This store is different. If that is what the Township Committee wants going forward, times change. That is the Township Committee's decision. Corporations do have their requirements, but it is the Township Committee's decision.

Committeeman Collamer discussed the Township Committee does not want to make the requirements so difficult that Dunkin Donuts withdraws the application. The Township Committee wants to make it as close to the Redevelopment Plan as possible. If the Township can come to a compromise on the orange band, then it will work.

Mr. Bori discussed there needs to be a compromise on some kind of orange.

Mr. Taylor discussed if the awnings were changed to the bright orange and added another awning over the door, there is an opportunity to introduce the orange in a way that is a lot less modern.

FIVE-MINUTE RECESS

Mr. Taylor discussed having a pavilion roof on top of the monument feature and transferring to a more traditional awning over this door and leave the flat roof here and carry some of that free zone over here, you are essentially doing the same thing, just losing the orange band.

Mr. Bori discussed Dunkin Donuts has to have that square. There cannot be a triangle there.

Mr. Taylor discussed bringing this up to here and then do the roof.

Mr. Bori inquired if Mr. Taylor is suggesting raising it higher than it is now.

Mr. Taylor discussed there is one on Route 541 and Church Road, which probably has less average daily trips.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed it could possibly be done, as long as it continues with the orange band. The hip type roof is going to take away from the brand recognition. If the store maintains the band, then it does not take away as much. If a hip roof is put on, then the band is lost and the store has lost all the brand recognition, totally.

Mr. Taylor discussed that is what the site signage is for.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed building a Dunkin Donuts inside the Monmouth Mall. There are no signs on the building or space at all. There was a woman pushing a stroller and the child said, "Mommy, Dunkin Donuts". That is the issue. It is recognized as they approach the store. By the time the sign is read, the customer passes the store.

Mr. Taylor discussed the Township is trying to work on the Township's branding, so when people drive by the site, they say "Waretown", not "another Dunkin Donuts". No pads have moved over the last six years.

Mr. Lisa discussed wanting to dress up the corner and inquired if Mr. Bori would consider a hip roof to tone down the colors.

Mr. Taylor discussed coming back next month and see if there are more options.

Mr. Lisa would like to discuss these issues with Mr. Bori tonight.

Mr. Lisa discussed keeping the building consistent with Shop Rite, taking the cornice and carrying it across to make it consistent, tone the colors down and that keeps the brand.

Committeeman Collamer inquired what colors are envisioned for the cornice.

Mr. Taylor discussed the cornice would be white or off-white.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed whatever color is picked for the other tenants.

Mr. Lisa discussed it will tie the buildings together.

Mr. Bori discussed there will still be orange, but not bright orange.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the actual color is called shocking orange.

Mr. Oris inquired about the proposal for the tenant space. That location has a parapet wall and the cornice across the top.

Mr. Lisa discussed keeping it the same.

Mr. Oris discussed the applicant's proposal is to leave the tenant space as proposed right now.

Mr. Lisa discussed that is correct.

Mr. Oris discussed the applicant's proposal of the modifications to the Dunkin Donuts space will include a four-sided, pavilion-type-façade roof on top of the Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. Taylor discussed a four-sided equal roof.

Mr. Oris discussed it would really be the three sides of the building. The applicant is only talking about on the corner of the building.

Mr. Lisa inquired what the Township envisions the material being on that, a shingle roof as what's on the rest of the center.

Mr. Taylor discussed it could be asphalt shingles or it could be standing.

Mr. Bori inquired if there is a height requirement.

Mr. Taylor discussed the applicant is well within the height requirements.

Mr. Oris discussed the shingles are to match the existing type at that location.

Mr. Taylor discussed the applicant could do it in bronze and a brown that would tie into the rest of the colors.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed that would look really nice.

Mr. Oris discussed the applicant is going to carry the cornice across.

Mr. Lisa discussed, yes, the cornice is going to be carried across with the same dimensions.

Mr. Oris discussed the applicant keeping the stagger in the cornice and the two cornices are going to be different heights.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed playing with the parapet height to create two distinctive tenant buildings and separations.

Mr. Taylor discussed that will justify the change in color.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the color would be white.

Mr. Taylor discussed the color could be white or off-white. The forms match because there are very cool colors. The colors are whites and light grays on the siding and warmer colors on the side. It could be white or a tan.

Mr. Collamer discussed it should be something more earth tone.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the cornice elements can tie in to match and use a cream or an off-white to tie in with the earth tones. Architecturally, some of the elements are carrying through and can relate to the Ocean First Bank.

Mr. Oris discussed the applicant has indicated providing some additional architectural features in terms of a faux window feature, something to break up a few of the building faces.

Mr. Taylor discussed with the elimination of the orange band, is there a way to bring a brighter orange awning across the façade. That will still give the applicant the branding they are looking for. The hard part is instead of shocking orange use a rust.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed rust stays a lot better looking than an orange. Orange fades quickly over time and the dirt sticks to it.

Mayor Tredy discussed the applicant and the Township Committee have come to some sort of an agreement. The Township Committee discussed for the benefit of the Municipal Clerk, one person shall state everything that was just said, so it can be on record.

Mr. Jakuboski summarized what has been agreed upon. The applicant will take the monolith element depicted on drawing Z-01, the floor plan, which has the entry to the Dunkin Donuts tenant space and wraps around the corner so that it is facing the parking lot, more towards the side of the bank building. That applicant is going to take that element and put a pyramidal shaped roof that is either going to be a standing sea metal roof that is consistent with the Ocean First Bank or a shingle roof, depending on costs. The applicant will tie the cornice line in from the adjacent tenant space across the façade of the Dunkin Donuts side.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed being told Dunkin Donuts prefers a standing seam to the roof element over the monolith. The cornice line will tie in from the adjacent tenant space across into the building, will still allow the parapet heights, to create a little distinction between the two tenant spaces so the roof lines are not just a boring line running across the façade of the two tenant spaces.

The applicant will keep the color pallet of the adjacent tenant space, Tenant A, in the warm grays that are consistent or similar to the Ocean First Bank. There will then be a color break with the Dunkin Donuts side and use off-whites for the cornices and still use the earth tone elements and also the gradation pallet for the monolith elements that will be capped with a pyramidal shaped roof.

The applicant will then take the eyebrow projection that surrounds the windows that are currently depicted in the rendering as a shocking orange, will be muted down, if it is acceptable to the board, submit a few color samples for the planners review, prior to implementing the installation of the color onto the building.

Mr. Oris discussed, "regarding the building façade and features, I believe so".

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired what the applicant is going to do with the monument sign.

Mr. Lisa discussed we are withdrawing it from the application, the LED portion, but would like to come back to Redevelopment with another sign.

Mr. Jakuboski inquired, if it is not LED, will Mr. Lisa keep the same monument design or do you want to go back and relook at the design.

Mr. Lisa discussed he would like to go back and talk to Shop Rite.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the applicant would like to withdraw the monument sign for now.

Mr. Oris discussed the balance of the signage on the façades of the building, one of the comments in the T&M review letter was to provide an overview with regards to compliance with the Redevelopment Plan for signage and suggested that if the board acts favorably on the signage or this application, that the signage would either be compliant with the Redevelopment Plan or in the event that there is a noncompliance, that the applicant would seek a variance from the Planning Board, with regard to the size and locations of the signs.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if there is a microphone before a customer gets to the drive through window, or does the customer order at the window.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the customer orders at the menu board.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired where the menu board is.

Mr. Yuro discussed the menu board is to the east.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired how the outdoor seating is separated from each other and from the driveway and if there is a fence.

Mr. Yuro discussed the patio area will have a barrier or some sort of a fence, whether a picket fence delineation between the patio area and the drive through lane in which the order board will be placed in the grass island between the two.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired what kind of fence.

Mr. Yuro discussed decorative metal picket fence.

Mr. Taylor discussed it could be done in a bronze color that will tie in with the rest.

Mr. Oris discussed regarding the T&M review letter, he is 100% through that. Mr. Taylor has a review letter and some of the comments have to be addressed.

Mr. Taylor discussed the Taylor Design report is dated April 22, 2016 and has touched on Items No. 1, 2 & 3. Mr. Taylor is concerned about Item No. 4 because the Redevelopment Plan expresses some concern about the drive through because there really is no alternative than the drive through cueing to be at that very visible intersection. Mr. Taylor suggested the sign wall be moved. If you look at the sketch, where they are showing that sign wall just as a standard sign, Mr. Taylor thought that if that wrapped around

where the drive through cueing would be, that would help to screen the views of the cars that were cueing, while still allowing good views and visibility of the building. That part is critical to have that full screening in there, since the sign has been withdrawn, there should either be a wall or very dense evergreen hedge in that location.

Mr. Lisa agreed with Mr. Taylor's recommendation.

Mr. Taylor discussed on Page 2 of the Taylor Design report, it is shown where the sign wall could go in red, wrapping around to the screen.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed the applicant will incorporate that into the application.

Mr. Taylor discussed for the time being, obviously, it will not have a sign. At some point in the future, whether or not a sign, LED, lit, unlit, the applicant will have to return.

Mr. Lisa discussed withdrawing the LED request and will come back with a separate monument sign, it may be incorporated into Mr. Taylor's wall design.

Mr. Taylor discussed the applicant has addressed Item No. 5, which is railing and fencing to separate the outdoor. The applicant has addressed Item No. 6, which is that connection, also shown on that sketch, into the County trail with a cross walk. The applicant has addressed Item No. 8 and 9. The applicant has agreed to submit a full landscape package that will be consistent with the Redevelopment Plan and the ordinances. There are some requirements for shade trees, parking lot trees and buffer screening. Mr. Taylor is confident and has worked with the applicant on planting the remainder of the Town Center. If it is okay with the Redevelopment Committee, Mr. Taylor will work out those details as the application moves forward to the Planning Board level. At that point, benches, receptacles, bike racks and similar amenities can be shown as the plan evolves to that level.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed that will match what is currently on the property.

Mr. Taylor discussed talking about the signage lighting, standard lighting on the buildings, building mounted lights, and inquired if there are any additional parking lot lights.

Mr. Jakuboski discussed there are no additional parking lot lights. What is out there today will suffice and obviously, a new lighting plan with photometrics will be provided.

Mr. Taylor recommended that given the close location to Route 9, that any of those fixtures not be outward, wall-mounted or flood light fixtures, but a shielded down light so there is no unnecessary offsite glare on the roadway.

Mayor Tredy inquired about Item No. 7.

Mr. Yuro discussed Item No. 7 is a trash enclosure that is currently designed into the property as part of the overall design. It has been constructed. Obviously there are no trash receptacles there at this time. That location is going to remain as it is today. Unfortunately, the employees are going to have to walk about 150 feet with the garbage and put it in the dumpster.

Mr. Taylor inquired if that is acceptable operationally for Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. Bori discussed Dunkin Donuts has a large container on wheels, and right now, if you look at the distance from the Dunkin Donuts all the way to the other end of that building. The employees will wheel it out there as many times as needed.

Mr. Collamer discussed observing this issue while doing business at the bank. That is the spot where the maintenance contractor has kept their salt.

Mr. Collamer discussed relocating that, as it is a sore thumb in that area. If you look at the site plan, it shows the travel lanes of the parking lot flow actually go across the corner of that concrete pad. At this point and time there is a significant elevation difference between that concrete pad and the asphalt.

Mr. Lisa discussed the reason for that is because the base coat was put down for that pad. Now, moving forward, the top coat will be put down and everything will match the grade. The reason the container is on a 45 degree angle is so that a truck could come in and pick it up. That will be cleaned up.

Committeeman Collamer does not deny that it doesn't work, obviously it does. There probably is a more suitable location for that.

Mr. Yuro disagreed. Obviously it is not ideal. It can be seen coming down the drive isle. If it is relocated it will start to get a little closer to Volunteer Way or Route 9. There is really no easy place to tuck it away. A lot of times, it is put in the back of the site. Unfortunately, the applicant is dealing with an area right at the front corner. This keeps it out of sight from the highway and travel ways, which is really the main concern. There is landscaping around it and if it has deteriorated over time, it will be replaced. The pavement in that area only has a base course and does not have the final top course. Once that is put in, it will be cleaned up. Similar to other locations on the property, you are driving across that concrete pad, which is required to handle the weight of the garbage trucks. Otherwise, there will be flooding in all of the pavements and there will be pavement repair every couple of years.

Committeeman Collamer inquired if the professionals have a suggestion for that.

Mr. Taylor discussed there is no ideal situation. It is a bad spot. Mr. Taylor has looked at it several times. If it is moved to one of the edges, then everyone on Volunteer will see. The other place is where the drive through comes out, but then everyone who comes in and out of the site sees it more. Unfortunately, there is no better solution.

Mr. Oris inquired if the usage of the dumpster pad is currently only being used by the bank.

Mr. Lisa discussed no one uses it.

Mr. Oris inquired if the dumpster pad area is currently vacant.

Mr. Lisa discussed the former maintenance contractor put salt there. It is not being used operationally for a tenant. Ocean First Bank and most banks handle all of their own trash internally or it is shredded and carted away. The pad was placed there on the original site plan as a sit down restaurant. It was the best location. Mr. Lisa would like to keep it in the same place as it wards traffic.

Mr. Oris inquired why the dumpster pad could not go further to the north at the far end of that same bay isle.

Mr. Lisa inquired if Mr. Oris is referring to the parking spaces down to the south.

Mr. Oris is pointing to a drawing and discussed move this so it is oriented in this manner. The garbage trucks would come around in the morning and be able to back up, make the pick up and go out. This area could be fenced off similar to how this is fenced off. This is lower. The drive area here is lower. These are retaining walls. This is all the same height. When leaving this area, you see the back wall. If this dumpster pad was further to the north, whatever parking spaces you lose here, you could pick up the few parking spaces here.

Mr. Bori discussed his concern is all the people driving out of the drive through are going to drive right past the garbage.

Mr. Oris discussed it is the same thing here, too, though. They still have to travel past it.

Mr. Bori discussed it is up here. This is the drive through exit lane here. They are coming right there and going out.

Mr. Lisa discussed all the curbing is done, if we have to rebuild it.

Mr. Oris discussed a member of the Redevelopment Committee is looking for something to make it improve over its current location.

Committeeman Collamer inquired which location is Mr. Oris suggesting, where it says 11 spaces or where it says 8 spaces.

Mr. Oris discussed in the same bay.

Committeeman Collamer inquired if it could be moved to where it says 8 spaces and go to the far northwest.

Mr. Oris discussed it is potentially more visible only because it is right at the edge of Volunteer Way.

Committeeman Collamer inquired if something could be done in the way of plantings.

Mr. Taylor discussed because it is already terracing up, the grade comes up. A flat area would have to be created just for planting. That would likely push because you only have about 18 feet of depth. It might push it out into the drive isle.

Committeeman Collamer pointed to a drawing and discussed "somewhere in this area right here". The first drop of elevation of the first terrace is only going to be a two-foot change or something.

Mr. Oris discussed in that range, 2-3 feet.

Committeeman Collamer discussed even if you put the plantings on that first terrace, if the plantings were tall enough, it would shield the trash cans just fine.

Mr. Oris discussed there is going to be a wall. What you would see first is a wall. It will not look good as a wall. If there is room for plantings, then there might be a way to do a thin row of plantings to help mute the wall.

Mayor Tredy agreed with Committeeman Collamer. Initially these were terrible and they are not shielded properly.

Mr. Taylor pointed to a drawing with Committeeman Collamer and discussed, here's the Dunkin Donuts in this corner, then plant around there. Operationally it works.

Mr. Lisa discussed it will make the trucks work. If Mr. Bori is okay with it and Mr. Yuro can make the plans work, then Coastal Redevelopment is fine with it.

Mr. Yuro discussed getting it out of the little parking lot and put it over here. We can work with that.

Mr. Yuro discussed the applicant would not be able to do any planting or a wall there.

Mr. Taylor discussed, something that could either match the building. It could be frame wall sided to match the building or a block wall.

Mr. Oris inquired if it is to match the retaining wall.

Mr. Bori discussed every block wall he has ever done, the trucks hit it.

Mr. Taylor discussed then he can put 8 inch concrete filled steel bollards in front of those two corners. The problem with fencing is it gets ruined as well.

Mr. Lisa discussed Coastal Redevelopment is good with the location and will come up with the details with the professionals and inquired if that is okay.

Mr. Oris discussed at the discretion of the Redevelopment Committee, yes.

Public Comment

Motion to open Public Comment was moved by Committeeman Collamer, seconded by Mayor Tredy.

Roll Call: Collamer: Yes, Tredy: Yes

No comments from the public.

Motion to close Public Comment was moved by Committeeman Collamer, seconded by Mayor Tredy.

Roll Call: Collamer: Yes, Tredy: Yes

Mayor Tredy inquired if there is a complete list of the agreements made tonight, to make a motion to approve.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed he does have a list, but would have to listen to the audio recording.

Mayor Tredy inquired if the Redevelopment Committee makes a motion to approve, can it be based on the statements given by the applicants.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed, yes.

Mr. D'Elia discussed subject to the agreements and their review as shown in the recorded record.

Motion to approve this project, contingent upon the discussions and agreements the Redevelopment Committee and all professionals discussed tonight, was moved by Committeeman Collamer, seconded by Mayor Tredy.

Roll Call: Collamer: Yes, Tredy: Yes

Mayor Tredy would like to put it on record that during the Coastal Redevelopment/Dunkin Donuts hearing, Mr. Monahan approached the dias and indicated that the Mackres Family LLC applicant was withdrawing their application at this time.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn meeting was moved by Committeeman Collamer, seconded by Mayor Tredy.

Roll Call: Collamer: Yes, Tredy: Yes

Signed and Submitted:

Diane B. Ambrosio, RMC
Municipal Clerk

Date