

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

Chairman Capazzi called the meeting to order at 8:00pm.

Open Public Meeting Act Announcement: In compliance with Chapter 231, Public Law 1975, adequate notice of this meeting was made. It has been posted on the Bulletin Board in the Municipal Center. Copies have been mailed to THE RECORD, NORTHERN VALLEY PRESS, and the NORTH JERSEY SUBURBANITE. A copy has been filed with the Borough Clerk and copies have been mailed to individuals requesting the same.

ROLL CALL

Roll Call	PRESENT	ABSENT
(JC) Chairman John CAPAZZI	X	
(PA) Vice-Chair Peter ARDITO	X	
(PH) Mayor Paul HOELSCHER	X	
(AN) Councilman Allan NAPOLITANO	X	
(JB) Member Jesse BARRAGATO		X
(RM) Member Richard McLAUGHLIN	X	
(RW) Member Robert WALDRON	X	
(DV) Alt. #1 Denise VELA	X	

Also Present:

- (JK) Jennifer Knarich, Board Attorney
- (AK) Anthony Kurus, Neglia Engineering (Engineer)
- (RP) Richard Preiss, Phillips Preiss Grygiel Leheny Hughes (Planner)
- (CL) Carolyn Lee, Land Use Secretary

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

July 9, 2019

To approve July 9, 2019 minutes	MOTION	SECOND	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chairman John CAPAZZI			X			
Vice-Chair Peter ARDITO	X		X			
Mayor Paul HOELSCHER					X	
Councilman Allan NAPOLITANO			X			
Member Jesse BARRAGATO						X
Member Richard McLAUGHLIN					X	
Member Robert WALDRON		X	X			
Alt. #1 Denise VELA			X			

INVOICES FOR APPROVAL

Allegro (Escrow)	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (March 2019)	\$ 180.00
Allegro (Escrow)	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (April 2019)	\$ 480.00
Allegro Development (Escrow)	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (June 2019)	\$ 60.00
General	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (June 2019)	\$ 642.78
COAH	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (June 2019)	\$ 765.00
BCUW/Madeline Housing Partners, LLC ad Ray (Escrow)	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (June 2019)	\$ 165.00
Allegro (Escrow)	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (July 2019)	\$ 870.00

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

223 Lynn Street (Escrow)	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (July 2019)	\$ 150.00
General	Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio (July 2019)	\$ 534.28
Affordable Housing	Phillips Preiss Grygiel Leheny Hughes LLC (June 2019)	\$ 887.00
General	Phillips Preiss Grygiel Leheny Hughes LLC (June 2019)	\$ 363.00
41 Peat Street (Escrow)	Phillips Preiss Grygiel Leheny Hughes LLC (June 2019)	\$ 1,968.75
Allegro II (Escrow)	Phillips Preiss Grygiel Leheny Hughes LLC (July 2019)	\$ 445.50
TOTAL		\$ 7,511.31

To approve invoices with option for funding	MOTION	SECOND	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chairman John CAPAZZI			X			
Vice-Chair Peter ARDITO	X		X			
Mayor Paul HOELSCHER			X			
Councilman Allan NAPOLITANO			X			
Member Jesse BARRAGATO						X
Member Richard McLAUGHLIN		X	X			
Member Robert WALDRON			X			
Alt. #1 Denise VELA			X			

HEARINGS

1. 41 Peat Street – Reconsideration for minor lot subdivision

Mayor Hoelscher recused himself from the 41 Peat Street hearing.

Mr. David L. Rutherford appeared on behalf of Deidra Sykes O’Neil, the applicant, and was accompanied by Massimo Piazza their professional engineer. Mr. Rutherford stated for the record that they filed the affidavit of notice and publication for this evening and provided it to Ms. Lee earlier. JK reviewed the affidavits and notices.

Mr. Rutherford reviewed that they are seeking a minor subdivision of lot 22. It is an assemblage of 9 lots filed in Bergen County in 1897 and was acquired by Ms. O’Neil’s parents in 1955. The first application required variances for each lot. The larger lot oriented towards Peat Street was 11,617sf and already has a home on it. The lot oriented toward Deal Street was 10,775sf that is vacant or the backyard. The application was denied with three (3) votes to deny, two (2) votes to approve and one (1) vote to abstain. Mr. Rutherford provided a revised plan and some information that may address some concerns from July. Each lot is over 11,000sf.

Exhibit A-7 proposes that lot 22.01 width is 98.02ft where 100ft is required. It is a beneficial change to the plan and is larger than 10,000sf that was originally required in 1950. There is a change in the conceptual drawing on lot 22.02 without a variance relief. It shows just a building envelope. They are prepared to stipulate that any home to be built on lot 22.02 will be in full compliance with the zoning ordinance. If a new home were to be built on Lot 22.01, it would fully comply with zoning. They are asking the Board to approve lots that are slightly undersized, but in doing so they are not creating an issue for the Board of Adjustment in the future.

Mr. Rutherford said they believe there is a hardship case to be made, section C1 of the Municipal Land Use Law. The north lot line on lot 22 is not 90° to the lot lines on Peat or Deal Street, therefore the lot gets narrower as it goes to the east and creates a hardship. If the property lines were 90° there would be 2 conforming lots. Section C2 of the Land Use Law, what they are proposing would represent better zoning alternative for the property. They suggest that through lots are not favored and not good planning. Part of the problem is the back of the yard would

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

have amenities behind the home that would be the front yard of the adjoining rear street. It doesn't lead to good planning. They are taking in consideration the record of the matter to include the testimony taken and exhibits marked in July as supplemented by this evenings proceedings. They provided transcripts to the Board of the July meeting. If anyone missed the meeting, they can render themselves eligible by reading it.

JC said that Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Piazza were still under oath.

Mr. Piazza confirmed he was the qualified as the expert in the field of land surveying and professional engineering in July. Nothing affecting his qualification or license has changed. Exhibit A-7 Subdivision Plat - Original April 23, 2019, revised May 31, 2019 and revised August 28, 2019. There were changes to 22.01 and 22.02 lot lines. Lot 22.01 is 11,391.7sf and lot 22.02 is 11,001.01sf. Lot 22.01 has a depth of 98.02 from center of the property to the rear. Lot 22.02 complies to lot depth. 2ft is not distinguishable for the area. 1,000sf for lot 22.02 and 600sf deficiency for 22.01 is not noticeable. In lot 22.02, he has taken off the conceptual dwelling, as it seemed to cause confusion. Now, there is a building envelope where the structure can be constructed.

Mr. Rutherford testified that conforming dwellings could be built on lot 22.01 and 22.02 in full compliance with the zoning ordinance. They are willing to stipulate that as a condition if the Board seeks it. Questions about soil movement, permit applications, landscaping or tree removal were asked in the last meeting. Soil movement approval will likely be required. A condition would be that they return to the Board for any approval required. Lot 22 could have a building with a footprint of approximately 5,600sf with 2 stories would be 11,000sf house. A house of that size is not consistent with the block with some exceptions.

There was discussion about Block 802 lot 1. With some investigation, the lot is 19,118sf based on the recorded provided on the application. Lot 22 is 22,392.77sf with a difference of 3,274sf comparing lot size. Lot 22 would be 93% if the lot were 24,000sf. Block 802 lot 1 would be 79% if the lot were 24,000sf. As a planner, surveyor and engineer, the difference is significant.

Exhibit A-8 (200ft radius and block of the surrounding area). There are lots in the area that are over 12,000sf. The property line is skewed. Lot 2 (top left corner) is 11,700sf. As you go down, there are lots that are 10,600sf, 9,600sf. They are proposing 11,391sf and 11,001sf. Block 802 lot 1 is 19,118sf. If they tried to subdivide the lot, it would be less than 10,00sf. The proposed subdivision is not an unusual configuration. Mr. Rutherford noted that it was a common denominator in those lots (22, 1 804, 22 803, 1 802) the northerly line is the skew. Along Deal St. there are 4 lots less than 12,000sf (Block 569 lot 11) along Hackensack Ave between Lynne and Deal Street.

JC opened the meeting to the public for questions for the engineer.

Motion: RW Second: PA

In favor, all said "aye".

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

Judy Jones, 32 Deal Street, asked if they looked at the houses on Deal Street and the cul-de-sac. The lots were larger that were built in the 1990s. She asked if the modern plan for the neighborhood was for larger lots. Mr. Piazza said that this neighborhood is a different design and is more rectangular. The new subdivision tried to divide it to get the maximum lot coverage in that area. You can't compare what is present in the block to the subdivision. Ms. Jones said that the lots should follow the new design principles. Mr. Piazza said it was specified in 1897. Ms. Jones said that the Ottomanelli house is the most recent house built on the block and is substantially larger lot. The trend in the past 25 years is larger lots to support larger houses. Mr. Piazza said that they are following normal procedures and the intent of the lot. Ms. Jones noted there is a pass through on 22 Deal Street and the characteristic on Deal reflects larger lots. It is not the modern vision of the street to handle larger houses. They would need to prepare for environmental resources, sewage, and water resources for larger houses. Mr. Piazza disagreed with her assessment. He said that this lot warrants a subdivision. A 10,000sf house would not fit in this neighborhood. The proposed minor subdivision would be better zoning and consistent. Ms. Jones said that realistically, a house that size would not happen in Harrington Park because there is not market for it. Mr. Piazza disagreed.

No other questions for the engineer from the public.

Motion: AN Second: PA

In favor, all said "aye".

Meeting closed to public for questions.

Ms. Deidra Sykes O'Neil, 414 Lafayette Road, Harrington Park was sworn in. She is the applicant and introduced herself. She grew up on Peat Street. Her family has been in Harrington Park for 120 years or longer. Great grandfather's parlor was the first Catholic mass in town. The stain glass behind the alter is dedicated to his stepson. Her grandfather was a councilman for 8 years, Mayor for 8 years and president of the fire department for 11 years. Her uncle was a renowned firefighter. Her mother was on the ambulance corps for decades. Ms. Sykes was honored at the Harrington Park School wall of fame. She and her family love this town. She said that her family was instrumental in making the town the way that it is and is their legacy. She would never try to harm the town and her family's legacy. In July, she felt that people didn't get the sense that. Her parents had always planned to subdivide, but held off. They had contactors try to buy the property over the years. Development of the cul-de-sac approached Ms. O'Neil. The property was always planned as a subdivision. After her mother's passing, they thought it was time to do it. It is a great house and having 2 houses in a great neighborhood would be good solution. She asked to consider lots in the area that are smaller than hers. The houses can respect the character of the neighborhood.

Meeting Open to public for questions.

Motion: PA Second: RM

In favor, all said "aye".

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

Ms. Jones thanked Ms. O'Neil for the tradition and wouldn't be here without it. It is appreciated. This is about modern standards of building. She said that envisioning the house staying the same would not happen in most cases. Ms. O'Neil said that she has not attempted to sell. Ms. Jones said she wouldn't know if it is a hardship to sell the entire property. Ms. Sykes O'Neil spoke to some realtors who provided advice to subdivide and sell as 2 properties.

Meeting closed to public questions.

Motion: PA Second: RW

In favor, all said "aye".

Mr. Kurus and Mr. Preiss did not attend the last meeting.

Anthony Kurus, Neglia Engineering, 34 Park Avenue, Lyndhurst NJ was sworn in.

Richard Preiss, Phillips Preiss Grygiel Leheny Hughes, Hoboken, NJ was sworn in.

AK was not at the original hearing. The engineer details would be worked out at a later date. Drainage and soil moving would need to be addressed. It is not out of the ordinary to come for a subdivision without those details. Those items would have to be addressed if a house was to be built on the lot. The lot line shifted 2ft to the west that created a variance for lot depth on lot 22.01. It is a similar plan as the last time. He had nothing else to add.

RP would like the Board to take in consideration in that the when the subdivision was created in the 1950s the minimum lot size was 10,000sf. The original intention when the property was subdivided and lot was created, it was sufficient in size to create 2 lots. The placement of the house on the Peat Street side left open the possibility to create another house facing the Deal Street side with both lots being able to comply with the minimum lot size. In the subdivision, the shift is helpful to bring the lot size closer in size. The lots would be 1,000sf and 600sf deficient and 2ft depth variance. This is de minimis. The pattern of lots in the area is odd shaped properties because of the cul-de-sac. If you look at the lots on Hazel, Peat, Deal and Lynn Street, it is what the zoning/master plan has envisioned. Zoning does not favor through lots. Zoning favors lots with frontage on the street as is the pattern on all these streets. There could be a driveway, pools, garages, rear entrances or accessory structures facing the front yard on the Deal Street side. A subdivision would be in conformance that has been established in this particular neighborhood. Most lots meet the 12,000sf limit. The diagonal line of the block limit has created a situation where you have a substantially oversized lot or 2 lots, which are slightly undersized. This lot is 93% of the 24,000sf what would be necessary to create 2 conforming lots is very close to what was envisioned. The impact of the neighborhood is the treed area. If a house were placed in the lot, it would be consistent with the lot pattern in the area. The applicant is not claiming for economic hardship. The request is to provide 2 lots what they would be entitled to when the subdivision was created. The Board can take in the factors for the 3 de minimis variances.

Open to Public comments.

Motion: RW Second: PA

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

Michelle Ottomanelli, 41 Deal Street (Block 802, Lot 1) was sworn in. She did investigation on her property, which is across the street from the applicant's property. She strategically placed a moderate house in the middle of the property. It has a lush backyard on Hackensack. She was before the Board for a fence and understands why backyards should face each other, but said it is nice to have a big backyard. There are other lots that are close proximity to the property. One is on Peat Street and the other is on Hackensack. It would upset the area and neighborhood by forcing another house into their space. She cannot get out of her driveway if landscaping trucks are on the street. Emergency vehicles cannot get up or down the street. In the winter the street is narrow. There is a fire hydrant in front of the property where they want to place a new home on. The lots do not conform whether it is 79% and 93%. The neighbors attending the meeting would like to see it remain the same with one home on the property. She said her lot also had the diagonal line, she made it work and the neighborhood is nice the way it is. She hopes not to over populate a park like property the town.

Rosemarie Negra, 45 Deal Street (lot 6.01) was sworn in. She stated that it would be unfair to bend the rules to fit a house that is not going to look right on a small piece of property for financial gain. It would detract value from the rest of the homes.

Judy Jones, 32 Deal Street was sworn in. The lots would not be consistent with the cul-de-sac on Deal Street, which is a modern design of that street. Any contractor coming in is looking to make a financial gain. Buying that property and trying to build a house, they would look to put something there over 3,000sf or 4,000sf to attract buyers and return financial investment. 2,500sf house is not feasible. Mr. Rutherford objected to the testimony because Ms. Jones is not qualified to make that judgment. She claimed that she spoke to 4 agents or contractor who provided that information. Mr. Rutherford noted that it was hear say. Ms. Jones believes that it is realistic that a house would be \$1 million. Mr. Rutherford continued his objection. Ms. Jones said that a large house would be built on a postage size property, which is not how Deal Street was designed. The older houses on one end have smaller lots, but have smaller lots on them by design. 1,000sf and over 600sf are substantial deficiencies on a small lot. They are small lots and would like the board to consider it. A bigger house on Peat would not look out of place. A big house on a small lot on Deal Street would look out of place. She questioned why the Board adopted the lot size to 12,000sf. The larger lots are for larger houses. It will have a negative impact on the neighborhood if they proceed.

Meeting to Public comments was closed.

Motion: RW Second: PA

In favor, all said "aye".

Mr. Rutherford responded to the comments. Financial hardship is not part of the application. What is the best planning alternative? As suggested, though lots are not favored. In 1950 zoning was 10,000sf and in 1955 it went up to 12,000sf and has stayed there. There are deficiencies. The Board grants variances where appropriate. It balances the rights property owner with the

Harrington Park
 PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

right of the municipality. The strict enforcement of the ordinances is not always appropriate. A variance always has some determinant because of the deviation. The argument is based on the shape of the property and nature though lot. There is good basis on section C1 and C2 to grant variances. It is a perceived desire for larger houses on larger lots. The cul-de-sac is not the same as this property. This proposal reflects an older plan, the purpose and intent of the Master Plan to have lots 12,000sf. The zoning ordinance will regulate the size of house lot 22.02. They will stipulate that the house will conform to zoning ordinances. 91% comply with lot size. It represents a better zoning alternative. It will be consistent with the lots in the area and the deficiencies would not be noticed. He thanked everyone for their time.

Questions were opened to the Board.

PA referred to and read portions of the transcripts provided by the applicant. He highlighted that 2 lots in the area did not comply with the 12,000sf lot area. It was noted that only properties within 200sf were compared. There are lots close to PA that are through lots that do not look out of place and are landscaped. He referenced the transcripts noting that each case is unique then noted that the there were comparisons made. Over time things change and the board does not know the specifics about the other properties. PA is concerned about consistency in decision. The board is judging the application based on the rules that they have now.

All member of the board at the meeting read the transcripts provided by Mr. Rutherford. All 6 members present can vote.

To deny the 41 Peat Street minor subdivision application	MOTION	SECOND	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chairman John CAPAZZI				X		
Vice-Chair Peter ARDITO	X		X			
Mayor Paul HOELSCHER						(recused)
Councilman Allan NAPOLITANO			X			
Member Jesse BARRAGATO						X
Member Richard McLAUGHLIN		X		X		
Member Robert WALDRON			X			
Alt. #1 Denise VELA				X		

The 41 Peat Street application was denied. (9:15pm)

2. Allegro – changes to plans (Additional unit and temporary fences)

Mr. Podvey, representing Allegro, provided an update. The project is under construction. JK noted that she reviewed the notices and affidavits and application. The client would like to add some temporary signage and may want to add an additional unit. The last time he was here, was June 2018 with the second amended preliminary final site plan approval. Condition #6 of the approval indicated that unit mix could be changed by the planner. Any other changes such as additional unit from 177 units to 178 units would need to come back to the Planning Board. There is no change to the site plan, parking and affordable housing. The number of bedrooms has gone down from 239 beds to 233 beds. The signs cannot be seen from the roads. They want to put temporary fencing along the entrance with a canvas backing and temporary monument signs for information and direction. The signs will come down once they get their Certificate of

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

Occupancy. Mr. Sproule Love (Allegro), Dan King (architect) and Lisa DiGerolamo (professional engineer) accompanied Mr. Podvey.

Mr. Sproule Love, Allegro Senior Living, 300 Park Ave, New York, New York was sworn in. He is the manager of real estate acquisitions and is familiar with the property. They are asking for the option to add a unit. They are still determining if it makes financial sense and are still in discussion with their equity manager. The top floor (penthouse) has the largest units. It was determined that the space designated as a lounge is not needed because the units are so large. Each of the units is about 2000sf. Residents will probably stay in the unit or go to the common area. They would like the option to change the area to another unit with 2 beds and 2 baths.

Signs – JK noted that the application on page 3 that 2 were approved and Allegro is requesting a 3rd. Are all 3 temporary? Mr. Love is requesting a 3rd is a permanent monument sign. The two fences would surround the entrance and direct potential residents away from the western entrance used for construction. Another temporary directional sign for fence wrapping. The 3rd monument sign is permanent because the eastbound traffic wouldn't see the other 2 monument signs. It would be on the eastern side of the eastern entrance.

Board Questions

PA – If you decide not to increase the units on the top floor, would everything revert back to the original plan? Mr. Love said that Allegro is still under discussion and this is just an option. Mr. Podvey said if you change the mix at 177 or go down, the planner can approve, but this is increasing the number of units.

Richard Preiss, planning consultant for the Board, was sworn in. He asked what is the reason for decrease in beds? Mr. Podvey said that the architect could answer the question. Mr. Love said that it would not change affordability housing. RP agreed. RP and JK discussed the increase in number of units and do not believe that there is any requirement in the zoning that would trigger a variance by increasing the units from 177 to 178.

No other questions from the Board.

Dan King, 227 East Lancaster Ave was sworn in. He confirmed that his license is still in good standing and still has the same qualifications.

Exhibit A-62 shows the changes in unit mix. The change of beds was a result of Department of Community Affairs (DCA), Health and market reviews. DCA reviews wanted better separation between the assisted living and independent living. AL unit increased by 2 and one from memory care decreased by 1. Penthouses level there were 12 units originally and decided in favor on 1 bedroom with dens and fewer 2 bedrooms. There used to be 25 2-bedrooms and now there are 15. 10 were converted to larger bedrooms with dens changing the total from 239 to 233 beds as a result. He agreed with Mr. Love about the reason for removing the lounge space to create a 2-bedroom unit. It is a beautiful space looking through the woods to the reservoir.

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

Sheet 104-A Proposes a 2 bedroom over 2,000sf space. They are pricing it out to see if it is worth it.

RM asked if there is any significant change in the footprint and if parking stays the same. There would be no change in footprint or parking or affordable housing.

The professionals had no questions.

Lisa DiGerolamo, 67A Mountain Boulevard Ext, Warren, NJ was sworn in. She confirmed that her license is in good standing. 2 permanent monument signs were approved last time, one on the westerly side and another on the easterly side. They would like to add a sign for the eastbound traffic for better visibility.

JK confirmed that Exhibit C-17 is inset A enlarged.

The permanent signs are 2 monument signs (freestanding). One is located on the westerly entrance to direct people along Old Hook Rd. A second permanent sign is located in the island area between 2 lanes of the eastern entrance directing people at the easterly driveway to the westerly driveway. The signs are 4ft x 8ft.

JK asked if the temporary signs be up at the same time? Ms. DiGerolamo said they would not be up at the same time. One will come down and the other will go up. On the easterly driveway there will be a 6ft fence with Allegro wrap on a chain-link fence on either side of the driveway. Exhibit C-18 shows an example of the temporary signs, placed on fence on the in and out lane of the easterly driveway. The wraps are 75ft x 6ft (450sf each).

AN asked how long will it be up? Mr. Podvey replied that they would be up until there is a CO.

PA asked about the colors and if the monument signs will be the same as the original shape design. Mr. Podvey said it is close to the Allegro colors. Ms. DiGerolamo said the monument signs would be exactly the same.

AN asked if the signs will be across from another sign that was approved. Ms. DiGerolamo agreed that one will be on the east side and one will be on the west side. They are basically facing each other but geared to opposing traffic

JK asked if the signs were double sided. Ms. DiGerolamo was not sure if it would be double sided, but it wouldn't be seen on the other side because of the angle. JK asked about the setback and sight triangle. Ms. DiGerolamo said that both are outside of the sight triangle.

PA asked when the site trailer would be in place. Mr. Podvey estimated about 3-4 months.

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

AN asked if there was a picture of the additional proposed monument sign. Ms. DiGerolamo had a copy of what was approved.

PA asked if there was still signage at the top of the building. Are they adding a temporary sign because it is covered? Ms. DiGerolamo said they are not removing the signage at the top of the building.

RM referred to 4 temporary signs on C-17 shows 2 fence signs and 1 temporary free standing sign. 2 are permanent. There are 3 on the easterly side. Section 8 of the application references signage proposed at 4 locations. 1. Westerly, 2. Fence line 3. Free standing in the island 4. Fence on the far side.

PA asked if the signs rips, will they be replaced so that it would not be an eyesore. Mr. King confirmed that it would be fixed in a timely manner.

RP indicated that the application shows 2 temporary freestanding signs. The easterly is in the center and is double sided so it can be seen from both easterly and westerly side. The monument sign is 2 signs on either side of the driveway. He asked if they considered a permanent double sided sign in the middle. Ms. DiGerolamo said the median has some brush and is difficult to see through. The character of the signs is different. The temporary sign attract the people to get them in while the permanent signs are subtler. From that ascetic point of view, the better alternative would be to have 2 monument signs on either side of the driveway rather than a single sign in the median.

No questions from the professionals

No questions from the public

RW was recused from the hearing.

To approve the Amended Allegro Application	MOTION	SECOND	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chairman John CAPAZZI			X			
Vice-Chair Peter ARDITO		X	X			
Mayor Paul HOELSCHER			X			
Councilman Allan NAPOLITANO			X			
Member Jesse BARRAGATO						X
Member Richard McLAUGHLIN	X		X			
Member Robert WALDRON					(Recused)	
Alt. #1 Denise VELA			X			

ADJOURN

Motion: RM

Second: PA

In favor, all said “aye”.

Meeting adjourned at 9:57PM

NEXT SCHEDULED PLANNING BOARD
 REGULAR MEETING

Harrington Park
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 10, 2019 @ 8:00PM

Tuesday, October 8, 2019 at 8pm