

**BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Tuesday, October 9, 2018**  
**—MINUTES—**

**1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

Chairman Ronald Charles called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Courtroom, 100 Commons Way, Bridgewater, New Jersey.

**2. OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT ANNOUNCEMENT:**

Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act N.J.S.A. 10:4-6. On January 10, 2018 proper notice was sent to the Courier Newspaper and the Star-Ledger and filed with the Clerk at the Township of Bridgewater and posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building. Please be aware of the Planning Board policy for public hearings: no new applications will be heard after 10:00 pm and no new testimony will be taken after 10:15 pm. Hearing Assistance is available upon request. Accommodation will be made for individuals with a disability, pursuant to the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), provided the individual with the disability provides 48 hours advance notice to the Planning Department Secretary before the public meeting.” However, if the individual should require special equipment or services, such as a CART transcriber, seven days advance notice, excluding weekends and holidays, may be necessary.

**3. SALUTE TO FLAG:**

There was salute to the flag.

**4. ROLL CALL:**

Stephen Rodzinak – present

Mayor Dan Hayes – present

James Franco – present

Evan Lerner – present

Chairman Ron Charles – present

Urvin Pandya, Alt. #1 – absent

Councilman Howard Norgalis – absent

Debra Albanese, Alt. #2 – present

Tricia Casamento – present

Others present: Board Attorney Thomas Collins, Township Engineer David Battaglia, Board Planner Scarlett Doyle

**5. APPROVAL OF BOARD MINUTES:**

**6. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS:**

**EDEN WOOD REALTY (PATRIOT GREENS)**

Block 329 Lots 3.01, 13.01 & 14- Main St. and Radel Ave.

16-004-PB, Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan –Residential Complex Request for Extension of Approvals

Motion by Mr. Franco, second by Mrs. Casamneto, the foregoing resolution for an extension was adopted on the following roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Rodzinak, Chairman Charles, Mr. Franco, Mrs. Casamento, Mayor Hayes

ABSENT: Councilman Norgalis, Mr. Pandya

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Lerner, Mrs. Albanese

**7. LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS:**

**R.I. HERITAGE INN OF BRIDGEWATER LLC/S.S. HERITAGE INN OF BRIDGEWATER**

**(Thaldson Hospitality Development LLC)** –Route 22 East & Adamsville Road Formerly Days Inn

Block 222 Lot 3,4, & 5

#18-016-PB- Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan– Hotels, Restaurant, & Medical

Attorney Jeff Lehrer was present on behalf of the applicant. The applicant is seeking approval for two hotels, Residence Inn and Springhill Suites and three stand alone buildings in the front of the site. The use would be for medical, restaurant, and or other uses permitted in the H1C zone district. No tenants have been obtained for the three stand alone buildings, but the uses will be permitted. The applicant is proposing to designate a portion of the site, which is on a riparian buffer for conservation purposes. The site is approximately 13 acres in size which contained the Old Days Inn hotel that has been demolished. There are two access points on the site on Route 22 and the applicant will be using the same access points. There are certain variances that are associated with the application. There is a minimum front yard setback of 200 ft is required and 178.5 ft is existing and 161.46 ft is proposed. A minimum rear yard setback of 75 ft is required 432 ft is existing and 128.6 ft is proposed, which is not a variance. Maximum building height 4 stories is 45 ft is required and 3 stories 26.10 ft is existing and 4 stories at 49.20 ft for the Springhill suites and the other hotel will be compliant are proposed.

The minimum buffer for parking is 75 ft required and 21.88 ft is proposed in one area. For the accessory structure a minimum amount of 75 ft is required and 50 ft proposed. The minimum amount for the principal building 125 ft required and 90.88 ft proposed. The preexisting free standing sign will stay the same in size. There is a 5% ordinance for signs, two façade signs proposed for Residence Inn both at 84.61 square ft one on South side & one on the West side. The two façade signs proposed for Springhill suites one at 81.96 square ft on the West side & 98.91 square ft on the North side.

Nathaniel Loeffelholz, AIA for Base 4, Michael Medea, Landscape Architect, Jeff McKay, Dakota Legacy Group, Developer, Rick Larson, Dakota Legacy Group, Developer, Curtis Patel, Developer, George Folk, PE, Gary Dean, Traffic, Gary Kliesch, AIA, Gordon Gemma, PE, were sworn in for testimony.

Mr. Lehrer submitted an exhibit that was marked into evidence as follows:

<b>A-1</b>	<b>10/9/18</b>	<b>Ariel photo of the site before Days Inn was demolished</b>
<b>A-2</b>	<b>10/9/18</b>	<b>Colored Rendering of the Site Plan</b>
<b>A-3</b>	<b>10/9/18</b>	<b>Exhibit with revised Firetruck Access along both sides of Residence INN</b>
<b>A-4</b>	<b>10/9/18</b>	<b>Color &amp; Material Exhibit &amp; Three dimensional artist's rendering</b>
<b>A-5</b>	<b>10/9/18</b>	<b>Architectural Elevations of both hotel buildings</b>
<b>A-6</b>	<b>10/9/18</b>	<b>Color rendering of the outside buildings designed by Gary Kleisch,AIA from 10/25/16 the original submission</b>

Mr. Folk, PE of Dave Stires Associates was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Folk described the property and provided testimony as follows: The ariel photo shows the buffers of the property. The property will consist of five separate buildings, 7000 square ft building, 14000 square ft building, 8000 square ft, 97,000 square ft 4 story Spring Hill suites and 67,000 square feet Residence Inn. Behind the Residence Inn will be a detention basin to accommodate the runoff from the site. The three stand alone buildings in the front will have a permitted use which will be professional, medical, and restaurant with no retail. Presently there are no tenants yet for the three buildings.

The Residence Inn is to the south of the project, its height will be 49 ft and 4 stories as previously testified and is a longer stay hotel. The longer stay means a week to a month or even longer. The hotel will have a patio with a pool and a sports court. The Spring Hill Suites is also 4 stories with a pool, work-out areas and is a shorter stay hotel. The 3 buildings will have pervious pavement patios that allow the rainwater to seep in.

There are 538 parking spaces required but there are 553 spaces provided. The calculation used for the parking spaces was a 1 to 1 for the hotels and the calculation for the uses are based on the Township ordinance. There

is a two-way access throughout the buildings and parking lot. Per Fire Marshall Karl McAleer's report there is a needed access behind Residence Inn. There are two access points one from the East and one from the West for a ladder truck.

Each building has a loading zone. There are temporary loading zones for box truck deliveries and trucks will not be parked overnight. The deliveries will be off peak hours and will not interfere with trash and recycling pickups. The 3 buildings will have a loading zone, but not the hotels since it is common for a hotel not to have one.

There are sidewalks to connect the buildings and front of the Hotels and there are striped areas for the pediatrician crossing. As per one of the professional reports they recommended the dumpster near Stanford Drive should be moved. The dumpster is 50 ft from the property line and it is in a masonry wall enclosure. It has a heavy landscape buffer, which we will be maintained so the residents on Stanford drive will have a large enough buffer. The dumpster will provide trash and recycling. There is a fence along the property that is 10 ft high on the Chelsea side that goes to 6 ft which is a stockade. There is also fence that goes along Finnerne heights condominiums. The lighting will be LED and have Wi-Fi capability in which they can adjust the lights.

The variance for the front yard setback is 200 ft is required and 178.5 ft is existing and 161.46 ft is proposed. This is consistent with the neighbors to Houlihan's and Mercedes Benz. The minimum buffer for the parking lot is 75 ft. and we are proposing 21.88 ft. The minimum buffer with the accessory structure is 75 ft is required and we are proposing 50 ft which is the dumpster for Spring Hill and the dumpster for Residence Inn. The minimum buffer for principal building structure is 125 ft and we are proposing 90.88 ft. Storm water will be addressed by having an above ground detention basin south of the project.

Jenifer Gould attorney with Stark & Stark for Chelsea Village put an objection on the record. Stating that due to the restaurant and the local land use law this should be a D-Variance and be heard through the Zoning Board not the Planning Board.

Attorney Jeff Lehrer responded stating the C-Variations due to the pertaining use would be the Planning Board. Tom Collins Attorney for the Board stated that the Planning Board does have jurisdiction to the case due to the uses for a C variations.

Attorney Jeff Lehrer also stated that prior to the meeting that they are trying to work with the Chelsea Village regarding having a buffer or a retaining wall around the site. Attorney Tom Collins stated that if there is a change to let the Board know.

Mr. Folk addressed the size of the parking stalls will be 9.5 feet by 18 feet and some will be 9.5 feet by 16 feet if we allow for an overhang. We are going with 16.5 feet with an overhang into a 6.5 ft wide sidewalk or landscaping. The Board questioned how many stalls will have 9.5 feet by 18 feet and 9.5 feet by 16.5 feet. Mr. Folk did not have answer, but will get it. Additional handicap spaces will be provided.

As per the Human Services report the applicant will provide two electrically vehicle stations for the each of the hotels. Bike parking and bike sharing will be clearly marked pedestrian crosswalks. The Board questions will there be specific bike paths. Mr. Folk stated they will be along the road and they will provide bike racks.

The Board questioned the existing outlet headwall is to be used and the storm water will flow to the same outlet as it does now, per the engineers report. Mr. Folk stated that they are maintaining the same outlet condition and redesigning the existing basin to accommodate the additional improvements and the proposed outlet will provide the reductions in outflow per the state requirements for storm water management. The

project also requires DEP permits. The Board confirmed that there will be a reduction in output. Mr. Folk confirmed that was correct.

In the Township Planners report there are questions regarding the landscaping, if the height of the trees should be increased from 6-7 feet to 8-10 feet. Mr. Folk agreed that they will comply with the 8-10 feet. Mr. Lehrer and Ms. Gould had a discussion before the meeting regarding the buffer. Ms. Gould stated that there are concerns regarding the buffer. Mr. Folk explained that they discussed a fence along the buffer. They are taking the existing fence out and enhancing the landscaping and then putting a 6 ft board on board vinyl fence on top of the berm. As the fence goes along the West property line we will have 3 ft high keystone retaining wall along the parking for Residence Inn. The retaining wall will go up to the 10ft high fence north then on top of that keystone wall will have a berm 3 or 4 feet then go back down to the property line and on top of the berm additional landscaping.

Mr. Lehrer stated that the Homeowners's Association wanted them to remove the 13 parking spaces. Unfortunately they really can't per the franchise of the Residence Inn. The compromise is to build the retaining wall, a berm and a fence on top of that. Mrs. Gould stated the issue is that the parking spaces face the residents, so when people go to park the lights shine and they can look up at the people on the balconies. Mrs. Gould also expressed concern regarding the buffer maybe expanding it so there is enough the evergreens spread out. Their main concern is with the 13 parking spaces. The Board planner commented about making sure that the planting is done on both sides of the fencing. The Board questioned the height of the fence 10 ft and 6 ft. Mr. Folk stated the 10 ft is existing fence that is on the Chelsea property. The requirement on our side is 6 ft with the berm, so the cars that will park there will be below 12 ft the top of any fence. There is also a buffer on the Chelsea side with trees that are important to stay.

Mr. Lehrer stated as previously testified that they can dim the lights per the WI-FI. The Board Planner commented regarding the lighting asking if a security plan will be later. The concern is the location of the security lights. Mr. Folk stated that the security plan was going to be when the lights were being installed. The LED lights can be adjusted per granting the CO. The Board confirmed that the location will be approved prior from Engineering and the Planner. Mr. Lehrer stated they will provide way finder signs in the plans and the free standing sign will show the address.

Mr. McKay testified that there will not be any outdoor music on the patio. The Hotel has fixed windows, so they cannot open up. We like to keep the rooms quiet. Mr. Patel also testified that there will be no outdoor music at his buildings.

The Board questioned the prior testimony regarding to confirm the square footage and was concerned about going over the FAR. Mr. Lehrer stated that the architects will do that. The Board also mentioned as previously testified that the trash enclosures will have source separation for recycling.

Chairman Charles opened the public portion of the meeting for questions. Before doing questions the Board will be taking a break and start with questions from the audience for the witness

The Board took a 5 minute break and returned at 8:30pm with all members present.

Joseph Vince of 131 Chelsea Way was sworn and stated has the applicant examined one building for two hotel uses as a dual branded hotel. Mr. Lehrer stated to the Chairman that they are two different hotels, one is a longer stay and the other is a shorter stay, which cannot be done. Mr. Vince asked in your experience, do dual hotel brands exist in one building. Mr. McKay stated they do, but we do not prefer to do that on this site. Also, the hotel would be in one, so if you wanted to sell them you would have to sell them both. Usually if that is

done it's done on 1 acre or 2 acres at the most. Mr. Vince stated that Mr. McKay stated that the dual hotel is better on a smaller site asked if the hotels were in one building then the buffers can be increased along the side property lines. Mr. McKay stated that they have no interest in doing one building on this site, but yes it can improve it.

Mr. Vince asked if it is possible to move the rear building on the south to side 15 ft to the East.

Mr. Folk stated as previously testified the riparian buffer goes along the East to the Cuckels Brook. There are utility lines, deep large storm water pipes that go into the detention basin and the fire access in that location. To push anything in this location would be not be approved from the DEP. Mr. Vince asked if he can point out the riparian buffer limit. Mr. Folk stated it was right there and Mr. Vince said it was east of the sidewalk, this was confirmed by Mr. Folk. Mr. Vince asked if the building could be moved up to the face of the sidewalk.

Mr. Folk stated that the building being moved would be poor planning. The Board asked how far is it, up to the edge of the sidewalk. Mr. Folk stated from the riparian to the edge of the sidewalk is roughly 10 ft. There is also a large drainage pipe that runs along the back. Mr. Vince asked is that pipe is proposed or existing. Mr. Folk stated it was proposed. Mr. Vince asked does the DEP permit proposed drainage pipes within a riparian zone or a wetland, can you get a permit to do that. Mr. Folk stated you can get a permit to do certain things. We will be putting permits in to put the detention basin and riparian disturbances associated with that detention basin. Each permit has a quantity of area that you are allow to disturb and once you go pass the limited areas, no further disturbance of a riparian buffer. The building was moved to the East to conform with the DEP requirements for the disturbance within a riparian zone. There are other issues with sanitary sewer that exist within the riparian buffer so we cannot go over 5000 square feet, since we are at that limit already. Mr. Vince asked if you can request a hardship exception from the DEP and provide 2 to 1 compensation. Mr. Folk stated we do not have the areas on site to provide compensation. Mr. Vince asked what is the distance of the proposed pipe to the riparian zone limits Mr. Folk stated it's approximately 15 ft from the East underneath the sidewalk. Mr. Vince asked is the sidewalk 10 ft from the riparian buffer Mr. Folk confirmed yes Mr. Vince asked if there is a reason why the pipe can be moved 10 ft from the East. Mr. Folk stated that it would not fit in the detention basin. The pipe comes into the basin at the lowest point and would not make it into the basin. We would have to push the basin out into the repairing zone. We are using the existing berm so the vegetation is not disturbed so we are using the berm to build a pond. We do not have the area and the permits to further push this berm into the riparian zone. Mr. Vince asked if you can put a manhole in the line to change the alignment of the pipe so it can get in the detention basin Mr. Folk said he can put a manhole in there. Mr. Vince stated if the storm drain is moved 10 ft to the east is there a reason besides the alignment of the front entrance which may be able to be accommodated can the building be slide 10 ft to the East. Mr. Folk stated there is a potential to move the building the geometry of the site for safety reasons since the emergency services wouldn't be able to circulate through the parking area.

Mr. Vince asked if he can point to the front entrance door and then 10 ft East of the front entrance door. Mr. Folk did point to both places. Mr. Vince stated that the front entrance would still align with the circulation bulb. Mr. Folk stated it would move 10 ft to the East. Mr. Vince agreed. He also stated that if the building was moved 10 ft to the East the parking on the west side of the building be moved to 10 ft to the East or re-orientate on a slant at the southerly most end the end of the parking row can be relocated 10 ft to the East. Mr. Folk asked if the building is moved to the 10 ft to the East then the parking can be moved 10 ft to the East is that the question both confirmed "yes" Mr. Vince also asked if the parking is moved 10 ft to the East would the buffer along the westerly side property line be increased. Mr. Folk said yes Mr. Vince asked how many evergreen trees are proposed on the westerly property line. Mr. Folk stated that he can't answer that that would be for the landscape architect. Mr. Vince asked can you indicate on the proposed plan the limits of the existing parking of the previous Days inn site. Mr. Folk indicated exhibit A -1 shows the existing parking areas. Mr. Vince said correct but wanted to see it on the proposed plan. Mr. Folk pointed out on exhibit A-1 and A-2 and also A-3 the locations. Mr. Vince asked if he can indicate the new parking area on the proposed plan that is

specifically southerly of the existing parking area. Mr. Folk stated all the parking that he point out on exhibit A-3.

Mr. Vince asked did you consider proposed fence that is around the southwesterly property line and the southern portion of the property on the top of the berm of the detention basin. Mr. Folk said he concerned it Mr. Vince stated in your opinion would that provide a better screening for the building that what is proposed on the plan. Mr. Folk agreed it would enhance the screening

Robert Smith of 3 Staple Drive unit 4B was sworn he asked where the parking lot run off is going to go. Mr. Folk stated there is a DEP permit that is required for this project. Per the regulations a storm water filter will be required and will go on the out of the detention basin and will collect the oils. Mr. Smith stated that is a fence by Houlihan's and are you going to enhance the shrubs around it to buffer the noise. Mr. Folk stated the landscape architect will address that, but he did indicate that we have landscape proposed. Mr. Smith asked about the trash location by Morgan Lane. Will they access that from the Houlihan's property or from the road. Mr. Folk stated that they will access it from the back corridor from that building. Mr. Smith stated that there are EPA wells in that area, Mr. Folk stated that he is not aware of any wells on this property. Mr. Smith also asked about traffic going out on Morgan lane. The Board stated that is correct and there will be a traffic expert that will testify.

Chairman Charles asked the public any more questions, seeing none.

Mr. Lehrer's next witness is Nathananiel Loeffelhlz, Mr. Loeffelhlz was accepted by the board as an expert witness as an architect. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated that he prepared the proposed floor plans and elevations for the two hotels. Mr. Loeffelhlz described the Spring Hill Suites as an all suite hotel which is an upscale Marriot product. There typical guest is a business traveler and is not an extended stay and is usually a one or two night stay. The Residence Inn is the extended stay hotel and meets the height requirement, but the Spring Hill Suites does not. The both hotels are 4 stories wood frame building, but the Spring Hills Sites Lobby has higher ceilings and the guest room height is higher. In the Residence Inn the guest room ceiling is 8 ft and in the Spring Hill Suites it's higher for the upscale look. The Board asked if the Spring Hill Suites are three stories. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated he has never designed one but they are usually are 100 guest rooms. The answer is yes, but they are rare. The amenities for the Spring Hill Suite are a business center, sun deck an indoor pool, fitness center, market, meeting room, patio with a fire a pit, a buffet for breakfast only to serve the guests. The patio will have outdoor furniture for the guests.

As per the exhibits this is an updated Marriot model. The Spring Hill Suites is a contemporary look, a modern feeling with a standard brick vaner face. The colors that were used are the same throughout the development. We are also using ethesis a sand pebble finish on top of the building to bring out the colors. The air conditions units on top of the building will be screened and have a parapet. The same colors and textures will apply to the Residence Inn as well. Just the colors will not be exactly the same as per Marriot. Marriot wanted the Hotels to have their own identities.

The amenities for the Residence Inn are very similar to the Spring Hill Suites. Since the Residence is a longer stay hotel they will have a large guest laundry and the sport court out back. The buffet area is also for the guests only. The tables and the chairs are for the guests only, so the parking 1 to 1 ratio is only for the hotels and not bringing other people in. The Spring Hill Suites is a generation 6 model. The Residence Inn looks like a more my house at home, Cape Cod feel. The Township wanted the hotel to have a more modern look to them. The Board mentioned that they are not a fan of ethesis. They know that the hotels use prototypes, but the architecture looks bland can you talk more about the materials and the look. Mr. Loeffelhlz described The Residence Inn stating that they took a lot of wing features lapse siding and they omitted that. The Spring Hill

suites have a very contemporary look and ethesis has come a long way. The Board also questioned the parapet seems greater than 3 ft on the drawings. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated 3 ft would be the stop point.

Mr. Larsen wanted to comment about the architecture. Mr. McKay stated that the buildings are sharp and he has done 400 hotels. He also stated that they work with ethesis and ethesis has come a long way. They also have put brick on the buildings as per your recommendations, which was approved by Marriot.

The Board had a question for the architect, regarding the exhibit A-4. The Board asked about the lights, noticing that there are no lights shown on the exhibit. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated that this is for rendering proposes only. The Board asked if there could be lights on the building that could illuminate the parking areas. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated they are on the prototype, but we don't have to have them. The Board confirmed that there will be no lights on the building that will illuminate any areas beyond the confines of the sidewalk. Mr. Loeffelhlz agreed that was correct.

The Board also stated that you are requesting two façade signs and noted exhibit A-4 the Spring Hill suites sign on the left is that visible from Route 22. Mr. Loeffelhlz said that is correct. The Board asked the other Spring Hills sign will be viewed by parking lot patrons, which is also correct. The one Residence Inn sign will be for Route 22 which is correct but the other Residence Inn sign which can be read by the residents in Chelsea. Mr. Larsen stated that you are right. We are still going to request two façade signs but face them to Route 22

The Board asked about having the Residence Inn to be smaller from East to West to provide less need for a buffer variance. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated he would direct you to the upper floor plans, which is A-104 of the Residence floor plan. The size of the hotel is determined by the number of guest rooms requested by the developer. In order to make the hotel smaller you would have to remove a bay of rooms. The Board was questioning the size, since the prior testimony from the residents was in regard to parking. The Board questions that 13 parking spaces is not a lot for the applicant to work around. You can maintain the parking if the building is smaller and move it over or you can eliminate the 13 parking spaces and take a risk that the size of the buildings are. The Board also mentioned that since they are close to the FAR in the past they granted a variance to reduce the parking spaces from 9 1/2 ft to 9 ft. you would gain a spot for every 9 spots. You also need 580 spots and you are off by 40 spots and you lose 3 spots to islands. The Board also mentioned using the 13 spaces for employee parking only, so there will not be a lot of in an out for the residents.

Chairman Charles opened the public portion of the meeting for questions.

Mr. Vince returned and asked if they had a rendering of what the rear of the Residence Inn would look like. Mr. Loeffelhlz said he an elevation. Mr. Vince said could he see that. Mr. Loeffelhlz pulled it up on his lab top. Mr. Vince asked if he can describe the left and the rear of the building and what architectures elements have been incorporated. Mr. Loeffelhlz said that there is brick on the base of the building used different colors all around the Residence Inn. Mr. Vince asked did you scale the surrounding buildings and the location for the color rendering. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated they used Google maps and Google imaginary. Mr. Vince asked if there was 3D imaginary and he stated yes Mr. Vince asked if he ever physically visited the site and he said no and confirmed that they are not perfectly accurate. Mr. Vince asked how are the trees and the landscaping in the surrounding area developed. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated it was based off the landscape data that we had at the time the color rendering was put together using Cad files. Mr. Vince asked about the surrounding trees around the property lines how to they relate to real life. Mr. Loeffelhlz said they do not. The color rendering is for proposed astectics only. Mr. Vince asked would it be possible to create a view of what the buffer would look like and also what the rear would look like. Mr. Loeffelhlz stated yes he could and would have to check with the owner. Mr. Vince asked about the exit door on the residence Inn and Mr. Loeffelhlz confirmed there is one

## —MINUTES—

exit door. You can enter through that door only with a room key. Mr. Vince asked for someone to park in the last parking space to the East of that building how many parking spaces would they have to walk to get to the exit or entrance door if they had a key to the hotel. Mr. Loeffelhz stated that there is one exit door for emergencies only and you can get in there with a room key it has Rafd lock so technically it's an entrance. Chairman Charles asked the public for any more questions, seeing none.

Mr. Lehrer's next witness is Gary Kliesch. Mr Kliesch was accepted by the Board as an expert witness as an architect. Mr. Kliesch stated that he prepared the color rendering of the outer buildings. He confirmed that the square feet of each building the first one was 7,000 sq. ft, the second is 14,000 sq. ft and the third is 8,000 sq. ft. Mr. Kleisch described the uses that are proposed for the buildings the first one is a restaurant, the second one would be broken up in three parts one a restaurant, medical office, and a coffee chain. The third building would be a restaurant for 5,000 sq. ft and spa for the other 3,000 sq. ft. He also described the colors and the textures of the buildings stating they are going to mimic the prior testimony of Mr. Loeffelhz. Mr. Kliesch confirmed the parapet will be 3ft. The Board questioned Mr. Kleisch testified he did something different and would like him to clarify. Using exhibit A-6 he went with more traditional material which is pilaster split face and used the brick, but not as the ultra modern contemporary look. Also the outdoor space will have the pervious pavement so water can penetrate through. The buildings can use the outdoor space. The façade signage will be compliant with the Township Ordinance. The Board confirmed the total square feet of all the buildings are 29,000. Mr. Kleisch confirmed that is correct. The Board would like the total square feet of the hotels. Mr. Kliesch did not have that information, but Mr. Loeffelhz did and the Residence Inn is 96,840 sq. Ft. and the Spring Hill Suites is 63,444 sq. ft. The Board asked if there will be metal canopies over the entrances. Mr. Kleisch said yes and it will match the store front material anodize aluminum.

The Board had a question about what kind of restaurants. Mr. Patel stated that there is no contract but Red Robin, PF Chang, World of Beer, PG Brewery and there is no delivery date there is no confirmed tenant. Mr Patel also stated there will be no fast food maybe Panera Bread or a Starbucks and nothing with a drive- thru. The Board also questioned the Spa. The compliments of the hotel and confirming it's a service and no retail.

Board commented on the square feet and to have all information reflected on the revised plans for the next meeting.

Chairman Charles opened the public portion of the meeting for questions.

Mr. Vince returned and asked what the definition of Fast Food is? Mr. Lehrer stated that the HIC Zone says as conditional uses excluding and drive-in and drive-thru fast food establishments. In my opinion Starbucks is not a drive- in /drive- thru fast food establishment. Mr. Vince agreed.

Chairman Charles asked the public any more questions, seeing none.

Mr. Lehrer asked the Board if they had any questions for Mr. Larsen or McKay since they are here from North Dakota and also if they had any more questions for Mr. Patel. The Board asked about lighting and as previously testified WIFI lighting and have the lights around the commercial buildings dimmed and the entrance way. The Board also asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Patel stated the medical would be 8am-8pm the restaurants could be 11am -12 or 1am. Board confirm the World of Beer would be looking to stay open to 1:00am, Mr. Patel confirmed, but there is no tenants as of yet. There also may be light music outside no loud music and will comply with the noise ordinance. The Board also commented on having the Panera Bread and Starbucks may open earlier than 11:00 and Mr. Patel confirmed that is correct maybe 5 or 6 am.

Chairman Charles opened the public portion of the meeting for questions. There were no questions or comments.

Mr. Lehrer stated he still has three more professionals to testify. The Board and the applicant has agreed to carry the application.

At the applicant's request the application was carried to November 26, 2018 at 7:00pm with no new notice required.

**8. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:**

There were no members of the public wishing to address the Board on any matter not listed on the agenda.

**9. OTHER BOARD BUSINESS:**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jacqueline Pino,  
Secretary to Municipal Services