

**Borough of Watchung
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
February 21st, 2017**

Chairwoman Schaefer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Salute to the flag. The Chair called for a roll call. Present at the call of the roll were:

Schaefer (present) Boyd (present) Desnoyers (present) Ellis (absent) Haveson (present) Sopko (absent) Pennett (present) Pote (present) Speeney (present) Spingler(present) D'Annunzio(present)

Linnus (present) Herits (present)

Chairwoman Schaefer indicated that there was a quorum to conduct business and stated that this meeting was being held in compliance with N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 of the Open Public Meetings Act and proper notification of this meeting has been made.

Mr. Linnus swore in Mr. Herits as the Planning Board Engineer. The Chair asked to waive the reading and made motion to accept the minutes of January 17th 2017. It was so moved and the motion carried. Mr. Ellis arrived at 7:35p.m. Mr. Sopko arrived at 7:50p.m.

The secretary called Application PB16-02 and PB16-03 Seritage Properties. Attorney for applicant, Patrick McNamara provided testimony. In the beginning applications were jointly filed and the applicant felt that they could be considered together. Since that time the applicant has been approached by someone (tenant). If a deal with that tenant is made, the site plan would likely need to be revised, if not, we would move forward with the updated plans submitted on 2/15/17 for the PB16-02 site. We would preferably like to be adjourned to your April meeting, thereby giving us enough time to present a comprehensive design for both properties. The Chair asked Mr. McNamara if he was confident that his client would be ready at that time. He said he was reasonably confident. The Chair noted that our agenda was getting full and that the board would like to hear Seritage to ensure we are compliant with the time line. Mr. Speeney stated that our boards practice has been that when an applicant is looking for a preliminary and a final, we address the preliminary first and then carry that to the final. Mr. McNamara said he would advise his client. He had no objection.

Madame Chair Schaefer made motion in the affirmative adjourning Seritage Growth Properties PB16-02 and PB16-03 until April 18th with an extension until May 31st 2017. It was moved, seconded discussion was offered and the Chair stated any new plans for PB16-03 be submitted no later than March 15, 2017 with notice given as well. Mr. McNamara agreed. Mr. McNamara consented Mr. Linnus' requested extension of May 31st 2017 on both applications. With no further discussion the motion carried on a voice vote.

Because there is a conflict with Maser Consulting and RPM, Tom Herits of Maser Consulting will not be able to provide professional engineering services for RPM. The Planning Board prepared a resolution appointing alternate engineer David A. Stires of David A. Stires Associates to work on Ordinance 17/04 that the board will act on. Mr. Stires will be accepted as a non-fair and open engineer. Since David is already an engineer through a fair and open application and will be acting as an alternate engineer for this board he does not need to provide an RFP and that is what non-fair and open means. The Secretary read PB17-R6 into the record appointing David

A. Stires as an alternate engineer. Madame Chair called for a motion to accept, it was moved seconded and discussion was offered. Mr. Haveson asked if there was a conflict because Mr. Stires is the Board of Adjustment Engineer. The Chair said no conflicts exist. Mr. Linnus verified that he can serve on both boards. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairwoman Schaefer summarized the timeline of Planning Board's hearings with respect to identifying Block 5701 Lot 6.01 as a Non-Condensation area in need of Redevelopment for Proposed Ordinance 17-04. She stated that the Borough has also been dealing with C.O.A.H (Council on Affordable Housing) throughout. The Supreme Court has ruled that there is a constitutional obligation and right now we are not entirely sure of the number of units that we will be obligated to provide. We may be obligated to provide as low as 230 units or as high as over 430. In order to show the courts that we are moving towards meeting those needs, the Mayor and Council has had negotiations with a developer, RPM, to develop the parcel into 49 units with 48 of them being non-age restricted very low, low moderate, and moderate income rentals. The 49th unit would be occupied by the superintendent of the complex and buildings and not qualify as a C.O.A.H unit. RPM would develop the property, rent it out as well as maintain it. In order for the developer to receive the tax credits from the state it would need to make their submission to the state by no later than May 2, 2017.

It is the Planning Board's job to determine if this redevelopment plan is consistent with our Master Plan. We then need to recommend through resolution to Mayor and Council adoption of the ordinance prior to their next meeting of March 2, 2017. Which would allow the public time to comment. The developer would then introduce an application by March 10, 2017 to the Mayor and Council and it would be reviewed by all experts before coming before this board for a hearing. This is a much needed ordinance in light of our C.O.A.H. obligation and many towns are in the same situation.

Mark Healey, Planner, summarized the requirements as outlined. There is a cap of 49 total units. Thirteen percent of those units have to be very low income units. The reason for that is that there is a requirement in the fair housing act that states such. The density is just under 8 units to the acre. The density in the RMLI zone, Regency Village and Avalon, is up to 14. Building height is capped at 35 feet. Building coverage is 15% which is half the building coverage of the zone across the street. Impervious coverage is capped at 35%. This will occupy less of the site than was originally contemplated. The maximum number of lots per structure is capped at 12. This plan has six buildings. Five buildings are 8 units and one building is 9 units. That's the one that has the superintendent's apartment. These are going to be smaller buildings about half the size of the buildings across the street with larger set-backs than some comparable ordinances.

I have suggested that there be an allowance for land banking which is already in the ordinance. At the time of site plan if they can prove their parking needs are lower than what the state requires, those spaces would be grass and be reserved (banked) for future improvements. Mr. Linnus asked Mr. Healey if RPM will accept land banking. Mr. Healey said, yes. They are basically going for a mountainside village appearance.

The Chair reminded the board that they are not here tonight to look at development or any of the site conditions. They are here for the ordinance alone and to make sure that it is consistent with our Master Plan.

Mr. Healey explained that this ordinance is a self-contained ordinance separate from the rest. It

super cedes the rest of your ordinance. He incorporated a lot of the important sections such as storm water control, site stabilization, tree protection, and soil erosion control. Similarly there are standards about the aesthetics of retaining walls, materials, screening landscaping etc. The conclusion is that this redevelopment plan is consistent with the Master Plan, and it directly effectuates a recommendation of it. In 2010 he stated with respect to the housing element and fair share plan, this site was initially identified as a means to meet the borough's obligation. That plan was a 46 unit 100% affordable development. This plan is essentially the same. In the Master Plan re-examination from 2011 it recommends that the borough continue to monitor changes to affordable housing regulations and react appropriately. The borough is monitoring and reacting to C.O.A.H. and the Supreme Court. Lastly, the Master Plan from 1994 has a series of goals and objectives. Objective number 6, says that the borough should continue to address the Mt. Laurel mandates and requirements of C.O.A.H.

Both Madame Chair and Mr. Speeney thanked Mr. Healey. The Chair called for questions and comments from the board. Mr. Speeney commented that the design standards are included in the ordinance which is unique. This particular ordinance is for East Drive only which makes it easier to impose design standards. Mr. Speeney commented that it is 100% affordable and that there are three levels of affordability and that it is consistent with the Master Plan. Mr. Healey said one of the advantages of the redevelopment plan IS that you can be more specific than normal zoning. Madame Chair said most of it will be ironed out before it comes to us, which is favorable. Mr. Desnoyers asked why 48 units when we need 200, what do we need? Madame Chair said at this point we don't know. Mr. Healey said the site is only 6.5 acres and there are some slope and shape issues limiting how many units you can put on that site. Mr. Desnoyers said, 13% of 48 units are very low. How many is that, six or seven? It's seven units. It's 30% of the median income in the housing region. Mr. Desnoyers, said he had not seen this ordinance before tonight. Was it emailed? It was emailed last week and just passed through the Mayor and Council last week, that's why it's in front of us tonight. Mr. Linnus offered to explain the legal process. The Borough Council introduces the ordinance, which they did. Then required review by the Planning Board, which we are doing tonight to determine whether this particular ordinance is consistent with the Master Plan. If the Planning Board determines that it IS consistent with the Master Plan, then we pass a resolution and send it back to Council and they will have that for their public hearing on the ordinance. Are we are relying on Mr. Healey's testimony as to whether it is consistent with the Master Plan asked Mr. Desnoyers. That is correct. Chairwoman Schaefer said Mark worked on our Master Plan in 2011 and he's done other applications with us as well. Mr. Desnoyers understood. Are we supposed to examine this to determine if we are happy with it being consistent? Madame Chair said, if you are uncomfortable with it, then you say that, but this is why we have Mark because he is our expert. Mr. Speeney added a point about getting C.O.A.H credits. Forty-eight units is the minimum we would get, but because these are rentals and 100% affordable we could get a greater number credited up to 2 for 1. We would get 48 for sure, but we could get more. Mr. Healey said yes that is true.

Madam Chair asked for any further comments and questions from the board. None was heard. She then opened it up to the public, hearing none that portion was closed. The Chair seeks a motion in the affirmative that the proposed redevelopment ordinance OR: 17/04 of East Drive is consistent with the Borough of Watchung's Master Plan, it was moved, seconded and carried on a call of the roll: Mr. Boyd {yes}, Mr. Desnoyers {yes}, Mr. Ellis {yes}, Mr. Haveson {yes}, Councilman Sopko {yes}, Mrs. Pennett {yes}, Mayor Pote {yes}, Mr. Speeney {yes},

Chairwoman Schaefer {yes}.

Mr. Desnoyers read PB17-R5 into the record. Chair seeks a motion in the affirmative recommending the adoption of Resolution PB17-R5 redevelopment of East Drive with no changes. Motion was moved, seconded and carried on a call of the roll: Mr. Boyd {yes}, Mr. Desnoyers {yes}, Mr. Ellis {yes}, Mr. Haveson {yes}, Councilman Sopko {yes}, Mrs. Pennett {yes}, Mayor Pote {yes}, Mr. Speeney {yes}, Chairwoman Schaefer {yes}.

The secretary called application: PB17-01 PSE&G Oakwood Road Block 7401 Lot 2 Site Plan approval and bulk variances. Prior to proceeding board member Sopko he had given expert testimony in the past in relation to surrounding property values by cellular towers and accessory uses, and would like to give the applicant the option to recuse him from the application. Or he would hear the application and conclude in a no vote. Attorney for the applicant, Dean Stamos, asked Mr. Sopko if his prior testimony given was on behalf of resident objectors. Mr. Sopko said yes. Mr. Stamos asked if he could be impartial. Mr. Sopko said yes, but I would conclude in a no vote. Now you have recused yourself said Mr. Linnus.

Mr. Stamos, attorney for applicant, stated the reason PSE&G is here tonight is that they are proposing to install 3 whip antennas and 1 dish antenna toward the top of the monopole with related equipment at grade level. This is for PSE&G's own proprietary network for emergency communications and day to day maintenance, and communications with their employees. This is not T-Mobile, or Verizon type of application. It's a system for a public utility company. The proposed installation is a permitted use under your ordinance with an existing tower in any zone in the borough. We noted some variances: The wooden fence as required by your ordinance, secondly, the set-back of the equipment and 2 foot height variance. Mr. Linnus asked Mr. Stamos to explain the existing non-conformity for 120% of the tower height for any property line. Mr. Stamos, looked at the ordinance and said it pertains to a request for a new tower and this is an existing tower. Mr. Linnus said you have to establish that the tower was approved. It pre-exist, but you haven't established that it's been approved. He suggested Mr. Stamos offer some proofs with respect to that variance. Mr. Stamos agreed. With respect to the set-back, the ordinance states for this zone its 50 feet said Mr. Linnus.

Corby Sluss, Radio Frequency engineer for applicant was sworn in to provide testimony for PSE&G. Currently there exists an analog system that's more than ten years old through Motorola. The coverage is half of what it would be with the proposed new system. This would be a digital system with greater coverage, new features and functionality. The purpose of this system is two-fold, first is the coverage and the other is for safety in the event of a natural disaster, like hurricane Sandy. This system is for PSE&G, not for the general public. All users of the frequency would be tied back to the two main locations, Edison and Newark. Mayor Pote asked if more coverage by the new technology and structure meant less sites. They're getting more coverage because they have more sites and with deploying new technology they get more coverage, so it's both. There are some areas where you need more sites, because there's no coverage there period. What is the existing need today asked Mayor Pote. Is there no coverage in some areas? Mr. Sluss said right now PSE&G doesn't have coverage in some areas. They will be getting about twice as much coverage. Without this site, you will have a hole. Mr. Linnus asked for the area of coverage that you're proposing in miles radius for this site. Mr. Sluss said it's probably around 8 to 10 miles radius. These are not necessarily stand-alone sites. They work together. Madam Chair Schaefer asked if the 20 sites that exist now are the maximum allowed. Mr. Sluss, said that's what they need for the coverage of their service areas. Mr. Haveson asked, who gets the communication, I'm missing something with the

antennas. Mr. Sluss, said these are 20 sites that provide communication with the PSE&G guys in their trucks, if a power line is down or there's a gas leak they need to go to that area. A dispatcher will call out. Now they have the ability to talk to their guys because they have more coverage. Madame Chair said so this is PSE&G's communication rather than a cell phone, this is their interpretation of their own cell phone so to speak. Mr. Sluss said it's their internal mechanism to communicate to the guys out in the field only PSE&G. Mr. Haveson asked why they need 3 antennas and a dish. The antennas are for the number of people they want to support. The dish is to communicate back to Edison or Newark. They are not cellular type antennas at all. They are a post about 16 feet tall about 3 ½ inch diameter. Mr. Haveson, asked why do you need the enclosure? "Do you have a generator or power supply there?" "Yes, the shelter houses all the radios, and the network equipment. You run co-ax up to the antennas and transmit out to the guys in the truck and receive back information." The Chair asked for any more questions from the board hearing none, she opened it up to the public.

Mike Finne, 180 Oakwood Rd. West. "Could you build the access road from Johnston Drive and not use Oakwood Rd., because we have to give you an easement." I can't answer that. Our engineer can speak to that. The Chair asked Mr. Finne if there was an Oakwood Rd. Association. Yes. He said when they built the monopole we gave them an easement. PSE&G damaged the road, which they did repair, but our road is not made for trucks. Mr. Finne did not have a problem with the antennas and the dish.

Michael Volpe, 126 Oakwood Rd. West asked what their current communication system is and why does this need to be done. Why can't the PSE&G employees use a regular cell phone system? Mr. Sluss, said right now I think some of the guys do use their cell phones, but from things that have happened and may occur such as natural disaster, hurricanes, and terrorism, you can't count on the cell towers. Homeland security comes in and shuts down cell towers. PSE&G is trying to increase coverage, make it safer for their guys and provide customer support for businesses. This is for quick dispatch and a way for the guys to initiate an emergency call when they need help. Even though PSE&G is not a first responder, usually the responders wait for PSE&G to turn off the power in an emergency situation. When you move to digital you get more functions and frequency. I hope that answers your questions. Whether there's a house that has a gas leak, or a power line down that's blocking a street or school, you're not going to get that response or support with the cell phone. Mr. Volpe asked if that has that ever happened before where the cell phone towers were down. He hadn't heard about any problems where there was a gas leak and PSE&G couldn't get there and there was a threat to the community.

James Yorke, Communications and Strategy Manager for PSE&G responded. This came as a result of hurricane Sandy. During Sandy, we had the flooding and all the communications in our area were out. We did NOT have cell phone coverage. The only systems we had to rely on was our radio systems. Because of their design, we were able to keep that system functioning. We have very strict safety rules where people cannot operate unless the dispatchers and the operators know who's working on those lines. If we can't communicate, then we can't energize or turn them on and off for safety reasons. We have major holes in our system that were identified during Sandy. What we're trying to do is prevent that situation from happening again and get everybody restored quicker. There were major holes in this particular area going down the Watchung Mountains and the Route 22 corridor. The guys would have to drive out to where they had coverage, get their instructions then drive to where the work was to be done and then drive back out again to get their next set of instructions then drive back to the site. This was delaying the whole process. What we're trying to do is strengthen the system so we don't have these issues anymore. Most cell towers do not have back-up generators, they are stand-alone

systems. Mr. Volpe asked if any other locations were considered. Mr. Yorke said I can't tell you for sure because the system was designed by Motorola. They look at the state of our existing tower locations then identify where holes are and design that system based off the geographic areas and figure out where the towers need to go. First we looked at Route 22, but because that's lower we couldn't fill the gaps, so we had to go higher up on the hill. This was based on their coverage analysis. They picked an area that would give us the best coverage and fill in the gaps. Mr. Volpe asked if there are alternative sites. Mr. Stamos stated that this is a permitted use at this location, so we don't have to provide any alternative site analysis. We are a permitted use for site plan and bulk variance. The Chair said yes I understand, but I'm giving the residents an opportunity to ask questions. Mr. Volpe asked, if there are plans to make the site look more presentable. We have an engineer and a planner that will address your concerns. Madame Chair asked if there were any more questions from the public for this witness.

Apurva Patel, 35 Oakwood Rd asked if the antennas are more than UHF VHF and do they transmit data. Mr. Sluss answered, they are 900 band VHF. Data is within that same band. Is it considered a distributed antenna system asked Mr. Patel. We have sites that support the antennas and there is some overlap. Mr. Patel said he assumed it would have to go through FCC regulations compliance. Mr. Sluss said Motorola solutions doesn't add additional requirements that the FCC has already established. The band is the same. The equipment is outdated. Mr. Patel asked if they have any supporting documentation that this is not going to cause environmental or danger to the residents of the surrounding area. Mr. Stamos said they have a compliance expert that would be addressing that. Madame Chair called for any other members of the public for this witness. James Biallargeon, 75 Oakwood Rd. asked if there is an existing wireless system in place. No. Mr. Biallargeon said, I see you're requesting a variance for wetlands but I don't see the delineation in the plans that show wetlands. "Where are the wetlands?" Mr. Stamos said he would have his engineer address that. Madame Chair asked Mr. Herits for his input. Mr. Herits said I don't believe there are any wetlands in that area. I think what he's asking for is a waiver from having to do an LOI (Letter of Intent) for that area. Hearing no more questions for this witness, the next witness for the applicant, Joseph Minneo RF expert, was sworn in.

Mr. Minneo testified the FCC has guidelines and mathematical formulas of how to calculate the site in order to meet compliance. Within those formulas there are factors that go into account, such as the whole environment being reflective, which is not the case. It also takes into account that there is no line loss and that every channel is operating at full power constantly. On top of all those worst if scenarios, there is also a 50 times X safety factor worked into the calculation. At this particular site the maximum exposure is 0.1697% of the limit. What that means is that this site is 580 times below the acceptable FCC limit for this type of operation. From an emissions standpoint this is by far within the compliance requirement. Mr. Minneo, said it's basically 2 tenths of 1 percent of the actual limit. Madame Chair called for questions from the board. Mr. Desnoyers asked, "Are they antenna emissions." Yes, exactly. The Chair opened it up to the public again. Mr. Patel asked if anyone from the government has done this analysis. The guidelines and the formulas that we followed in our report are directly handed and tested by the FCC. Mr. Patel asked if there are documents showing that the FCC gave their approval. It's not mandated that the FCC review all wireless applications. They give the calculations and formulas to the firms and it's our responsibility to follow them. If you want to you can look at them because we follow the FCC's guidelines to a T. Mr. Patel said so we are taking your firm's word that people in our neighborhood will not be impacted by emissions or in any danger. Mr. Minneo said you're taking the word of the FCC's guidelines. It's all mathematical. There's nothing that we can manipulate. Are we taking the word of Pinnacle, asked Mr. Patel. Mr.

Minneo, said you are taking the word of myself as a professional engineer, yes. Mr. Patel, asked if they could have it reviewed by someone else. Mr. Minneo said if you feel that it's necessary, yes. Chairwoman Schaefer thanked Mr. Patel and asked if there were any more questions for Mr. Minneo.

Hearing none, Mr. Stamos called his next witness. John C. Ferrante, professional engineer testified the shelter is 34 feet by 19.5 feet in width and is 16.9 feet from the fence line in reference to the bulk variances. The reason we chose this location is because Public Service doesn't allow a structures under the monopole. The shelter is a very small footprint. The shelter houses the equipment and the generator.

We are proposing access from Oakwood Rd. because when PSE&G upgraded to the monopole they created an access drive that was recently upgraded. We certainly can access from Johnston, however the only practical reason we wouldn't do that is because there is no existing access drive there. One would have to be created. We are showing the existing wooded area there now which helps provide shielding for the residents to the North. This site basically only requires power and we're bringing in a gas line from Oakwood Rd. to the shelter for the generator. We are proposing a 50kw gas operated emergency generator.

The existing tower is at 136 elevation above grade and we're adding 12 feet of antennas bringing it up to 148 feet. The actual shelter is roughly 26 feet in length 11.9 in width and 10 feet high with two compartments, one for the generator and the other contains the air conditioning for the equipment. This site is monitored 24/7 remotely through a central control center. Mr. Ferrante said Watchung has one of the better noise ordinances that he has seen. The standard for outdoor day time noise requirements for the generator is 65 decibels at the property line. The indoor day time is 55 decibels. Mr. Linnus asked if he looked at the ordinance section D-7. It states the noise for telecommunication equipment shall be less than 40 decibels at the property line except for emergency situations requiring use of a back-up generator. Are you looking for a departure from the site plan requirement? Yes thank you for pointing that out. That's the standard in the sense that we weren't looking at this as a wireless communication facility, it's communication for Public Service. You are governed by this ordinance said Mr. Linnus. Mr. Linnus asked for the decibel level coming from the generator. The manufacturer sites that the decibels, outdoors without any enclosure would have an 80 decibel noise emission, which would not meet the borough's requirements. With an enclosure it brings it down to 74 and 71 so this generator does not meet the ordinance at the property line, but based on the work we have done on other sites and the distance that we have from the generator to the nearest properties, we believe that the indoor will be met based on the distance. We will have to propose sound attenuation measures to meet the requirements of the code. What we will do is run a sound test once the generator is installed to see what the noise levels are at the residences and at the property line and then we would work with the town engineer to come up with attenuating measures to mitigate the noise so that we meet the standards. Madame Chair asked if they will be recording decibel levels. Yes. Mr. Stamos clarified this would be for that one time, 30 minutes when the generator operates. Mr. Ferrante stated it is for 30 minutes during the day every month. It's not constant. Madame Chair said it may be de minimis but we're trying to....Mr. Ferrante interrupted, I'm not diminishing the importance. Mr. Stamos said we are just referencing the frequency of it. Chairwoman Schaefer said I don't care if it's one time a week, or one time a month, or one time a year, we still have residents who live near it and you need to adhere to the standards. Will the equipment itself and other than the time the generator runs, comply with the noise regulation in the ordinance? Mr. Ferrante answered the equipment, without any mitigation, will not meet the ordinance at the property line. The wooden fence would help, except an 8 foot fence is not sufficient height. I'm

testifying based on other sites where we had to mitigate noise. The fence did go higher than 8 feet. Madame Chair, "you said 65 decibels is what you were gearing for at the property line based on the enclosure." We would do as much as we can with the generator shelter before we start mitigating on the exterior. Mr. Ferrante stated the applicant has to meet the standards of the decibels as well as not exacerbate the concern of the aesthetics. Mr. Stamos said they have no objection to raising the height of the fence. Mr. Speeney asked for clarification on the noise of the generator while it's testing as opposed to if it were running for 8 days. Mr. Ferrante answered, typically the exercise is at full capacity. Mr. Speeney asked if during emergencies they give it a rest or does it run full time? The communication is needed 24/7 during emergencies. Mr. Speeney said if you are supposed to meet the standards, the X number of days is critical in terms of noise and the 30-40 minutes of testing. Are you going to meet the standards? Mr. Ferrante deferred to the attorneys who stated during emergencies we are not obliged to meet the standards only during the exercising of the generator.

Mr. Ferrante clarified further. PSE&G would design the mitigation for a day time and night-time. Pointing out that the only reason the generator would be running at night time would be for emergencies. Chairwoman Schaefer called for questions from the board. Mayor Pote asked if PSE&G has met these standards in the past both in terms of decibel level and the short distance. Mr. Ferrante said yes. Our site committee was suggesting that you move that compound toward the center to help with noise mitigation. Mr. Ferrante said we would have preferred it to be there, but PSE&G doesn't allow it. Mr. Stamos stated, the testimony is for safety purposes and Mr. Ferrante added, they want to avoid encumbrances in case they have to re-wire circuits that go down. Mr. Speeney asked if that requirement was a unique one. Mr. Ferrante said he could only speak for Public Service.

Mr. Speeney asked if the shelter would have to be moved with the possibility of a pipeline coming through. Mr. Stamos responded, when a pipeline exists there's a requirement that it be dug by hand anywhere in that vicinity so there's no disturbance. Chairwoman Schaefer clarified there is a proposed pipeline. Mr. Stamos said certainly they would comply with that requirement. Mr. Haveson asked for the generator's size. Mr. Ferrante said it's a mid-range commercial sized generator. It's the standard generator that PSE&G requires. Mr. Haveson, asked about it being oversized for the site because that would then pose the question as to what else is being planned. Mr. Ferrante said he didn't have an answer, but would find out and see whether this generator could be downsized.

Because there's been discussion of the Pilgrim pipeline possibly coming through Madame Chair wanted to know how that would affect the shed. Mr. Ferrante stated from a civil engineers perspective, and not having knowledge of the pipeline, I think the pipeline would most likely be on the south to the southwest side. Chairwoman Schaefer said Mr. Finne mentioned that PSE&G had damaged and fixed their road. Is there anything from hindering you from coming in from the Johnston Dr. site? Mr. Ferrante, said we would have no objection, the only practical issue is there is an access drive already constructed for this purpose on Oakwood. There doesn't seem to be an improved access road from Johnston, but Public Service would not object to it. We would then have to create an access road from Johnston. Madame Chair said that would probably be better so you're not accessing via Oakwood, a private road. Mr. Ferrante said that's an issue we would take back to our client. The other practical purpose is when you disrupt to cut a new access drive, Madame Chair interrupted, if you look at the site, I believe there was a gate at the other end originally used for access and it's open coming from Johnston. I'm trying to preserve a road for individuals that have a private association. Madame Chair asked if the applicant was not averse to access via Johnston Dr. Mr. Stamos responded, it creates a lot more ground disturbance and additional area and because there's an existing

access drive, I would have to take a look at the legal rights to that and report back to you.

Mr. Speeney asked if the existing monopole at Johnston Dr. with an antenna and a power supply will be eliminated. Chairwoman Schaefer said there's an existing PSE&G monopole with antennas on top and a co-axle cable that leads up to the top. Mr. Yorke replied yes that is our equipment and that antenna will be eliminated. It doesn't have the coverage range for what we're trying to do so we have to remove it. Mr. Linnus asked for the location of that specific monopole. Mr. Yorke stated, I believe that it's at the R.O.W. on Johnston Dr. Also, with respect to the Johnston Dr. access, I was under the impression that the terrain on Johnston is why we weren't able to build a permanent access road going through that area. Mr. Ferrante stated in reference to the question about the wetlands, there are no wetlands on this site.

Madame Chair asked for the applicant to respond to our engineer's report of February 6, 2017. The applicant went on to address specific items for which testimony was given. In Item 4 they want to underscore that the mitigation of the fence would have to be higher and we don't know what that final total height would be. We will come back with a recommendation. In item 9 we have the structural report on the existing tower your engineer asked for and will submit it as Exhibit A-1 Structural Report. With the antennas we are proposing the pole itself is about 58% stress load, so there is a lot of reserve strength in the tower even with the proposed antennas. Mr. Stamos said he believes Item 11 issue belongs to the proposal and construction of a new wireless communications tower. We're not building a new structure. Mr. Linnus stated, so you're not expecting any co-location? Mr. Stamos, replied probably not, but we certainly wouldn't reject it. Mr. Linnus replied so you're seeking a waiver? I would assume, yes. I just don't think it applies to an existing structure. Simply because it's for the sole and exclusive use of PSE&G, asked Mr. Linnus. Is that what you're saying? Mr. Stamos stated, practically speaking you might not want other carriers using this tower. Chairwoman Schaefer said I don't think we would want that here. Mr. Linnus responded, it would be a site plan exception. In reference to Item 13 Mr. Linnus asked how many vehicular trips would be at the site. Mr. Ferrante said the vehicles trips would coincide with the exercising of the generator. In reference to Item 14 lighting, we propose a 70 watt light bulb in case the technician has to visit the compound at night. It's on a switch so it's not on all the time. And yes we will consider landscaping if required. On Item 15, if we are bringing in an access road from Johnston this will have to be revisited. Mr. Linnus asked Mr. Stamos if he had submitted to the county and Mr. Stamos said he had submitted for exemption and has not yet received a response. The Chair offered the public to ask questions for this witness. Glen Staropoli, 160 Oakwood Rd. East asked if they could get a photograph simulation of the wooden fence. We will provide that when we come back. Mr. Finne said our road is not going to handle the weight of the crane. We gave PSE&G an easement once and we had to literally threaten a lawsuit to get our road fixed. This area is not wooded at all. It's all mowed down. There's no problem in my mind, and I've been in construction for 45 years, to build the access road from Johnston Dr. The ramp is there, everything is there and you're coming off a public road without using Oakwood Road. You can't come up the power lines there because you have wetlands and you can't drive through it. Other than the Johnston Dr. access, I don't see any other way. If you look at the Johnston Dr. tower, PSE&G has all their equipment directly under the wires. My only other recommendation is maybe you can put some shrubs there. Thank you. Chairwoman Schaefer called for more questions from the public. Hearing none that portion was closed. Mr. Herits asked the applicant to have the following items ready for the next meeting. Are there security cameras at the site? No. Is the gas supply sufficient? So they're not tearing up their road to

put a new gas line in. PSE&G's engineer felt there was enough gas to power the generator Mr. Ferrante said, but we will confirm that. Mr. Herits said I'm assuming the 2 ton AC units are for the generator. Please confirm the size. Mr. Ferrante stated a lot of the noise is at the exhaust, so that's what you're going to have to look at and address. The only other request I had was to provide some landscaping. Madame Chair agreed. Mr. Herits also wanted to ensure there was no objection to repairing the road once they connected the gas line. The applicant agreed. Can we also have specs on the AC units and noise also. Yes. The Chair said the application will be continued at our March 21st meeting and gave notice to the public for that meeting.

Our last piece of business is Ordinance OR: 17/03 which has to do with digitalization of the boroughs records. When an applicant comes to a board they would have to submit their application through an electronic process. We need to send a memo back to the Mayor & Council with respect to this. Mr. Herits clarified that the real emphasis behind this ordinance was that we just recently upgraded the tax maps and there were sub-divisions and things missing. A lot of this has to do with the applicant supplying their plans in a digital form so we can easily put them on our tax maps. The ordinance states that we will still get paper submittals, but the borough wants to have a digital format as well. Ultimately, it's easier to store. The Chair asked for a consensus in having Maryann write a memo stating we are okay with the proposed ordinance of digitalization as long as we're able to get paper copies. The board agreed.

Mr. Ellis, for the record Weldon would like to come before our board regarding the landscaping design in April. Perhaps someone should contact their attorney to give him notice that our agenda is full. The clerk said she would contact him and Madame Chair Schaefer said the board wouldn't be averse to having a special meeting if necessary. Mr. Sopko corrected the record with respect to what he stated to applicant PSE&G PB17-01. He wanted to give them the opportunity to allow him to hear the application, but in the roll call vote he would be NV, not voting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maryann Amiano
Planning Board Clerk