

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Cook.

Roll Call:

Present: Mrs. Engelhardt, Mayor Greiner, Ms Melfi, Mr. Cook, Mrs. Pedrick, Mr. Hain, Mr. Perron, Mr. Townsend, Attorney Gianos, Planner McManus.

Excused: Ms. Kenoyer, Mr. Doshna, Mr. Budney, Engineer Clerico, Traffic Engineer Rocciola

1. Public Comments: None

2. Approval of minutes for May 1, 2017 regular meeting.

Motion to approve the minutes: Melfi, seconded by Greiner

Ayes: Greiner, Melfi, Pedrick, Hain, Perron

Nays: (None)

Abstain: Engelhardt, Cook, Townsend

Motion passed: 5-0-3

3. Resolution 2017-08: Parade Enterprises, LLC (Burger King) – Block 44 Lot 7

Motion to adopt the resolution to grant lighting design waivers: Melfi, seconded by Greiner

Ayes: Greiner, Melfi, Pedrick, Hain, Perron

Nays: (None)

Abstain: (None)

Motion passed: 5-0-0

4. Public Hearing:

Mr. Cook clarified the procedures of the public hearing starting with a presentation from Board Planner, Ms. McManus, followed by questions for Ms. McManus on the presentation and public comments noting that public testimony would be limited to 3 minutes.

Ms. McManus was sworn in for testimony and discussed the power point slide presentation noting that the study was posted on the website and discussed the location of the Study Area expansion. Ms. McManus explained the process to designate an area in need of redevelopment where the Council by resolution authorized and directed the Planning Board on March 13, 2017 to prepare a preliminary investigation and hold a public hearing on this study which was tonight's meeting. Ms. McManus stated that the Board would then adopt a resolution to provide their findings to Council which could include all, some or none of the study properties as an area in need of redevelopment and next Council would make its own findings to accept all or none of the Board's recommendations adding that it was ultimately for the Borough Council to determine if the parcels met the criteria of an area in need of redevelopment.

Ms. McManus discussed the powers of designating an area of redevelopment which included adopting a redevelopment plan which would allow flexible zoning regulations in the area; acquire land noting that this study was a non condemnation area and could provide other financial incentives such a PILOT program, loans, etc.

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

Ms. McManus discussed the Study Area which included six lots for a total of 0.9 acres which was broken into Tract 1 (Block 22 Lots 13 and 14) and Tract 2 (Block 24 Lots 1, 2, 3 and 5) all owned by Flemington Furs, LLC and all in the DB1 zone which were primarily commercial use with one residential and one vacant lot and all within the Flemington Historic District. Ms. McManus discussed the existing land use and zoning of the area along with the photos of the Study Area noting that the parking area behind the Union Hotel had 47 spaces reserved for the Flemington Fur customers and employees through an easement. Ms. McManus discussed the redevelopment criteria contained within in the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law (LRHL including H. The designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation and that in addition to the criteria, the LRHL states: A redevelopment area may include lands, buildings, or improvements, which of themselves are not detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, but the inclusion of which is found necessary, with or without change in their condition, for the effective redevelopment of the area of which they are a part" (N.J.S.A. 40A:12-3). Ms. McManus stated that the Study Area was necessary for the effective planning of the area in need of redevelopment per the Borough agreement with the redeveloper noting that the proposed redevelopment concept plan included an educational/medical space and parking lot on Tract 2.

Ms. McManus discussed the criteria and outlined the 2 failed redevelopment agreements with prior redevelopers that were terminated by Council including the second attempt where the redeveloper failed to purchase additional properties. Ms. McManus stated that the current plan was larger in scope than the previous efforts and discussed the Flemington Center Urban Renewal, LLC concept plan with 255 dwelling units; 103 hotel rooms; 45,000 square feet educational - medical space; 49,600 square feet retail space; 2,600 square feet amenity space; and 840 parking spaces (including 826 structured parking spaces). Ms. McManus stated that there was a new revision to the concept redevelopment plan which was on the website that would retain the Union Hotel façade and the building at 90-100 Main Street which would reduce some retail space and hotel rooms but the basic similarity would hold for the Study. Ms. McManus stated that the additional land and mix of uses were necessary for the effective redevelopment of the area which was an essential element of the Borough's vision for the area in the redevelopers proposal noting that the Borough Council had conceptually approved the concept plan and stated that the Study Area tracts are "required for the redeveloper to undertake its obligations hereunder" adding that history dictates the need for the additional land in the Study Area. Ms.

Ms. McManus stated that the current concept was the only plan with the mix of uses and that the 0.9 acres of the Study Area were necessary. Ms. McManus discussed that the inclusion of 0.11 acres of Block 22 Lot 14 in Tract 1 would allow comprehensive planning with the remainder of Lot 14 and Lot 13 would create an access point from Bloomfield that would allow pedestrian access and vehicle access to the redevelopment area. Ms. McManus discussed that Tract 2 would facilitate an arrangement of retail use and parking to allow for a substantial portion of the Spring Street corridor to be comprehensively redeveloped with mixed uses and a streetscape that supports the Union Hotel Redevelopment Plan and would allow the creation of a building with an architectural feature to serve as a visual terminus at the end of the plaza that

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

connects Main Street and Spring Street noting that this architectural feature was a significant component of the redevelopment plan.

Mr. Cook asked Ms. McManus if the LHRL defined effective. Ms. McManus explained.

Ms. Melfi asked to clarify that the Study did not include eminent domain. Ms. McManus clarified that the Study did not include the authority of eminent domain.

Mr. Cook opened the meeting for public questions.

Colleen Rosetti, 36 Pennsylvania Avenue, stated that the report was over 200 pages and was concerned that there were no questions from the Board. Mr. Cook explained that the most of the pages were the history of the redevelopment area. Ms. Rosetti stated that there was a proposed educational component and asked if there were any plans for a specific tenant noting that there was declining enrollment in the polytechnical school and asked who or what institute was planned. Ms. McManus explained that a tenant had not been identified.

Elaine Gorman, 34 New York Avenue, stated that the all of the redevelopment area prior and proposed was in the historic district which had a hierarchy of designations and asked Ms. McManus to clarify. Ms. McManus explained that Tract 1 had a contributing designation and Tract 2 on the east side of Spring Street was encroaching or non-contributing designations.

Steven Tuccio, 61 Elwood Drive, asked why Tract 1 was necessary to be consistent with the rest of the project and asked if the vehicle and pedestrian traffic impact to the surrounding areas had been included in the Study. Ms. McManus clarified that while the area of Tract 1 would provide access to drop off and pick of residents this would not be a parking lot or parking deck stating that the entire project will have significant implications to the area however traffic was not to be addressed in a preliminary investigation but would be addressed in the Redevelopment Plan and eventually during site plan application to the Board. Ms. McManus stated that the Study did not look at the concept plan but rather if the properties were necessary to the redevelopment to have access to Bloomfield Avenue which was off of Main Street and Spring Street. Mr. Tuccio stated his concern that there was no study on traffic flow when the finding relies in part on the inclusion of these Tracts as necessary. Ms. McManus stated that a traffic study will be generated on the redevelopment plan as a whole with a detailed review at the site plan hearing. Mr. Tuccio asked if the study was required to be consistent with the Master Plan and asked how this Study matched with the Master Plan. Ms. McManus explained that the time for a consistency review would be the Redevelopment Plan with the Master Plan.

Chris Englehart, 180 Main Street, asked when the Redevelopment Plan would be prepared. Ms. McManus explained that it would further in the process, possibly a couple of months.

James Maley, attorney, appeared stating that he represented local businesses and residents. Mr. Maley objected to the 3 minutes rule for questions and comments stating that this was an open public meeting and suggested that the Board not limit comments to the 3 minutes. Mr. Maley stated that he had provided a letter asking for the discontinuance of the hearing having filed two OPRA requests last week and he did not have all of the information requested from the

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

Borough Clerk at this date. Mr. Cook asked when the OPRA requests has been submitted. Ms. Parks stated that the requests were submitted May 30, 2017 and June 2, 2017. Mr. Cook stated that the report was over 200 pages of which 19 pages were the Study with appendix A, B & C including the history of the relevant information. Mr. Maley stated that it was more than appropriate to learn the reasons why the other redevelopers failed including those documents that were requested. Mr. Maley asked if there was a decision on this request for discontinuance of the meeting. Mr. Cook stated that there was a response from Mr. Gianos. Ms. Parks provided a copy of the response letter prepared by Mr. Gianos dated June 1, 2017 to Mr. Maley.

Mr. Maley stated that some Board members should not sit in on the hearing and suggested that the governing body members should not sit for the hearing. Mr. Gianos stated that the governing body members always sit on the Planning Board and are not required to recuse themselves adding that when a combined Board was acting as the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a use of 'd' variance would the Council members need to be recused. Mr. Maley stated that it was not the regular practice to have a redevelopment agreement prior to designating properties and that this would be a self-fulfilling prophecy and he was raising the issue. Mr. Gianos stated that if there was a problem that the Borough attorney would have brought this up.

Mr. Maley distributed a memorandum date December 30, 2016 and email chain last dated January 3, 2017 which was entered as Exhibit E-3. Mr. Gianos stated that the notice proofs would be entered as Exhibit E-1 and the presentation prepared by Ms. McManus would be entered as Exhibit E-2. Mr. Maley discussed the memorandum and asked Ms. McManus if prior to receiving the memo if she had discussion with the redeveloper of the contents of the memo and talked to them on how to make the Study Area meet the criteria and if Ms. McManus had asked for thoughts on how it would qualify noting that the memo pretty much follows what your Study states. Ms. McManus stated that it does not follow the memo but has some similarities. Mr. Maley asked if Ms. McManus had done studies in the past and if those studies had relied on section 5. Ms. McManus explained that it follows section 3. Mr. Maley stated that the study relied on only the second sentence under section 3 where the first sentence should be taken together to satisfy under the criteria. Ms. McManus stated that the proposed areas were part of the entire Union Hotel redevelopment area. Mr. Maley stated that with an adopted redevelopment agreement so it was necessary. Ms. McManus stated that that was one reason, not all as discussed, parking, the missing corner, easement. Mr. Maley asked if the developer did a plan 3 blocks over on Spring Street that the Council said was necessary should it be designated. Ms. McManus stated that it would inappropriate to randomly add properties, in hypothetical the area would be as larger. Mr. Maley asked what was the standard and if an independent analysis if the areas were necessary. Ms. McManus explained her analysis. Mr. Maley asked regarding comprehensive planning. Ms. McManus explained. Mr. Maley asked if Ms. McManus had reviewed the historic preservation report prepared last year on the project n, ing that it was not mentioned in the report and asked if Ms. McManus has read the 2015 Master Plan asking if there was consistency. Ms. McManus explained the documents provide context only to identify existing land use and were not necessary in a preliminary investigation. Mr.

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

Maley asked if they weigh in the analysis. Mr. McManus stated that the redevelopment plan public hearing was the time for a consistency review with the Master Plan.

Mr. Maley discussed the failed redevelopers in the past which the first only included the Union Hotel and the second failed attempt the redeveloper included only the hotel and asked if anything was done by the town to expand the Union Hotel area then. Ms. McManus did not believe so. Mr. Maley asked where Ms. McManus was getting the information for the Bloomfield Avenue delineation on page 15. Mr. McManus explained the information was in Appendix C identifying the pedestrian vehicle access. Mr. Maley asked if Council amends the redevelopers agreement would this change the designation. Ms. McManus stated that yes it would undermine the necessity noting that no such revisions are being discussed at this time. Mr. Maley stated that it could be amended tomorrow by Council. Mr. Maley discussed the benefits of long term abatements and asked if this was discussed. Ms. McManus explained. Mr. Maley asked prior to the memo what were the reasons Ms. McManus believed the area was in need of redevelopment adding that there was no difference in condemnation or non-condemnation that it was the same analysis and would be the same criteria would it meet the criteria of a blighted area for eminent domain if it was sufficient to take someone's property. Ms. McManus stated that there was no distinction between condemnation or non-condemnation. Mr. Maley stated that the Study included the failed redevelopment attempts and asked how Ms. McManus learned of these and who she talked to about these. Ms. McManus explained that her firm had represented the Borough for years and that she was aware of these attempts and requested the documents after speaking with the Mayor and Clerk. Mr. Maley asked if a proforma of the project has been analyzed. Ms. McManus stated that a detailed financial analysis would not be prepared for a preliminary investigation report.

Mr. Maley stated that the easement for parking for Flemington Fur customers and employees was used for the determination and asked if any analysis if the proposed parking could be accommodated by the new parking structure asking if the analysis for parking to necessary to make comprehensive planning. Ms. McManus explained that parking was an inherent need for the ability to comprehensively plan for uses which parking supports adding that it was an important component. Mr. Maley stated that in other studies most of the lots satisfy the criteria but not relying on the prior designation the proposed area does not meet the blight determination and was added because the developer has told the town that he needs them; that Council agrees and that Ms. McManus states comprehensive planning. Mr. Maley discussed the proposed architectural feature at the end of the plaza stating that trees are proposed at ground level and a person cannot see the end of the plaza from Main Street asking how does it meet the blighted criteria. Mr. McManus stated that there was an inherent problem with renderings and stated that the eye would be drawn to the end of the plaza not the few trees planted in the plaza adding that the plaza was one of the most important features and most significant to remove that feature for the visual terminus. Mr. Maley asked what if the plan was amended tomorrow. Ms. McManus that a substantial change in the concept plan would require change to the redevelopment agreement and if the Council adopted the plan it would undermine the components. Mr. Maley concluded and stated he has a witness to

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

provide testimony. Mr. Cook stated that there would time for testimony and comments later in the hearing.

Lois Stewart, 21 Spring Street, stated that most of Lot 14 was in the Union Hotel Redevelopment Area and asked why the remainder of Lot 14 and Lot 13 were being looked at as necessary. Ms. McManus explained noting that the portion of Lot 14 already in the Union Hotel Area consisted of a parking lot. Ms. Stewart stated that page 16 of the Study discussed the relationship of Tract to the redevelopment and asked what criteria would make this an area in need of redevelopment. Ms. McManus explained that the architectural visual terminus was necessary for the redevelopment plan. Ms. Stewart stated that the Study included redevelopment on both sides of Spring Street that would comply with the policy of infill of development and asked why this was necessary. Ms. McManus explained. Ms. Stewart asked for clarification on parking and why it was so important to have for the proposed building in Tract 2. Ms. McManus explained that it was important to have the properties linked legally to provide parking to support the redevelopment. Ms. Stewart asked why the parking at the corner of Bloomfield Avenue and Spring Street was open when there was a parking garage being provided. Ms. McManus explained this parking area would serve the education/medical building adding that a revised concept removes this parking to add a building. Ms. Stewart asked if there were any environmental concerns at the corner. Ms. McManus explained that she not aware of any. Ms. Stewart asked about the response letter to Mr. Maley to discontinue the hearing. Ms. McManus could not answer the question.

Betsy Driver, 50 North Main Street, asked if the Board does not adopt the plan would it stop Mr. Cust's plan or could he just buy the properties. Ms. McManus explained stating that was a Council decision adding that variances would need to be granted for the concept plan. Ms. Driver asked if there would be tax benefits. Ms. McManus explained that was decided by the Council. Ms. Driver stated that the designation was not necessary and that the developer could seek variances and continue with the plan. Ms. McManus stated that there were other reasons to go through the redevelopment process.

9:17 p.m. The Board took a recess.

9:30 p.m. the Board returned and resumed the hearing.

Mrs. Engelhardt asked to clarify on page 10 regarding smart growth planning principles and asked if it fit as one of the criteria. Ms. McManus stated yes that the entirety of the Study would qualify and was consistent with the State Plan adding the Borough was identified as an expansion area which would qualify but would encompass the entire Borough of Flemington. Mrs. Engelhardt stated that 10 years ago the Union Hotel was declared an area in need of redevelopment which was expanded in 2013, that this was the second expansion and asked if what the Borough did years ago did that still stand or did you need to find further reasons. Ms. McManus stated that the other property stand and this expansion would be included into one large redevelopment area.

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

Mr. Cook asked for public comments noting that he would not hold to the 3 minutes.

Attorney Maley appeared and introduced Robert Melvin, professional planner from Group Melvin Design, Camden, NJ. Mr. Melvin was sworn in for testimony, gave his credential, a bio of Mr. Melvin was entered as Exhibit E-4 and was accepted as a professional planner. Mr. Melvin stated that he had reviewed the Spring Street Study adding that he had only seen the plan in the Study and had not seen any revisions. Mr. Melvin discussed the parking easement. Mr. Melvin stated that he has prepared many preliminary investigative studies, when asked if any of those studies met with section 5 Mr. Melvin stated that he would never contemplate using section 5 adding that the term was use with a large area when a significant portion qualifies with a few parcels that do not to provide infilling in a relative rectangle, direct access, utility extension or other specific reasons to be used not a conclusion with perimeter parcels. Mr. Maley asked if Study was reviewed for consistency with the redevelopment plan. Mr. Melvin stated that it was not consistent with the 2014 redevelopment plan and required compatibility where seven story buildings were proposed with downtown business uses. Mr. Maley asked if concept plan was reviewed for consistency with the Master Plan Reexamination of 2015. Mr. Melvin stated that it was not consistent noting that the Master Plan recommended a mixed vibrant use for the expanded Union Hotel area where scale was often talked about to maintain the historic sites and resources with adaptive reuse, tourism and to limit building height to 4 stories maximum in the DB1 zone.

Mr. Maley distributed photos of the proposed expansion area which were entered as Exhibits E-5 to E-8. Mr. Melvin discussed the photos citing the inconsistencies of the concept plan to the surrounding neighborhood including the height of 7 stories proposed buildings where the existing structures were approximately 35 high noting that the propose buildings would loom over the adjacent neighborhood. Mr. Melvin stated that he had reviewed the HPC recommendations which had concerns for the historic character of the Borough buildings and recommended that new buildings should not create disharmony with the adjacent buildings but should try to fit into neighborhoods.

Mayor Greiner stated that if the criteria that Ms. McManus used to justify inclusion of these area are allowed by the law says I would accept the criteria.

Mrs. Pedrick stated that over the years she has seen many plans fail and would not want to see this fall be the way side like many others.

William Flahive, attorney, asked Mr. Melvin if he was being compensated for his testimony and who was paying him. Mr. Melvin said yes by attorney Maley. Mr. Flahive asked if there was any pending litigation. Mr. Melvin was not aware of any.

Dick Stogin, 1 Tuck Drive, stated that he had lived and worked in Flemington for year and tried to save every building that he could noting that not all agree on preservation and the hotel

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

would be expensive to renovate that this plan will fix it up with hotel rooms upstairs and fix up the downtown area. Mr. Stogin stated that it would be wrong not to go with this project and if it was turned down and wait who will want to do it, that you have to realize what the alternative was and who else was out there waiting to develop Flemington.

Jim Robinson, chamber of commerce member, Main Street, past president of planners, stated that he was in support of the expansion of the redevelopment, that the educational/medical building was an important element and the inclusion of the additional parcels was found necessary for the effective redevelopment of a balanced plan which will compliment and enhance the area already in the redevelopment area and urged the Board to include this area.

Robert Shore, 47 Broad Street, stated that they were all residents here that presumably pay taxes that could look at this development in two way, to expand – he had no problem expanding the redevelopment but stated that it was time to designate the entire town which had many blighted areas with caveat of condemnation should be put in this designation and expand the area further. Mr. Shore stated that the developer wanted to put a beautiful development and suggested that it expand to other blighted area and should ask what was going to be the best for Flemington was it this new designated area or further designate areas stating let's get the job done. Mr. Shore stated that second was the concept plan the best plan for Flemington will all its attributes and features can it be better and demand the best and what was best for the town.

Lois Stewart, 21 Spring Street, stated her concerns about the quality of life as important as the right of return for the developer. Ms. Stewart stated that she could see where the two buildings on the corner of Bloomfield Avenue and Spring Street are part of the redevelopment area but was having a hard time seeing how the buildings on Spring Street were included in the plan and requested that the parcels of the east side of Spring Street not be included.

Jennifer Morane, Jefferson Street, asked that the Board reject the plan, that never would she have imagined that the Union Hotel would be bulldozed and never imagined a seven story building in Flemington. Ms. Morane stated it was hypothetical to include a education building where the developer for over a year did not know what college would be occupying the space and asked the Board say no to expanding the study area.

Bill Flahive, attorney, urged the Board to approve the expansion.

Steven Tuccio, 61 Elwood Drive, stated that the additional area seemed to him to be scope creep and stated his concern for the appearance of influence being paid here and asked the Board to examine their conscience stated that there was no right way to do the wrong thing, that it's not a slippery slope its one step before it's beyond the control of you folks.

Marilyn Wanser, asked the Board to please reject he expansion, over 4000 signed a petition to not see the proposal go forward and have gone to the State which was very aware at the multitude of people that are against the expansion.

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

Betsy Drive, 50 North Main Street, stated that she could see Tract 1 being included and could see that happening but was against the east side of Spring Street being included stating that it was not a good thing for the residents of Flemington, that people have been speaking loudly and if only the Board knew what it meant they would not approve this but if they are truly set on expanding why not include the Larch Mansion and make that into an eight story building.

Robert Shore, 47 Broad Street, stated as he was listening to the public and suggested that what was wrong with Flemington was that there was a trust issue, that the right thing has not been done so far. Mr. Shore stated that the Council does not know how to make a consensus and was not doing their job and should start being leaders to get all together to work this out and that it has to be handled now.

Mr. Gianos stated that Richard Giffen, 9 Highland Avenue, had submitted a written objection to the Study which was distributed to the Board members today, this was entered as Exhibit E-9. Mr. Cook read the letter into the record.

Jack Cust, redeveloper, stated that Mr. Giffen had approached him to be retained for his services and stated that he had not retained Mr. Giffen.

Elaine Gorman, HPC Chair, stated that the position of the HPC on the redevelopment was on their website which will be revised after discussion.

Katlyn Jacobs, stated that there was a marked distinction between Tract 1 and Tract 2 where Tract 1 would fit into the redevelopment and not Tract 2. Mr. Jacobs stated her concerns about setting a precedent in designating areas in need of redevelopment.

Lois Stewart asked to see Mr. Giffen's letter and asked if the HPC was required to be included in the designation and how could the Board proceed without the opinion of the HPC. Mr. Cook handed a copy of Mr. Giffen's letter to Ms. Stewart. Mrs. Engelhardt explained that the Board was voting on the Study tonight and that the HPC would be included in the redevelopment plan and when the application for site plan came to the Planning Board. Mr. Gianos stated that he looked through the ordinance and found that at his point the HPC does not have any authority to review.

Susan Peterson, 105B Broad Street, councilwoman, business owner in town, stated that one word alone invalidates the Study which was 'effective' which means producing the proper result and was in direct opposition to how other areas in need of redevelopment were handled in the town. Ms. Peterson stated that it was the developers agreement that requires the expansion of the redevelopment area. Ms. Peterson stated that this stalls all other projects and stated that the should Board go back to the Master Plan. Ms. Peterson asked who was working for whom and stated that this was being done so that Flemington Furs could be relocated to Main Street.

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

Motion to close the public hearing: Melfi, seconded by Pedrick

Ayes: Engelhardt, Greiner, Melfi, Cook, Pedrick, Hain, Perron, Townsend

Nays: (None)

Abstain: (None)

Motion passed: 8-0-0

Ms. Melfi stated that she remembered sitting on the Planning Board for the 2007-2008 plan to redevelop the Union Hotel where the Board found that the area needed to be expanded and sent the recommendation back to Council which did not listen, and was on the Board for the second developer where the area was expanded but the attempt again failed, now the town has a new developer with a larger comprehensive scaled plan. Ms. Melfi stated that it was her belief that it was time for the Board to vote for the expansion.

Mrs. Pedrick stated that she was in total agreement with Ms. Melfi adding that more places were going out of business and the town has to move forward.

Mrs. Engelhardt stated that all were passionate about this project and discussed the criteria. Mrs. Engelhardt stated that she supported the expansion seeing the design last February, not knowing about the demolition, with the plaza from Main Street to Spring Street which allows a positive connection that needs the visual architectural element at the end. Mrs. Engelhardt stated that the Master Plan does include trying to find some higher educational use for the County seat, and as a planner, looking zoning, both sides of the street should look similar and was supportive of good planning practices adding that not seeing the details of the Cust proposal, expanding the areas in the Study makes sense. Mrs. Engelhardt stated the negative issue concerning the economic argument in that it seems to be going at this backwards with a concept plan where there was no proofs of economics that it would financially work. Mrs. Engelhardt stated that these parcels in particular, were important for a viable plan and the Borough needed to make the concept plan the best plan for Flemington. Mrs. Engelhardt encouraged the redevelopment committee to discuss and negotiate going forward as this was only one step in the process.

Mr. Cook stated that they were all appointed by the Mayor and were all passionate and that there was never going to be 100% only one right way adding that the town has to come together for the best plan for Flemington.

Mayor Greiner, remembering the 2013 expansion of the redevelopment area the main voice of opposition was why the choir building was included where the parking for the choir building was across the street in the redevelopment area which met one of the criteria. Mayor Greiner stated they knew that the hotel by itself was not going to work adding that having a developer that has a vision was a legitimate way to create a redevelopment plan to create an integrated solution for mixed use. Mayor Greiner stated that expanding this area was a key part of the project that really would make the project stand out along with the architectural element at the end of the plaza and stating that splitting the project right down the middle which would be

FLEMINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017 – 7:00 PM

MINUTES

creating technical problems did not make any sense and using just the existing area as it was designated does not make the plan better. Mayor Greiner stated that he would rely on Ms. McManus's testimony to proceed.

Motion to approve: Melfi, seconded by Pedrick

Ayes: Engelhardt, Greiner, Melfi, Cook, Pedrick, Hain, Perron, Townsend

Nays: (None)

Abstain: (None)

Motion passed: 8-0-0

5. Council Items:

None

6. Chair Items:

Mr. Cook stated that the next meeting was June 27, 2017.

HPC comments: HPC Chair, Elaine Gorman thanked the Board for adding the HPC comments and looked forward to the redevelopment plan committee

7. Bills:

Motion to approve: Greiner, seconded by Hain

Ayes: Engelhardt, Greiner, Melfi, Cook, Pedrick, Hain, Perron, Townsend

Nays: (None)

Abstain: (None)

Motion passed: 8-0-0

8. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 11:05 p.m.: Greiner; second: Townsend

Ayes: All were in favor

Motion passed: 8-0-0

Respectfully submitted



Eileen Parks

Planning Board Secretary

These minutes were approved on June 27, 2017

