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CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Theresa, can we call a quick roll of the board because we sort of (audio difficulty).

MS. SNYDER: Mr. Hunsinger.
MR. HUNSINGER: Here.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: Here.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Kita.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: His mic is still
off.
MS. SNYDER: There he is.
MR. KITA: Here.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Taraschi.
MR. TARASCHI: Here.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Hanlon.
MR. HANLON: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Chairman Cronheim. CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Here. And Mr. Stires is here as well.

MR. STIRES: I'm here.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you, Dave. We can proceed.

MR. McNAMARA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Patrick McNamara, again, on behalf of the applicant. This aspect of our application tonight
is seeking D variance relief because Chick-fil-A is looking to install 16 outdoor seats at the restaurant is that currently under construction. I have Mr. John Martinez as our lead witness to be followed by Ms. Cofone as our planner with regard to the variance relief that is being sought here this evening.

Mr. Martinez, you were previously sworn in?

MR. MARTINEZ: I was not, no.
MS. WOLFE: Let me swear everyone as well as Mr. Stires.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Right, new case.
MS. WOLFE: If you would all raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

ALL WITNESSES: Yes.
MS. WOLFE: Thank you. When you testify, just give me your address. Thank you.

J O H N MARTINE Z, sworn:

BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Mr. Martinez.

A Yes, good evening.
Q I need you at the outset to provide the Board with the benefit of your background and experience in the field?

A Sure. It's John Martinez, spelling on the screen is correct, $M-A-R-T-I-N-E-Z . \quad$ My address is 5200 Buffington Road in Atlanta, Georgia. As you can tell from my lack of a southern accent, I actually live in New Jersey in Middlesex County.

I've been - my titled with Chick-fil-A is development manager. I've been in this role for about 6 years, principally my responsibility is to develop new stores for Chick-fil-A not only New Jersey, but Pennsylvania, Long Island, and also work down in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, those states as well. I've been associated with Chick-fil-A for just about 19 years.

Q Thank you. And if you could please provide a description to the Board of the proposed outdoor seating that you're seeking approval for this evening?

A Sure, great. Yeah, what we're looking to do is to install approximately 16 outdoor seats on a patio that would be right adjacent to our main entrance, just to the left of our main entrance
and that outdoor seating would be used seasonally for customers principally, I would anticipate the customers would use that area from about April through October, say into November because clearly in the winter time, it's not desirable to be out there.

Those 16 seats would be a combination of four tables, each having four seats with an umbrella on them. We would also install trash dumpster, trash barrel there for any customer garbage.

Q And around the seating, will there be bollards?

Mr. Aguilar, if you could put the site plan up for the benefit of the Board, please, to show the area in question?

MR. AGUILAR: Sure.
A While he's doing that, you know, we propose to put in decorative wrought iron style fencing around there. Due to the proximity of this seating area being so close to the parking drive aisles, the Board Engineer requested some bollards for protection and that is not an issue at all. We've done it before, so we can incorporate bollards into the railing, so it will be a real
attractive look there. So you won't even know that there's bollards protecting those folks. So we can agree to do that.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you. A So one of the things -- so normally, we'll come in right from the get go on our initial application with outdoor seating, it's very typical. We look for it in all our locations. We generally look for somewhere between -- on the low side of maybe 10 or 12 seats to as much as 40 seats. In some locations, I'll give you an easy example, we're developing a store down near Long Beach Island. With that -- you know, that area there, we're going on the high side of about 36 seats. Here, being so close to the highway, we feel that 16 seats is an appropriate combination for our guests. Again, outdoor seating doesn't drive traffic here to the site, it's really just an accommodation for customers that choose to sit outside during the nicer days.

Q I have some further questions for the witness, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Go ahead.
Q Mr. Martinez, you're familiar with the Governor's Executive Order. If you are able to
open the restaurant and the Governor has not rescinded the Executive Order with regard to indoor seating in restaurants, will these seats be covered or roped off in some way so they're not utilized until the Governor's Executive Order is either amended or lifted?

A That's correct. We will -- if the order still stands once we have these installed, we will definitely have these roped off and they will not be used, that's correct.

MR. McNAMARA: Thank you. I have no further questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: I have a question for Mr. Stires. Dave, is it your contention that the site and the design of the outdoor seating is safe?

MR. STIRES: Yes, with the addition of the bollards, the fence with the bollards and their posts, yes.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you.
MS. WOLFE: Mr. Chairman, it's Amanda.
I have a question. Will there be waitress or waiter service to these tables and chairs?

THE WITNESS: No. There's -- we just have counter service. There will not be waiter or
waitress service to those tables.
MS. WOLFE: Do you intend to have music piped throughout?

THE WITNESS: We typically do not have any kind of speakers or music out there, no.

MS. WOLFE: So you'll stipulate to that?
THE WITNESS: Correct, we can agree to that.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you.
MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, it's Rich Brown. The outside seats, how close are they to the actual road?

THE WITNESS: I would let the engineer give you the exact dimension. But essentially between the drive aisle and those seats, we would have the railing bollards, railing we talked about sa well as landscaping, there's a strip of landscaping in there. So, Tim, I don't know if you're able to measure, but it looks somewhere in the neighborhood of maybe four or five feet, but I'll let you do that.

MR. AGUILAR: Yeah, it's about six feet from the face of the curb to the back of the chair.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Mr. McNamara, one of the things of which you should be aware of is that we have no real issue of the outdoor seating, if it's safe, looking out to Route 22. If you want to look over to Route 22, it's your decision. But it's the decision of your clients, we really don't feel -- there's no one near these sites and Mr. Stires, how far do you think we are to the nearest residential units in Watchung?

MR. STIRES: Oh, geez, I don't even know.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: A thousand feet, at least. I think they're on top of the hill.

MR. STIRES: Yes, yes.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: And obviously most of the time, it's going to be people sitting outside during daylight.

So I think, Mr. McNamara, you understand our position generally?

MR. McNAMARA: Yes, I do sir, thank you.
I have no further questions of Mr.
Martinez, if members of the Board have any other questions? Otherwise, I'll have Ms. Cofone come up to give planning testimony?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Any further
questions from the Board? Seeing none, anyone in the audience, the public, want to ask or say anything? Continuing the trend of no one being there, go ahead with your next witness.

MR. McNAMARA: Ms. Christine Cofone.
C H R I S T I N E
C O F O N E, sworn: members of the Board.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you. You've already been qualified?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: 10 minutes ago.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome. Still valid.

BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Ms. Cofone, if you could please provide us with your analysis from the planning perspective as to the justification for the relief being sought here this evening?

A Yes. Earlier I was asked to provide my address again before $I$ start testifying. So it's

125 Half Mile Road, Suite 200, Red Bank, New Jersey 07701.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you.
A You're welcome. So what we're seeking associated with the Chick-fil-A is a little bit different because it's a D variance for the outdoor seating area. As you know, the HD zone restricts us not from having restaurants, but having outdoor seating associated with those restaurants. So even though we're only proposing 16 seats, four tables, less than 20 percent, a very small percentage of our seating as outdoor seating, we do need to request that $D$ variance and demonstrate that our site is particularly suitable for this proposed outdoor seating.

I would submit to the Board that this is the perfect location along 22 in a large and commercially vibrant shopping center with a mix of uses. I think this is an ideal location for the proposed outdoor seating. The outdoor seating, as previously recognized, is not proximate or visible from residents within the Borough, so there's going to be absolutely no negative visual impact.

In addition, we testified that we would be willing to establish the bollards and we're
also proposing landscaping. So from our engineer's report, we would like to see the site be safe. But from a planning point, I think we want the site to be attractive as well because that goes into creating a vibrant center. So I think the combination of the bollards and the landscaping will allow us to meet our negative criteria proof and establish that there's no substantial detriment.

Some of the other things, operationally, you heard is that we absolutely do not have waitress service here, it's really just a convenience to our customers. If it's a great day like it was today or it's going to be tomorrow, it gives them the opportunity to enjoy the site, enjoy the center a little bit more, and sit outdoors.

We can certainly accept that as a condition of approval, so that the Board can be comfortable, that the exact type of outdoor seating that you're approving is the type of outdoor seating that you'll get in conjunction with the center. If that were to change, somebody would have to come back before the Board and seek additional relief.

So from a planning point of view, I think the Board can rely upon criteria G, talking about sufficient space in appropriate locations. And criteria M, an efficient use of the land. I think that the 16 seats are not taking away from any of the other aspects of the center with respect to parking or the ability to landscape it or screen it. So I think the Board can be comfortable that we have developed the site efficiently and there's no substantial detriment. Again, we are here in an opportunity where the master plan calls for commercial uses in this center of town. It calls for a balance of commercial ratable and it is calls for vitality in the shopping centers. All of that is certainly accomplished with this application. I, as a planner, am certainly in support of outdoor seating. And I think it's really a nice addition to the shopping center. So I can unequivocally say from a planning point of view that we meet the burden of proof with respect to particular suitability, as well as the positive and negative criteria for the D variance relief required.

MR. McNAMARA: Thank you. I have no further questions for the witness, Mr. Chairman,
at this time.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you. Does
anyone on the Board have any questions of our witness? Hearing none, thank you. Does anyone want to -- does anyone in the audience wish to make a comment or a question for this witness? Once again, seeing no one and hearing no one, we'll close the public portion of the hearing. And can we have a resolution to move forward? MR. HUNSINGER: I move for acceptance, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you, D.J. MS. WOLFE: With all the stipulated to conditions?

MR. HUNSINGER: Yes, absolutely. MR. McNAMARA: Agreed, Counsel. And we ask that the record now reflect all the submissions made with respect to this application. CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Excellent. MR. BROWN: I'll second that, Mr. Chairman, Rich Brown.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you.
With that, Theresa, would you call the roll, please.

MS. SNYDER: Mr. Hunsinger.

MR. HUNSINGER: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Kita?
MR. KITA: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Taraschi.
MR. TARASCHI: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Hanlon.
MR. HANLON: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Chairman Cronheim.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes.
MR. McNAMARA: Thank you very much, really appreciate the Board's patience while conducting this hearing.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: In the era of COVID-19, I think it make sense to have more outdoor seating, it's spreading people out, it's going to help. So we appreciate your applications.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you for hearing us.
(Discussion held off the record.)
MR. McNAMARA: Thank you for
entertaining our applications this evening. I want to thank Theresa especially for her assistance in all the technical issues involved
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CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: That brings us to the actual hearing. I'd like to thank Patrick McNamara for working with us in Zoom or whatever, Go To Meeting. Good to see you again.

MR. McNAMARA: Same here, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for hearing us on both applications this evening. The first one, Miller's Alehouse is basically a replacement for the Zinburger that had been previously approved by the Board. Unfortunately, Zinburger wasn't able to proceed with closing on the deal and moving forward. And Miller's has been recruited by our client to come in and be the new occupant of this pad. We have five witnesses to present the case before you this evening on Miller's. Joe Daniels to talk about operations aspects, how the place runs on a day-to-day basis; our architect, Andrew Dorin; Tim Aguilar from Bohler to take on civil engineering; John Harter, our traffic expert; and Christine Cofone as our planner.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you. Go ahead, Mr. McNamara.

MR. McNAMARA: Thank you. Is Joe Daniels on? I've got some people, but I'm not -MR. DANIELS: Yes, I am.

MR. McNAMARA: Okay. Great. Can the Board Attorney swear in my witness?

MS. WOLFE: Yes. Do you want to swear all of them in at once?

MR. McNAMARA: Works for me.
MS. WOLFE: And our own Board professional as well, Mr. Stires. If you would all raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God?

ALL WITNESSES: Yes.
MS. WOLFE: Thank you. And just as you're testifying, give me your name and address.
J O S E P H
D A N I E L S, sworn:

BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Mr. Daniels, if you can provide that information, please?

A Okay. My name is Joseph Daniels, I reside at 1765 Friendship Circle and that's in Hatfield, Pennsylvania 19440.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you.
Q What is your job with the Miller's Alehouse?

A I am director of real estate --
Q And the --
A -- of the Midatlantic region.
Q And in so doing, it's your responsibilities to oversee once the places are built and running, how they're operated in conformance with company standards?

A That's not my general role, my general role is related to getting the east done, getting through zoning and permitting properly and turning it over to management, in which case there's a general manager who lives in Voorhees, New Jersey, who will be responsible for collectively running this location.

Q Okay. And Miller's already has several restaurants here in New Jersey?

A We currently have four restaurants operating in New Jersey, Paramus, Woodbridge, Mount Laurel, and Rockaway, New Jersey, is our fourth unit right now. And Watchung is --

Q Hours of operation for a restaurant? A Well, a normal operation and this is subject to local guidelines, based on traffic, business, et cetera, but our general operation Monday to Thursdays 11 to midnight, Fridays and Saturdays 11
to 2, Sundays, we're open 11 to midnight. That is generally throughout the chain.

Q Okay. And have you acquired a liquor license?

A Yeah. We've acquired the license from the Zinburger who was the previous licensee here. So it was just a person-to-person transfer, so we are in control of that license.

Q Okay. And what would you project to be the number of full and part time employees at a restaurant of this size?

A Well, generally we hire between 85 and 90 people. Obviously of them are part time, given the number of hours that we operator. Our general modus operandi is to bring in a seasoned manager or two. And the other 85 to 90 are hired from the local community and they're trained by our training staff.

My -- I think about half of those, maybe a little more than half are part timers, but the others are people that operate in the kitchen, the bartenders and the cooks and generally five or six managers in every unit. So 85 to 90 , most of them are coming from the community.

Q And if you could please review the
nature and type of deliveries and frequencies for deliveries of various products over the course of a week?

A Yeah. Generally, in a week, we have four basic deliveries. For the sake of ease and quickness, we kind of stage them during the week and during morning hours when we're closed, as we open at 11. Our major food items will generally take two deliveries a week dropped by an SU-40 type truck, generally that's about a two hour unload time. So that's generally probably between 8 and 10, prior to us opening.

Beer, we have two to three deliveries from different local vendors, standard beer trucks, that's about a -- between 10 and 30 minutes unload time. Wine and liquor, depending on -- it's generally one delivery truck per week for that. And then we get containers and glassware and softwares, that's probably once a month for delivery.

Q Okay. And in terms of managing solid waste and recycling, how often is that picked up and how is that being done?

A The refuse is three times weekly, that's managed through the closed trash area by senior
manager in the restaurants, two employees taking care of that. The refuse is actually removed three time a week and then we would recycle quite strongly and that's three or four times per week is our recycling system.

MS. SNYDER: Excuse me. Mr. Kita, I think you're sharing your screen right now and that's what we're seeing. Can you please turn that feature off?
(Pause in proceedings.)
MS. SNYDER: Thank you.
Q You were talking about how solid waste recycling is handled. Is there a place inside the building and outside the building where it's containerized?

A Yes. We store that near the trash door during the busy hours. And then, again, a manager and one or two employees will help move that into the enclosed refuse area until it's time for pick up. But generally that occurs during the morning as well, prior to opening. The trash trucks do not come when we are operational.

Q And you hire your own removal services, you don't look for the municipality to take care of that for you?

A Generally, it depends on where we are. Generally the municipality is not involved, we hire our are refuse trash company. Quite often the shopping center provides one and we generally will use their for sake of ease. So we'll follow whatever regulations with respect to that we need to.

Q Okay. And you've testified previously regarding the various types of deliveries you get. With those deliveries, are you able to basically control the time of it so that it's not interfering with your lunch crowd, whether it's your restaurant or the adjacent Chick-fil-A? A Part of our delivery system is that we want nothing to interfere with our operations for management or customers during the day. So there will be no deliveries between 11 a.m. and closing, it's not feasible. So everything else happens, trash trucks might come as early as 7 a.m., but everything is out of there and complete and done delivery wise by 11. We want no disturbance to customers and employees.

Q Thank you. If you could briefly touch upon the security mechanisms that are available in a typical restaurant of this nature?

A Yeah. We have security cameras, full interior and exterior mounted and monitored by Miller's and recording are kept in perpetuity. So if we ever need to look back or there's some incident that needs to be reviewed by authorities, we generally will always have those available.

Q Okay. And you're prepared to certainly coordinate any such activities with the Watchung Police Department and advise them as you proceed toward opening operations as to the nature and type of security you have in the restaurant? A Absolutely.

Q Okay. Site lighting, if you could briefly touch on how that's managed in and around the restaurant?

A Okay. Our signage lighting is generally shut off immediately on closing. We allow for building lighting to stay on for one hour after we close for safe deployment of employees to get to their cars. So that's generally shut off an hour, the shopping center itself controls its own shopping center lighting. But around the building, we would make sure all employees are safely in their car, so it stays on one hour past closing.
$\qquad$

Q Okay. And for the employees that would be manning the bar, is it your policy to make sure they go through proper training and meet all the requirements of the Division and Alcohol and Beverage Control here in New Jersey?

A Yes. We've been through this numerous times obviously, because we have four restaurants, we're very familiar with the state. And all alcoholic servers are very subject to very strict alcohol training program and subject to $A B C$ and other federal and state regulatory requirements. So we're very strict about that.

MR. McNAMARA: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions of the witness at this time and make him available to the Board and public.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you, Mr. McNamara. Does anyone on the Board have a question of this witness?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Joseph, hours of operation what -- again? I missed that.

THE WITNESS: 11 to midnight Monday through Thursday, Fridays and Saturdays, it's 11 to 2 a.m., and then Sundays, it's 11 to midnight.

MR. BROWN: So lighting, the lighting
that's on the building is that the exterior lighting that's on one hour after closing?

THE WITNESS: Correct. The lighting around the building because -- for our employees' safety, generally if we're closed at midnight that will be on until 1:00 to allow for employees to safely leave the premises.

MR. BROWN: Okay, great. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Anyone else have questions?

MS. WOLFE: Mr. Chair? I'm sorry, are you planning on having any outdoor entertainment or speakers or anything that would cause a nuisance?

THE WITNESS: No, we do not. We have -we don't even have a patio here. We have what we call a Florida room, which is part of what's a secondary dining room which has roll up doors, which allow for kind of an outdoor feel. Those doors come down and we never have live during off hours in warmer weather. We never have live music at any of restaurants. So we will not -- we will testify we will not have any live music outside here.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Or inside the restaurant. CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you, Amanda. Does anyone else on the Board have a question? Go to your next witness, please.

MS. WOLFE: You want to open it to the public?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Is there public?
It's hard to tell.
MS. WOLFE: I can't tell.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Is there anyone in the public that wishes to ask a question of this witness? Hearing and seeing no one, we will now close that portion of the questioning. Mr. McNamara, you can go to your next witness.

MR. McNAMARA: Thank you. Our next witness is Mr. Andrew Dorin. Mr. Dorin's already been sworn.
A N
D R E W
D O R I N, sworn:

BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Mr. Dorin, for the benefit of the Board and public, could you please provide us with the benefit of your background, experience, your licensing here in New Jersey as a professional
architect?
MS. WOLFE: And your address.
A Yes. So this is Andrew Dorin, nice to meet everyone. I'm a registered architect in the State of New Jersey. My address for the record is 1925 Prospect Ave., Orlando, Florida 32814.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you.
Q And you're an architect?
A Yes. Just for background, I'm a graduate of Temple University, bachelor of architecture from 2007. I have my MBA from Georgian Court University from 2012. And I am -- I was a long time resident of the State of New Jersey with a lot of experience throughout the state for over 12 years. I've appeared in front of numerous boards throughout the state, I'll be glad to provide a few examples, if needed.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes, please.
THE WITNESS: So I would say I've -- you know, local to there, North Plainfield, I've been in Wayne, Asbury Park, Toms River, Brick, Wall, Ocean, Neptune, Freehold, Jackson, Middletown, East Brunswick, Linden, as well as many others over towards the west side of the state.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you. And your license
remains in good standing, right?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. WOLFE: Thank you. Mr. Chair, can we accept him as an expert in the field of architecture?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes, we can. Does anyone on the Board have any comments or questions? Hearing or seeing none, we'll continue. We can accept you as an expert.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.
BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Please proceed, Mr. Dorin.
A So we submitted a floor plan drawing titled dimension floor plan with a number on the sheet of A-101. And we've submitted an elevation titled exterior elevations, with a title -- a number on the sheet of $A-201$. Just to kind of go through the design of the project, I'll just try to touch on a bit about the exterior design as well as a little bit on the interior design. Would you like me to pull the exhibits up on the screen to share throughout the presentation?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: If you can do that, it would be easier for people to do that.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Let me see if I can
figure this out.
MR. AGUILAR: I can pull it up.
THE WITNESS: I think I got it here. I just don't know if when I'm flipping back and forth through .pdfs if it's only going to share the one and I'll have to do that each time. Are you able to see the floor plan of the restaurant? CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes.

Q Yes.
A Okay. So to just touch base on the floor plan of it. Can you see my mouse as I'm kind of pointing here?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes.
A So looking at the plan, the civil plan will show the orientation of the building from north to south. But for clarity, the north side of the building is down here, if you look at the key towards the bottom, the layout of the building has a centralized kind of focal entry point that you come in through. You have the dining area that kind of goes around the bar, there's some fixed seating and some tables. This is the Florida room that was discussed earlier. As you can see here, there's a few roll down doors that come around the outside perimeter of the building.

The kitchen is here in the back with a lot of the back of house like the restrooms. And then, you know, when we get in the elevations, I can kind of show this a little bit, but the cooler box as well as some of the back of house stuff is happening behind the kitchen. So really the kitchen becomes kind of the pivot point between the public view that goes to the back for some of the functioning of the building itself.

I'm going to try to flip to the .pdf of the elevations. Is the elevations showing or is it still the plan?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Looks like elevations.

A So kind of going off of what was discussed earlier, I'll try to zoom in on these a little bit to get some clarity to it. But here's the main entrance feature, this has been designated with a change in architectural aesthetics. This area of the building bumps up to around 28 feet, 9 inches in height. It's got an architectural stone veneer that is the material on it. As you kind of look, it's kind of set there to focus the attention to it.

The operations of the restaurant can be
spoken to a little bit more in depth, if needed. But basically all of the access points into this building comes from here for all patrons that are visiting. There is an egress door that comes out of the side of the Florida room, but this is not an access point, this is merely to meet the egress requirements. While the Florida room is in operation, the roll down goes up, but there's railings that come into place here, so it maintains the containment within that area of the restaurant.

When it comes to the overall building materials, there's a mix of, you know, beachy high wood panel, which is architectural wood, stone veneer, architectural. There is EIFS with multiple colors and tones to it that have been designated throughout, as well as awnings and canopies.

You know, the overall average height of the building is at around 22 feet, 9 inches. So other than the one area that pops at the very front of the building, the rest of the building is fairly consistent in its height at 22 feet, 9 inches. Except for as you get to the back, if you can remember back to the plans, this is where
a lot of the back of house functioning is occurring. And, you know, I think that the overall design is, you know, it's got a unique look to it to be consistent with the brand, but it's also very consistent with the surrounding development, the Cinemark across the street, as well as you look into the shopping center itself and you see the Sierra Trading Post, it's got a very similar look and feel to the existing stuff that's there.

The RPQs and mechanical equipment, we've dotted in the background so that you can see it's fully screened from all points of public view. And, you know, as far as the signage is concerned, I will let Patrick maybe speak a little more in depth on that. But we are, across the board, meeting all the requirements of the zoning.

So with that said, I'd open it up for any questions that anyone might have?

MR. BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's Rich Brown again. The roll up doors, what direction do they face in? Are they north or south? The roll up doors.

THE WITNESS: Looking at it, the north side is -- let me go back to the plan. The doors
are over here, they're facing -- the north side of the building is over here, so they're really kind of facing north from both sides. This one would be northwest on this face and this one would be the northeast face over here. If I was interpreting that correctly.

MR. BROWN: So that's basically looking out Route 22?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. BROWN: Okay. That's fine, thanks.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Anyone else want to ask a question?

Does anyone in the audience want to ask a question? Hearing no one and not being able to see anyone -- do you want to be continue or go ahead?

MR. McNAMARA: We can go ahead. Our next witness is our civil engineer.
(Technical difficulties.)
MR. McNAMARA: I didn't hear that.
Questions concerning the roll up doors? Andrew, if you could briefly review that again? I think there's a question regarding the location and function of the roll up doors?

THE WITNESS: So that one doesn't give
the orientation. This is the north, aerial plan, I just pulled this up. I prefer that Tim from the civil side kind of goes through this plan in more depth. But just to kind of use this as an example. There's the main entrance doors here, this is plan north. So this is north side of the building. So here's your roll up doors here in this plan. They are on that kind of northern side of the building but because it's kind of tilted and skewed on an angle, it turns this into the northwest side of the building. And then this would be the northeast side of the building with those roll up doors. And they're facing out to 22.

MR. McNAMARA: And you mentioned there's some type of fencing or other barrier so there's a clear line of demarkation, there's no outdoor seating being provided with this layout, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR. McNAMARA: Does that address the question that was raised Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: I couldn't hear the question, so you'll have to ask along with me. But I would like to note Mr. Warner has joined us for the record. And, Theresa, if you can mark
that?
MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be second seating, Ms. Wolfe will continue to be designated counsel.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Okay.
MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, it's Rich Brown again. I think the question being if these doors -- if they're north facing and they're facing the homes, just a concern about the noise coming out of there. And I think they said they weren't planning any outdoor music or playing in the facility, so there shouldn't be any adverse noise, I wouldn't think, coming when those doors are up facing the hill.

MR. McNAMARA: If I can just briefly recall Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels, are your operations such that you comply with the decibel requirements of the New Jersey noise control laws?

MR. DANIELS: Yes, correct.
MR. McNAMARA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you, Mr.
McNamara. I think we're ready for your next witness.

MR. McNAMARA: Our civil engineer, Tim Aguilar.

MR. AGUILAR: Hi, how are you?

T I M O T H Y A G U I L A R, sworn:
BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Tim, for the benefit of the record, please provide your name and address and your qualifications?

A Sure. My name is Timothy Aguilar, last name is $A-G-U-I-L-A-R$. I graduated from Institute of Technology in 2000 with a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering. I have a professional engineering license in the State of New Jersey, license is valid and in good standing. I've testified in front of zoning and planning boards in the state of New Jersey in the past. A few examples are Union Township; Lacey, New Jersey; Morristown; Elizabeth, New Jersey. And I'm happy to be here presenting in front of this board. Office address is 30 Independence Boulevard, Suite 200, in Warren, New Jersey.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: You have testified at boards before and you are a PE?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: We can accept you as an expert witness.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. McNAMARA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Q Tim, if you could, your firm has been involved with this dating back several years to the first series of applications. If you can just give the Board a brief review of the revisions that are being made to the site plan as a result of the swap out from the Zinburger to the Miller's Alehouse?

A Sure. And in doing so, I'll share my screen with the first exhibit. And again thank you for letting us be given the opportunity to present virtually. So what I pulled up on the screen, I'll introduce it as my first exhibit, it's the site layout plan for Zinburger. As you can see, the bottom right of the sheet, this exhibit was a colorized version of the site plan that was previously approved by this Board, it's dated November 8, 2018. For reference, north is to the top right of the sheet.

This is Block 6101, Lot number 5. And the application we're here to talk about has prior approval really is isolated to the northern quadrant in the site, it's a small peace of the overall development. So what I'll do is I'll zoom
in to get a better picture of this plan relative to what was previously approved and where we're going now with this application tonight.

So Zinburger was here previously for a 4,775 square foot restaurant that included a similar open air seating area on this western corner of the building. The building itself contained 207 seats, circulation drive aisles around all four sides, parking around all three sides of the building with immediate connectivity as well as connectivity from an accessible path to the balance of the parking field on the eastern side of the building.

With regard to the changes, what I think is important to note as you look at this plan is that the applicant and the work that's taking place is very much isolated to a select area that really hugs in the interior parking that I'm circling with this blue line on the screen. When you look at this line, the scope of work really is isolated to that area with the exception of some greening in the pavement areas just to make some modifications on the Miller's building work, but the scope of work is very much isolated to that area. When you look at the surrounding perimeter
of the site that abuts the egress route to Route 22, the frontage along Route 22, as well as the corner where it intersects with Terrill Road, those items are generally consistent with what the Board has seen in the past.

A few items I'd like to note that were variances that relate to the application that we're going to hear tonight, there was a front yard setback variance for the proximity of the building to Route 22, where 100 feet is required and a variance was granted for 65.7 feet.

There was a variance granted for parking setback to Route 22 frontage, which is located at this northern most parking stall, adjacent to Route 22. And just for clarity, there was a comment that Mr. Stires had in his review letter about the proximity of the two parking stalls that were here to talk about today. I can confirm that the dimension on our plans was actually measured to the curb line and not the Route 22 right-of-way. So we're not requesting an intensified variance for the parking setback to Route 22, it remains the same tonight. So it's an item we will revise with our resubmitted documents, so no further variance requested with that.

MS. WOLFE: Just to clarify, you're looking for 67.3 feet?

THE WITNESS: It is 8.3 feet. It was correctly noted on the prior application and the variance that was granted. Okay. So I'll flip now to the next exhibit, if there's no questions on anything that was previously approved.

The next exhibit that I will utilize is a colorized version and it's loading at the moment. But it's a colorized version of the overall site plan being $C-3$ that was prepared by our office. This exhibit is dated May 14th, 2020, but the submitted drawing was January 16th, 2020. And the only difference between this plan and what the Board has in front of them is this is colorized for illustrative purposes.

So I'll zoom into the pad again that's the focal point on this northern quadrant of the property. You can see the balance of the site in the exhibit that I referred to earlier. So as I zoom into the plan, you'll see what I described previously, looking around the perimeter, the plans are generally consistent and there's really no noticeable changes. The curb lines are
proposed where they were previously. And really the scope of work is isolated to that interior island, I'll say, the building, parking, landscaping, and sidewalks.

The building itself as part of this application is a total of 7,510 square feet in area, which is an increase from what we had seen previously. The building itself has a total of 239 seats, which is also a few more than were proposed in the Zinburger application. What's important to noted is the building has grown in this westerly direction towards Route 22 at the top of the page. And in doing so, the building has gotten closer to the Route 22 frontage. So we have a variance request that we are asking for tonight for relief on for proximity from the canopy to the right-of-way line or a setback of 41.2 feet. As well as a setback to the actual building of 43.7 feet where 100 feet is required.

I think it's important to note that while there's additional building here, the parts we did previously on the other drawing sits where I kind of sketched the blue line in this location. And there was development that was taking place in similar proximity and landscaping proposed along
the frontage of the perimeter.
Circulation, again consistent with what you've seen on the prior plan, what was previously discussed. Circulation is 360 degrees around the building. There are a total of 44 parking stalls in the immediate vicinity of the building as well as connectivity through the accessible ramps to the balance of the parking field where there's a total of 391 parking stalls that are proposed for the full build scenario.

The parking itself is based on a 4.5 per 1,000 square foot requirement and therefore our development, based on the increased building size actually increases the demand up to 412 stalls and we have lost a few parking stalls on this western side of the building. So our office, based on different uses of the site, we believe this is an adequate number, but we have a traffic expert here tonight who will discuss and prepared an analysis for the evaluation for the different uses on-site, he will speak to that later.

I mentioned that the building coverage where the building's grown, but what's important to note is that the building coverage itself is compliant with the code, it's up about 2,700
square feet overall from what this Board has seen in the past, but still a reduction of about 26,000 square feet from what previously existed on the development.

Similarly, the modifications, based on the removal of the parking stall, we reduced the impervious coverage, even with accounting for a pad that we'll talk about later, Chick-fil-A. And the impervious coverage actually comes down a nominal amount, about 374 square feet for the overall development, still complying with the code for coverage. With regard to the coverage, it's important to note that the drainage pattern is remaining the same as what the planning board engineer had reviewed and the inlets are in generally the same locations and they convey localized pipe runoff to different inlet areas that bring it to the stormwater system on site, ultimately complying with Township and DEP standards.

I've already addressed the comment about the setback, which we will update on the drawings, just to clarify again, the setback is 8.3 feet to the right-of-way line, there's no increase in the variance request in that location. There were a
few items that Mr. Stires identified in his review letter with regard to utilities that I'd like to address at this time. The pad itself has the utilities actually brought to it. And they're already stubbed at that location for gas, sewer, water for this building to pick up based on the development, there's mains that were already stalled with private mains for New Jersey American Water, transformers have been incorporated into this development as well for this facility. So there was a comment about the potential for securing additional well service, but I don't know if it's necessary as part of this application, since the approvals are in place. There will be construction permits that may still be required from the utility agencies, but with regard to all the services, they are there for this facility. Similarly for emergency access, fire suppression systems, the fire hydrant is still in the same location that was previously proposed along this main drive aisle that's east of the building. The hydrant is located around this location with the entry. And access is still provided along all four sides of the building.

```
                                    I think it's important to note the trash
```

room that's proposed on Miller's relative to the Zinburger, if you remember there was a much larger concrete area that stuck out here. We've actually been able to incorporate some additional greenery on this side as well, some additional shrubs with that reduced trash area, and still operated in the same way. As you've heard, they do the loading operations on off-peak hours and the store opens a little later in the morning. So generally no conflicts with what we expect for customers being on site for the Miller's Alehouse and can use the drive aisles next to the building.

In terms of the lighting, the lighting fixtures are consistent with what we proposed at our current and to be constructed development of 25 feet, LED high efficiency fixture. And as well as landscaping, as you can see the perimeter landscaping has the same and there's additional supplemental plantings around the building itself.

A couple other items in Mr. Stires' letter were about approvals. So we've actually provided the board secretary, Mr. Stires, the amended soil conservation district approval, the Somerset County Planning Board approval, as well as the letter of no interest from the New Jersey

Department of Transportation, that's still valid for the site based on the full build scenario and the square footage that's actually larger than what's currently on the side.

In addition, there's a treatment works approval question about the flow and even with the increase in size and overall square footage identified on the plan, there's a total of 353 seats allotted in that TUA approval. This application, including the additional seats we'll hear about later for Chick-fil-A is still below that total of 353 seats.

That concludes my direct testimony. I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Does anyone on the Board have any questions to ask of this witness? So basically you're saying fewer seats in the revised plan than the original plan?

THE WITNESS: There are more seats on this plan compared to the Zinburger plan.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: No, I mean combined?
THE WITNESS: So the application from a sewer perspective counted for a larger number than currently on the plan and that number is below. But the total seats on this plan are larger than
the seats provided as part of the Zinburger application.

MR. McNAMARA: So in your opinion, it is in terms of providing adequate sewer capacity for this development?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: That took into
account the two pad sites that have not been constructed, correct? So you may have to amend that in the future.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct. So I read the numbers and we're about 700 gallons per day or so below, based on the plan we're seeing here, what the TUA is active and approved for.

MR. STIRES: Okay. So at some point, you're going to have to amend but not now?

THE WITNESS: If there is a use that bumps us over, yes.

MR. STIRES: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the testimony that the application relatively from a site planning perspective is relatively consistent with what was approved previously by the Board of Adjustment with the bump out towards Route 22 of the building and the reduction on 10 parking spaces. I think the thrust of the
application is the parking and that will be testified to, I'm sure.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you, Mr. Stires.

MR. McNAMARA: Mr. Chair, I don't have any other questions.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Does anyone else have any questions?

MR. McNAMARA: I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Go ahead, Pat.
MR. McNAMARA: I have no other questions of the witness, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you. Amanda, is that you?

MR. HUNSINGER: Mr. Chairman, quick question.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Go ahead. D.J.?
MR. HUNSINGER: Are the sides
illuminated on the building? Can you hear me?
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes.
MR. McNAMARA: Mr. Dorin, would you
please answer the question regarding the lighting on the signage?

MR. AGUILAR: This is Tim Aguilar. They're internally illuminated.

MR. DORIN: Sorry, I didn't get to my mic in time. Thanks, Tim.

MR. HUNSINGER: The ones that face Route 22, how long do they stay lit?

MR. DANIELS: They go off at closing.
MR. DORIN: It's off at closing.
MR. HUNSINGER: They're on til 2 a.m. facing the mountain; is that correct?

MR. DANIELS: Well, Friday and Saturday, yes. Unless the store chooses hours that are shorter and they choose to close at 1, which is a local prerogative. Then they would be off at that time. We just have the allowance in our system, as does the liquor license, allow us to be open to 2, but it's possible that this may only be open to 1:00, but they do go off every night at closing.

MS. WOLFE: If I may, Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes, go ahead.
MS. WOLFE: The hours --
MR. HUNSINGER: Did not --
MS. WOLFE: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes, go ahead.
MS. WOLFE: So the hours proposed are until 2 then or 1?

MR. DANIELS: No. We are proposing to
go to 2, it's possible that if the business does not warrant we be open til 2, that's a local decision to maybe close earlier than that, but the proposal is that on Friday and Saturday, until 2 a.m., the other nights are midnight.

MS. WOLFE: Thank you.
MR. BROWN: This is Rich Brown. The signs will go out one hour after closing, I assume is that when the lights go out?

MR. DANIELS: No, the lights on the building will go one hour after closing for allowing a secure departure of our employees. The building sign lights will go out at closing.

MR. BROWN: Great, thank you.
MR. McNAMARA: Mr. Chairman, if there are no other witnesses, I'd like -- questions of the witness, I'd like to call Mr. Harter.

MS. WOLFE: Can we maybe open it to the public?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: I was going to say that. Is there anyone from the public that have any comments or questions to make at this time? Hearing no one and still seeing no one, we'll let you proceed, go ahead.

J O H N H A R T ER, sworn:

BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Mr. Harter, you're intimately familiar with this project having testified numerous prior occasions regarding this project before this Board and the Planning Board of the Borough? A Yes, that's right.

Q If you could, please you've prepared an analysis which has been submitted to the Board's professionals to update your overall review of traffic and parking and if you could please proceed to review the contents of your report for the benefit of the Board.

THE WITNESS: Is it fair to say I've been and qualified accepted --

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes.
THE WITNESS: -- or should I go through?
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Why don't you run through it for a minute.

A Yeah. I've gained a little more experience since I was last before you and testified before some other boards. But I have a civil engineering degree from Lehigh University, have been working in the field of traffic engineering for more than

25 years at Atlantic Traffic and Engineering, we're located at 30 Independence Boulevard in Warren, New Jersey. Licensed in this state and several others as an engineer. And I have been accepted and testified before this Board and more than 150 others in New Jersey.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: John, that's for the record, so I have no problem with it.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Go ahead.
A So I think I can run through the key points on the traffic. Tim mentioned, just to start on the big picture with New Jersey DOT permits sites from a perspective of trip generation and traffic sites generate. In March of last year, we did obtain a letter of no interest which confirms no new access permit is needed for DOT. And that remains now because that -- the plan at the time we sent to DOT did include the same Chick-fil-A with drive thru and totalled just over 93,000 square feet. And the current plan is actually smaller, the total area is 91,440 square feet. So given that, the DOT says this is a lower generator than what they actually approved, so there should be no need to do anything further
from an access permitting perspective.
In terms of the parking variance, we did prepare a traffic or parking letter report that was submitted to the Board. But first I want to just talk a little bit about ITE. We didn't provide any ITE projections in our report, but I think it's fairly pertinent in this case. So similar to trip generation manual that you always hear about in testimony from traffic engineers, ITE also has a parking generation manual. It's the 5th edition, it's the current version. And it is a very useful tool as well because for shopping centers, as they're classified as the DOT classified the site, DOT has studied numerous parking demand at various shopping centers. So the parking generation manual may have found that the non-December, so you have some research that's done around Christmas time, which is not what you want to rely on for design purposes.

But outside of December, they have studied 37 facilities on a Friday and 58 facilities on a Saturday. And the data, what the ITE will do is they'll grab the data and perform a regression analysis, just to see how well the data projects other facilities that we're looking at,
not just this one. And that value is referred to as an R-square variable. Those are one of the more particular that this data is of a site that we're looking at. And for the Saturday and Friday that is .96, .95, so it's a very high R-square value. So that gives us good confidence in this data.

The ITE provides not only a curved estimate based on the graphed data, but also an 85th percentile which is considered really more of a maximum estimate for a site. And when you look at that 85th percentile from the ITE parking generation for shopping center, based on our 91,440 square foot shopping center, we're getting an 85 th percentile projections of 346 parked vehicles.

As Tim described earlier, we actually have 391 spaces provided. And so under the ITE scenario with really that worst case 85th percentile, we still have a buffer of over 11 percent of open parking during a maximum parking demand scenario. So I think that's reassuring to see. And that buffer is a good amount. You like to see 10 percent buffer if you can in a retail facility. So that certain people
are circulating, looking for parking, there's sufficient open spaces to find. So that's an important point I thought.

We also conducted a parking study of the site itself and ITE recommends to use local data when you can. And obviously your site itself is the best local data you can find. In this case, there are four tenants that are currently occupied. And they're -- I would consider them really lower generating type uses, Sierra Trading Post, Home Sense, David's Bridal and Ulta. And they total almost 59,000 square feet. So when we go out and study those and get a sense of what kind of parking rates we're seeing now. And then also look at what the restaurants in addition to that and other retail spaces within the facility. So the two restaurants as you know the Chick-fil-A and this proposed Miller's Alehouse. And the there are also five other tenant spaces that are not yet occupied.

So for the remaining tenant spaces that are unoccupied, we're using the study rates that we got under the existing conditions. And then we're doing another step where we're looking at the two restaurants themselves. David Stires'
review letter back in February raised the point that he would like to look at the restaurants, rather than from a building area perspective, based on the number of seats. And just a point on that, the Zinburger actually had 207 seats and now the Miller's Alehouse is increasing that slightly to 239. So it's not really a significant change in terms of the seats.

However, we did do the exercise to develop the parking demand working it out as described, a second look out of the ITE shopping center. We conducted counts, now Dave's latest review letter, I think brought up a valid point. We're obviously under very unique conditions with COVID-19 right now. His report did mention that from May 5th and raised, you know, should -there's some concern he has with the data. The actual counts were done on Thursday, March 12th and Saturday, March 14th. And we collected ten and a half hours of data of the current parking demand in 15 minute increments, which is a typical procedure. And that was done during the peak times, week day, Thursday at the lunch time, Thursday evening into the nighttime. And then Saturday midday at the early afternoon. And I
think we're obviously under very unique situation with the COVID. But at that time, for example, our office was still open into the next week through Wednesday March 18th. And I almost feel that the time we were studying was a period when you actually had more activity. The COVID situation was evolving and people were out. There's a lot of shopping going on, people were worried about having supplies and things. So I almost expect that the numbers may be higher than a typical period that you would see. But that's my just expectation of that period.

From that study, we did find the Saturday period to be the busiest, that's typical in a shopping center during the $2: 15$ to $2: 30$ period, we saw 115 parked vehicles on the site for those four tenants. And then we create a rate of demand for that based on the building area. And that was 1.96 parked vehicles per thousand square feet. So now we have that rate, we can apply it to the remaining other retail tenants, as I said. And we did that for Saturday, that came out to 153. So now we have all the retail component of the shopping center, estimated as a maximum parking demand. Now we want to look at the two
residential and doing that based on the number of seats rather than the building areas, as Mr . Stires had asked.

So when we do that, the ITE has two different restaurant categories that are appropriate for Miller's Alehouse and Chick-fil-A. There's a high turnover, sit down restaurant, which is appropriate for Miller's Alehouse, 239 seats, that was used to estimate parking demand from parking generation. And then for the Chick-fil-A, 19 seats. And we used the category fast food with drive-thru. From that exercise, the ITE research indicates the Miller's Alehouse would generated 103 maximum parked vehicles and the Chick-fil-A would generate 36 maximum parked vehicles. I think the ITE does not give you the ability to look at when are those peeks really occurring. They will give you a weekday or a Saturday, for example. But they do not give you the actual peak of these types of uses. And it's hard to know there's so many variations of restaurants now. However, it's pretty clear from my experience that Chick-fil-A is really a lunch time generator, typically that's when you would see their peak. The Miller's Alehouse, because of
the liquor license and the focus around ale in this case that their peak would be more in the evening, in the nighttime. So I think what we would see is these two residential really having their own peeks at different times which is good for the overall shopping center.

But when we go through the exercise, so we've got our retail, our own counts, we have a retail rate of demand and then we add the two restaurants together, Saturday in our exercises, our analysis, comes up with a maximum parking demand of 294 parked vehicles, which is well below the 391 number of spaces provided.

So we have both our study, we have concerns with the COVID, you know, situation, which is a bit obviously unprecedented. But we also have the ITE research that's very extensive and demonstrates we would still have at least an 11 percent buffer during the peak parking demand periods.

So that really, I think, from me, in summary, we're asking for a small parking variance, it's a 5 percent deficiency from the Borough's requirement. And not only our study indicates that there would be sufficient parking,
the ITE extensive studies of other shopping centers also indicates the same. So given those findings, I think it's reasonable to grant the parking variance for the project.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Does anyone on the Board have any questions of this witness? MR. HUNSINGER: Can you guys hear me? Again, respectively, I've been by a Chick-fil-A at dinner time and any one I've ever been by, it is packed. It is not at all just a lunch time thing. And it is usually packed, both inside and in the drive-thru, it's usually backed up, creating a lot of traffic. If you've been to the other Chick-fil-A down on 22, that parking lot has become a nightmare to get in and out for both -there's two other businesses in there. And you just can't get in and out. And I have concerns that, you know, the numbers -- I think that during that May 18th or whatever, I think people weren't out in numbers. And I'm concerned we're going to put something in there and then when the site gets packed, we're going to have some trouble here. THE WITNESS: I hear you. CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Let's see what Mr. Stires says. Mr. Stires, what do you think?

MR. STIRES: Well, D.J., you know, that's why we raised the concerns with the parking, you know, with the square footage and number of seats and the high intensity of the Chick-fil-A. I think it's adding up to a concern. You know, John did a good job explaining this to me. I have a little more comfort level.

There is a peak, you know, if you say they're both pretty heavy evening wise of 139 spaces according to his testimony and, you know, that you dont' have half that amount of parking for those two pad sites without encroaching into other areas of the parking fields, you know. The other thing is you do have two future pad sites and maybe kick this thing down the road a little bit. Or if there is a concern with the Board, you have to consider it.

MR. HUNSINGER: Thank you.
MR. McNAMARA: We understand if there's a need for updated analysis once we're prepared to come back in for the other two pads, we'll certainly take these into consideration.

THE WITNESS: That's what I was going to say as well. I think no traffic engineer can sit here and give you the exact projection of what
these, you know, the Chick-fil-A will do at a certain time or the Miller's Alehouse and having the ability to see them operate, you know, really would be helpful and the give us the best information. I think what I was alluding to is Chick-fil-A from my experience, I worked on a lot of those on Long Island, and the lunch time is typically their peak, not that they're not busy in the evening, but lunch time is their true maximum peak.

And I think what you'll see is as this -- as this restaurant is opened, the one in Union, for example, which I've heard as well is very busy, well, they're in the same market. And that will relieve that site as well. And that's what they've seen in Long Island with sites, as they added -- there are only a handful now, but as they've added more, they settle down in terms of the peak parking demands.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: One other additional comment, which in my mind, leans slightly toward when the next two pad sites are considered, with this COVID right now, we're not sure if you will sit 50 in a 90 -seat restaurant, we're not sure -we don't know if it will be anywhere. We really
are changing the entire world in terms of packing in a restaurant. You're going to see restaurants spreading the tables out way more than they are now. You'll see a lot of restaurants probably have a problem because they don't have enough seating in distances for the safety of their clients.

So I would be willing to allow and look at the next two pad sites, because it's going to be different. Does anyone else have any questions?

MS. WOLFE: Mr. Chair, if I may? It's Amanda.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes, you may.
MS. WOLFE: Mr. Harter, do you have any conflict between the queuing of the vehicles at Chick-fil-A and accessing the parking lot for the new Miller's Alehouse?

THE WITNESS: I would -- well, under COVID, it's hard to say. What I know from my experience with Chick-fil-A is the sites as they're opened, they will have a grand opening team that comes and helps train the new operators. And the first handful of weeks is when they're really busiest, as the market opens up. And the
good thing that -- you know, I've talked to Chick-fil-A about that situation for this site. And what really, I think, works well is that the Miller's Alehouse will not be up and running during that period. So Chick-fil-A will be the sole restaurant on the out parcel and operating. So I think that will be very good and will learn to operate the drive-thru very well, especially beginning as they, you know, deal with that grand opening situation.

MR. McNAMARA: And, Mr. Harter, is it your understanding that the grand opening is slated for later in June, so they'll certainly be ahead of Miller's and will provide a summers' worth of data for you as we go forward with more pads?

THE WITNESS: Right, exactly, that's well put. And that period I think they usually see, you know, two to 4 weeks will occur in that grand opening period. I think what none of us know is with COVID that extends out from here, will we see -- obviously the drive-thru is a feature if it remains open in this condition, we won't see much parking happening. But we may see higher than usual drive-thru activity.

MR. McNAMARA: And then that live data can be used as each of the other pads are considered and eventually presented for consideration before the Boards?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
MR. McNAMARA: Thank you. I have no other questions of the witness, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you. Does anyone here have a question of the witness? Does anyone in the public have a question for the witness?

MR. HANLON: Mr. Chairman, it's Wayne. Quick question as far as you could say that we were equating back to parking, we didn't address the number of employees that are also going to be requiring parking spaces. In the opening statements, we talked about 85 and 90 , half of which are going to be part time employees. On any given day, what are we looking at as far as employees and my question goes to the fact that most of these employees will probably be driving their own vehicles, so you're looking at one employee for one vehicle. I'm trying to figure out how that applies in this whole matrix.

THE WITNESS: That's a good question, I
can answer that, too. So all of the data that I've just provided does include employee, customer, all types of demand, the ITE as well. So any of the studies I just referenced and the rates that are used include employees. I know for example, just a little more on that, that Chick-fil-A, as a standard, has their employees park away from the building. And then would look to park in the least desirable spaces on the site so they leave as much open adjacent to their facility.

MR. McNAMARA: Mr. Harter, it's my recollection that there's a New Jersey Transit bus stop in close proximity, if I remember correctly?

THE WITNESS: That's correct. So I do expect some employees would not be -- would use public transportation.

MR. HANLON: Thank you.
MR. McNAMARA: Or they use other
alternate transportation, as in take out the phone to call mom or dad to come pick me up, please.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: True.
MR. McNAMARA: I have no further
questions of Mr. Harter. Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Anyone in the

audience wish to make comments or a question? Hearing no one, we'll look to get to the next witness.

MR. McNAMARA: Next witness is our planner, Christine Cofone and our last witness on this application.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you.
MS. COFONE: Hi, good evening.
MR. McNAMARA: Ms. Cofone, I think you may have been out of the room. I'm going to ask Counsel to swear you in and ask you to please provide your qualification.

MS. WOLFE: Could you raise your right
hand? Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? MS. COFONE: Yes, I do. C H R I S T I E C O F O N E, sworn: MS. WOLFE: Can I just have your address?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Good evening. (Audio difficulties) the business address is 125 Half Mile Road, Suite 200, Red Bank, New Jersey. MS. WOLFE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: And, Christine, you've recently appeared before this Board, haven't you?

THE WITNESS: I have, yes.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: We can accept you the same we did last time, the Board has already accepted you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Nice of you to say.

BY MR. McNAMARA:
Q Christine, if you could please provide with your analysis of the variance relief that's being sought as part of the application pending before the Board this evening?

A Yes. Good evening. Of course, we did our usual, we reviewed the application, submission documents, and site plans. And we reviewed Mr. Stires' May 6, 2020, correspondence on the application. And we reviewed the zoning ordinances (audio difficulty).

And this is a substantially compliant application, when we look at what was previously approved for the (audio difficulty) we're actually replacing for Zinburger, (audio difficulty) the area with a Miller's Alehouse restaurant.

So the only impact (audio difficulty) what was previously approved by the Board were as Mr. (audio difficulty) testified earlier, we are increasing the front yard setback to about 41.7 (audio difficulty) or (audio difficulty) to what was previously approved by the application.

If you look again, when you see the substantial change between the end of the pavement and right-of-way of 22 and parking (audio difficulty) park area, so in some respects, you can consider (audio difficulty) less of an impact than what was previously approved because we've taken (audio difficulty) of that. So (audio difficulty) Mr. Aguilar (audio difficulty) the blue line of disturbance area.

So I don't think there's going to have a very substantial impact from the front setback. The zone requires 100 feet and the Board previously granted relief for this and what we're asking for in conjunction with this application given the geography of Route 22, (audio difficulty) the improvements that are on the site, I think the Board can certainly grant the variance relief on (audio difficulty) statutory criteria, (audio difficulty) invoking (audio difficulty) of
the land use law talks about provide sufficient (audio difficulty) in appropriate locations. (Audio difficulty) I think it's applicable here, which talks about a desirable visual environment.

Mr. Dorin, our architect -- the (audio difficulty) there's going to be (audio difficulty) with the setback of the building --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm having a very hard time hearing the witness. A You are?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: It's breaking up. A I hear you fins, so maybe I should -CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: There's a whistle. A I'm in Mr. McNamara's room, we're in the same building, not socially distanced really. So I'm going over here.

So since the court reporter I don't think got that, so I'm just going to back up. And I'm sorry, I apologize. I'll go through that again. I was talking about the front yard setback variance that we're requesting for the Miller's Alehouse building of approximately 41.2 feet. And I testified that I had testified on the prior site for this. And the geometry of 22 and how the current -- in conjunction with the current
application, we're actually taking the parking field that was in front of the building out of that area and we just now have our building, which I believe as Mr. Dorin explained earlier is a very attractive building with canopy elevations.

So I think in granting this variance, the Board can rely on criteria G, which talks about efficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of uses, but also criteria I, which talks about creating a desirable visual environment. Because I think there will certainly be curb appeal, a desirable visual environment despite the fact that we're not meeting the 100 foot setback and we are coming somewhat closer to 22 than what was previously approved in conjunction with the application. I think given reliance on those two purposes of the land use law, $G$ and I, the Board can be comfortable that the positives are satisfied for the grant of the variance.

As far as the negative criteria, the Board is asked to hold us and any other applicant to the standard just that the benefits of the grant of the variance outweigh any detriments. When you look at the fact that this is in a
commercial corridor, not only is it in a commercial corridor, but in such a corridor that your Borough and your master plan encourage for this type of commercial development and commercial vitality. And specifically to promote new development of non-residential uses. So I think that the mix of uses -- the mix of restaurant types, as Mr. Harter explained, is going to be beneficial to this center.

I don't disagree that Chick-fil-A does have a lot of traffic throughout the day. But I think that we're only adding an additional 32 seats to the Miller's Alehouse over what was approved in conjunction with the Zinburger. So when you look at the ITE standard and the fact that we really exceed what those requirements would be -- and another thing, we find quite a bit these days, I think you're finding that Uber and Lyft will reduce definitely the need for parking, as well as other things that you see, such as Doordash, Grubhub and things like that.

So I think we, as planners, have definitely recognized a reduction in the amount of parking that's associated with restaurants. And I think that is definitely a suburban phenomenon as
well as a phenomenon that's in more metropolitan areas. I am a professor at Monmouth University, I teach special topics in real estate. And I took my class one night to observe a board meeting in Rumson and there was a restauranteur there who has all his restaurants in suburban towns. And I was very compelled by the statement he gave about Uber and Lyft and how it impacts his business and the parking that's associated with restaurants these days.

I've also been on a couple panels, the planners conference where this topic has come up. And I do think as a board you do have an opportunity because we don't have those two other pad sites occupied, that if there is an issue down the road to capture and deal with it. We want our center to be successful as much as you do. So I think we can certainly be comfortable from a planning point of view that there is no substantial detriment from either one of these variances. And that the burden of proof with respect to the negative and positive criteria is satisfied.

MR. McNAMARA: Thank you, Ms. Cofone. I have no further questions of the witness, Mr.

Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Anyone on the Board have questions of Ms. Cofone? Anyone in the audience have any comment or question for our witness? Hearing no one, I'm going forward. Patrick, I think you're finished with this application with Ms. Cofone?

MR. McNAMARA: Yes, we are, Mr. Chairman. That concludes our case-in-chief and we request that the Board act favorably upon the application as presented before you this evening. CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you, Mr. McNamara.

Does anyone on the Board have any comments they want to make before they say anything or does anyone want to make a motion?

MR. BROWN: I have one question for -I'm not sure who. I guess what type of a facility is this, is this primarily a drinking facility or is it a dining facility?

MR. DANIELS: I'll speak to that, Mr. Brown. We are a family restaurant with -- a sports-themed family restaurant. So this is not considered a -- we don't considered ourselves a sports bar by any means. We feel our menu appeals
to all people, young and old. We call ourselves from highchairs to wheelchairs as a brand. So we (audio difficulty) the demographics. And we consider ourselves a sports-themed family restaurant.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.
MR. HUNSINGER: I have a question. I'm not sure if it's for Dave or Amanda. We've talked about if we have a parking problem, we can do something with the other pads that are not taken. But they can still get (audio difficulty) but that's only if they need a variance, right? If they don't need a variance, can we cut down what they have for parking? Does that make sense?

MS. WOLFE: So you're saying if they don't have a variance and they're fully compliant, do they have to come to the Board at all?

MR. HUNSINGER: Right. Like we can have a parking problem and we keep saying we'll make it up on the two other pads, but they can fill out at their maximum without coming to us and now we have just a bigger parking problem.

MR. McNAMARA: Well, we would have to come back in for site plan approval for each of the two remaining pads, so we would anticipate
that we would be asked to give an updated traffic analysis, as we said earlier, we would certainly agree to do that and understand that's going to be part of any subsequent application we make to this board or the planning board for the other two pads.

MR. HUNSINGER: My biggest concern here is that we're creating a mess we're not going to be able to clean up. I mean we're giving an extra bunch of right-of-way and not even getting the parking to comply.

MR. McNAMARA: Well, as I stated, it's something that the applicant is going to have to address as it comes forward with either of the other two pads. So it's certainly going to be part of that discussion, whether the next application is before you or before the planning board. We fully understand that this is going to be an ongoing and evolving issue that we're going to have to address head on. I don't know who the other potential tenants will be, but it is not uncommon in commercial settings to have eases where certain tenants are guaranteed or required to have a certain amount of parking provided to them as a condition of their lease.

So we're looking at not only meeting the ordinance requirements that the Borough has, but from a business and economic standpoint, it's not going to do my client any good to have a lease of a space and the tenant says where's my parking, oh, we gave it all away already, you have to fend for yourself. That's not going to fly with anybody.

MR. HUNSINGER: So we're reducing the available spots in the other pads right now?

MR. McNAMARA: Would that be a fair description, John?

MR. HARTER: I'm sorry, the question is we're reducing the parking?

MR. HUNSINGER: Are we reducing the available parking for the undeveloped pads? Does this take away from their available parking?

MR. HARTER: All the tenants are sharing parking, so that's the concept of a shopping center. So I'm not really --

MR. HUNSINGER: Okay, I understand.
MR. HARTER: Yeah.
MR. STIRES: I think, D.J., to the extent that they're asking for a variance, yes, they are reducing the available parking for the
pad sites that have been -- that are undeveloped.
MR. HUNSINGER: Okay, thank you.
MR. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, if may? The remaining -- and I would ask counsel for the applicant, as well Ms. Cofone, the planner, would it be accurate to say that the Board has the discretion to consider the impact of any parking deviation request with respect to any pad within the shopping center in conjunction with -- the impact it would have on the shopping center parking as a whole in the context of considering a variance or exceptions, waiver relief being sought for each individual pad?

MR. McNAMARA: I think that's a fair statement. We understand that we have to look at it holistically, we can't look at it piecemeal.

MR. WARNER: In that way, perhaps that part addresses -- perhaps not the concern expressed by Board Member Hunsinger, but actually puts into context the relevance and materiality of the question that he posed. And maybe that needs to be further addressed, I think, as a Board, by Mr. Harter and/or any other of your witnesses. MR. McNAMARA: John, if you want to take a stab at responding to Counsel?

MR. HARTER: Oh, my gosh, could we ask that question again? Could you redirect the question?

MS. WOLFE: Hang on one second.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Can you restate the question? I'm not clear what the question was.

MR. WARNER: Steve Warner again. The question essentially was, I think, from your counsel, can you further address Mr. Hunsinger's inquiry, since it is both relevant and material to the decisionmaking process of this Board this evening as to the impact that the parking deviation requested on this pad with respect to the application for this pad will not only have in isolation on this particular application, but also holistically on the shopping center as a whole? Since it's, I think, now being conceded to be both a relevant and material question by Mr. Hunsinger with respect to this application.

MR. HARTER: Yes. I think I talked throughout my testimony that each tenant throughout the shopping center will have -- it's a shared parking concept, that's what a shopping center involves. And some tenants are going to be more intense in terms of parking and have parking
demands at different times of the day. And I think what's being alluded to is that Chick-fil-A, for example, and Miller's may contribute to more parking demand than other tenants within the facility. And we recognize that, that's really typical of any shopping center. And that's the rationale of coming back and looking at parking demand as these other tenants come into our build and operating, such as Chick-fil-A.

So, yes, I expect it will be more of a demand generator than some other tenants that are potentially -- which we expect to be other retail tenants in the future. So that combination of lighter generators along with a more intensive generator, we anticipate will work for this center.

MR. HUNSINGER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Anyone else with questions on this matter from the Board? Hearing no one, is there anyone in the public? We'll close the public session. And does anyone wish to make a proposal for either approval or denial of this application?

There was no public comment because there's nobody here. Once again, no public
comment, no one here. No one can be seen.
MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, there's a number of variances we need to approve with this as well, I assume, right?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes. Amanda, that's correct, right?

MS. WOLFE: Yes. I believe the front yard setback and the parking variance, correct?

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Correct.
MR. McNAMARA: Correct.
MS. WOLFE: So it's just those two and that would be a majority vote. And I believe Ms. Cofone said it would be under the $\mathrm{C}-2$ standards because the benefits would outweigh the detriments.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Correct, that was the testimony.

MS. WOLFE: And we also need the amended preliminary and final site plan approval, with all stipulated to conditions, unless stated otherwise by counsel.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Correct.
MR. McNAMARA: We agree to all
conditions, by the way, for the record. And we would ask that the application package exhibits
and reports be moved into the record at this time.
MS. WOLFE: Mr. McNamara, do you want to mark each of them separately or how -- I don't recall which ones were submitted in advance and which ones were not.

MR. McNAMARA: I believe Mr. Aguilar can respond. I think there was a submission made? MR. AGUILAR: Yeah.

MR. McNAMARA: Or indexed as part of the overall submission package.

MR. AGUILAR: So the Zinburger exhibit which was the prior application, the overall site exhibit sheet C-3, and I can re-share these again, Amanda, directly with you. They're with the architectural plans that Mr. Dorin had referred to. Those mentioned, the architectural floor plan sheet A-101, dated January 28th, 2020. Exterior elevations, sheet A-201, dated January 28, 2020. MS. WOLFE: And the sign packet was already submitted 10 days in advance, correct? MR. AGUILAR: Yes. MS. WOLFE: Thank you. MR. AGUILAR: Mr. McNamara, one of the items mentions all the conditions of the review letter, but I think we addressed in the testimony
about the will service from utility companies that wouldn't necessarily be necessary since service is already provided to the building.

MR. McNAMARA: Understood. I think there's been correspondence on those and so that reflects accurately, thank you.

MR. WARNER: If I may, Mr. Chairman, this is co-counsel. The exhibits were submitted and designated as A-1 through A, whatever the last number was, would that be correct? When they were pre-submitted?

MR. AGUILAR: They were in their destination when they were submitted.

MR. WARNER: Okay. So they'll go into the record with that submission with those designations. And if our court reporter needs further clarity, that can be provided because they're on the agenda or linked to the agenda. Just a housekeeping matter. Thank you for letting me interject.

CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Would someone like a make a resolution for or against this matter?

MR. BROWN: I'd like to move for this application with the agreed variances we're talking about.
$\qquad$

MS. WOLFE: And the conditions stipulated to?

MR. BROWN: Yes.
MS. WOLFE: Thank you.
MR. BROWN: All the above.
MS. WOLFE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: For the record, would you say who made the resolution, please?

MR. BROWN: That was Richard Brown.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: I know. I can see you, but I don't know if others could see you. So thank you, Richard.

Is there a second on this resolution?
MR. TARASCHI: Second by Mitch Taraschi.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you. All right. Any comments anyone wants to make before we vote? Hearing none, Theresa, would you call the roll, please?

MS. SNYDER: Mr. Hunsinger.
MR. HUNSINGER: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Mr. Kita. We'll come back. Mr. Taraschi.

MR. TARASCHI: Yes.
$\qquad$

MS. SNYDER: Mr. Hanlon.
MR. HANLON: Yes.
MS. SNYDER: Chairman Cronheim. CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Yes. MS. SNYDER: Mr. Kita, can you put your mic on, please? Mr. Kita.

MR. KITA: The light is green. Yes.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Thank you.
MS. SNYDER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: With that, it's
six-zero, it's passed unanimously. I thank you for your time.

I have only have one other comment to make. We have a stenographer here tonight. Susan, if you need a break, would you put your hand up? You want a break?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, please.
CHAIRMAN CRONHEIM: Okay. Please take two minutes. And let us know when you're back.
(Whereupon the matter was adjourned.)
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