

**CITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK
PLANNING BOARD
AUGUST 26, 2019
MINUTES**

SPECIAL MEETING LOCATION:
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL, TOP FLOOR
78 BAYARD STREET
7:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

x	John Cox (Chairperson)
	Ivan Adorno
x	Michael Belvin
	Peg Chester
	Sue McElligot
x	John Zimmerman
x	Doug Sheehan
	Nancy Coppola
	Charlotte McNair
X	Evelyn Azcona

II. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT (OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT)

III. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

IV. RESOLUTIONS OF MEMORIALIZATION

A. CHARLES ST NB, LLC, ZB-2018-14

Motion to Approve: Zimmerman
Second: Sheehan

	YES	NO
John Cox (Chairperson)	X	
Ivan Adorno		
Michael Belvin		
Peg Chester		
Sue McElligot		
John Zimmerman	X	

Doug Sheehan	X	
Nancy Coppola		
Charlotte McNair		
Evelyn Azcona		

B. 303 GEORGE STREET – MATRIX AEW NB, LLC, ZB-2019-01

Motion to Approve: Zimmerman
 Second: Sheehan

	YES	NO
John Cox (Chairperson)	X	
Ivan Adorno		
Michael Belvin		
Peg Chester		
Sue McElligot		
John Zimmerman	X	
Doug Sheehan	X	
Nancy Coppola		
Charlotte McNair		
Evelyn Azcona		

V. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

- A. GLORIA LEGACY, 294-296 LEE AVE, Z-2017-20**, Application for Site plan and variance application for the construction of a 2-car garage and storage in the R-5A District at 294-296 Lee Avenue, Block 259, Lot 7

Moved to September Zoning Board Meeting

- B. UNIVERSAL PROPERTY SERVICES, ZB-2019-07**, Variance application for the construction of a Gas Station/ Retail to be located at 127 Easton Avenue, Block 71, Lots 29, 31, & 33, Zoning District C-3B

Himmelman asked for extension of time, granted by Board, and a formal letter will follow

Peg Chester is read into the record as in attendance.

C. KHATER 18 CONDUCT, ZB-2015-14, Variance application for the construction of a three-story, mixed-use building to be located at 18 Conduct Street, Block 50, Lot 22.01 & 21 Zoning District C-3B

Asked for extension since the time to be able to file the subdivision, deeds expired prior to being able to perfect the subdivision

Motion to Approve: Chester
 Second: Sheehan

	YES	NO
John Cox (Chairperson)	X	
Ivan Adorno		
Michael Belvin	X	
Peg Chester	X	
Sue McElligot		
John Zimmerman	X	
Doug Sheehan	X	
Nancy Coppola		
Charlotte McNair		
Evelyn Azcona	X	

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. STIRLINGSIDE URBAN RENEWAL LLC, ZB-2017-22, Variance application for the construction of a multi-family, mid-rise residential apartment to be located at 50 Neilson Street, Block 121, Lot 1.01 & 1.02, Zoning District R-6

Jong Sook Nee, Applicant's Attorney: The area is owned by the Community Builders, who are a regional non-profit, real estate development company that have a couple decades of building and developing affordable housing. The application, as it has already been described, is for preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of a multi-family, mid-rise residential apartments. This project will consist of four stories over ground level parking with 53 residential units, nine one-bedroom units, 30 two-bedroom units, and 14 three-bedroom units. All these units are available and restricted only to affordable housing. We will discuss the parking later on. The site is slightly over half an acre, it consists of an entire block and is cornered by Neilson Street, Hassart Street, and Tabernacle Way. It is commonly known as Block 121, Lot 1.01 & 1.02. A substantial portion of the site is vacant, but a portion of the site is being used as parking for the Lord Stirling Senior Housing that is adjacent to this site at 40 Hassart Street. This project is actually a culmination of years of work between the applicant and the City of New Brunswick who have been

trying to craft a project that meets the community's needs. We are requesting "d" variances for use, building height, and FAR. We will provide testimony today that will address the positive and negative criteria for each of these. We are also requesting adjustments to the bulk standards regarding lot minimum, lot size and area, setback, building coverage, and impervious coverage. Lord Stirling has actually been granted Planning Board approval in June 11, 2003, application number was 9-2003 which authorized another project that was also constructed by the Community Builders. That provided 25 parking spaces for its residents, and that is senior affordable housing. So, the parking standard was lowered to 25, which was accommodated by a combination of both off-and on-street parking. As part of the present application, we are seeking relief, similar to the Lord Stirling approval, from the parking requirements. Again, we will provide testimony that will justify this. With that I have about four or five professionals.

Karuna Mehta, The Community Builders Representative: The Community Builders is a nationally recognized non-profit housing developer that has created over 30,000 affordable homes and manages over 8,000 nationwide. While we are national, we have a deep commitment to serving the New Brunswick community. And I have been working in close partnership with the housing authority and the city since 1998. When we were selected as the developer under the Hope VI program. Since then we have developed over 190 units locally, all of which we continue to lease and manage through our central management office. The three buildings: Hope Manor, Lord Stirling, and Riverside are all permanently affordable, with affordability ranging from 20% of AMI to 60% of AMI. We are deeply committed to our mission and to the community, which is why Stirlingside will follow suit for families and individuals earning 50% and 60% of Median Income. We are also committed to working with the local continuum of care to set up six units for homeless families who currently live in shelters and temporary housing facilities. We will also be working with the Housing Authority to prioritize families that are currently on the public housing waiting list. Our experience in managing these units has informed our approach to property management and specifically given us insight into how to manage building operations, such as trash and security. With regard to trash, there will be accessible trash rooms on each floor. There will be a super and a porter that will collect trash to a compactor room located on the ground floor. We intend to contract with a private trash hauler who will pick up recycling and garbage twice a week. We believe that this is the best way to manage trash within the building and to maintain a safe and clean environment for all of our residents. With regard to security, the site will have the following features for all residents: key fob access entrances, locked package rooms, CCTV monitoring, and an at-grade garage with bicycle storage facilities. Finally, in regards to parking, we will develop a 46-spot covered garage for residents in both Stirlingside and Lord Stirling. As John noted, Lord Stirling currently has 25 spots, with a lot with 23, and two on-street parking spots. Since 2004, when the building was completed, only three residents in Lord Stirling have registered their cars to legally park in the lot. For

the new development, these residents that currently have permits will be provided with new covered parking spaces. In addition, the two on-street parking spots will continue to serve permanent Lord Stirling residents. We have experienced a similar issue in our Hope Manor development, where there are 61 spots, but only 29 registered cars. As 50 Neilson Street has a similar access to transit, jobs, and shopping, we expect a similar trend as Hope Manor. Stirlingside represents a three-year effort to utilize what is currently a vacant lot with an underutilized parking lot at the heart of downtown New Brunswick into homes for 53 families. Throughout this time, we worked to address concerns regarding parking and density. Including reducing the unit count drastically by 25%.

Joaquin Bouzas, B.A. in Architecture from NJIT, Principal: This is T-100, title sheet, showing the location of the site bound by four streets: Tabernacle Way, Neilson Street, Abeel and Hassart Street. Currently, the property is vacant or mostly 2/3 of it. The lot is gravel and 1/3 of it is partially used a parking lot. We have a few variances that we are seeking, which we will go through tonight. The building is 53 units, it has nine one-bedrooms, 30 two-bedrooms, and 14 three-bedrooms. The proposed building covers the property by 100%. It would be improving the entire site with new curbs and sidewalks, ADA accessible connections on all corners, as well as light poles and street trees. There will be a parking entrance off of Neilson Street.

On the ground floor, we are proposing 46 parking spaces. We have separate areas for a trash room, and three 2-yard containers, transformer room with electrical meters right behind it. In addition, there will be two staircases that will bring you upstairs to the upper floors and two elevators. The entrance of the building from Nielsen street leads into a 500 sq. ft. lobby. The building will also contain a package room, office, fitness room, 15 bike parking spaces, gas meters, and a maintenance room. There will also be a loading zone at approximately 13 ft. by 18 ft. through the rear lobby entrance.

The second floor will have a mix of one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedrooms units. Each room will have come with a small kitchenette and bathrooms. All the units are ADA accessible and adaptable. There will also be a community room. Each unit will also have closets, plus an open plan for the kitchen. There will be HVAC in each unit, high efficiency. Minimum 1BD = 650 sf., 2BD = 850 sf., 3BD = 1100 sf. The smallest bedroom is 11 ft. by 10 ft. There will be one large laundry room for the entire building and all residents. There will be a garbage chute that goes down the trash room, as well as a janitor closet and another storage room. Next to the community room, we have a large outdoor terrace and planters to act as a boundary. Upper floors of the building are stepped between 2 to 8 ft. to allow light and air to adjacent properties. This is a typical upper floor, with a green roof over the community room. Otherwise, it is the same as the other floors. The elevations show the setbacks on the façade from Abeel Street the building has a variety of materials, step backs and articulation. You'll notice that the elevation slopes northerly at 10 ft.

on the side of Hassart Street. The parking area is concealed from all sides. The parking entrance has a roll up door. There is also a metal cornice, cement board, brick, capstones, and decorative banding. This is attracting some of the detail from across the street. There is a grey capstone brick on the Nielsen side of the building with access only via fob and vents for the transformer room. There are windows on the fitness room side. We varied height and articulated the façade to give is some design features. We tried to capture some of the same detailing from across the street.

Exhibit A-2 shows colored renderings of all facades. Exhibit A-3 shows a view from Neilson Street showing the upper floors stepping back. Exhibit A-4 shows an aerial view of the five stories (52 to 56 feet), which is reasonable in terms of context. We have a material board, A-5, that shows the materials of the facades, cornice and the like.

Matthew Seckler, Bachelor's Degree in Engineering, MCRP, Principal of Stonefield Engineering: I am here to speak about the traffic report issued 8/2/2019. There was an earlier traffic report issued November 2017. This project is bounded by a number of streets, including Neilson, Hassart, Tabernacle and Abeel. They are all one-way, with the exception of Neilson, which is a two-way. Nielsen street is the main access, with on-street parking and bike lanes. The bike lanes are important to mention, because as we discuss the parking, it is important to notice that this is a street that has multi-modal methods of transportation. As part of this study, we looked at the anticipated trip generation, using ITE trip generation manual, which shows during the busiest hours, 20-25 cars per hour. Overall, this would not change the flow of traffic in a significant way. From a parking standpoint, we are seeking a parking variance. The overall site has 53 units and 46 spaces. There will be an allotment to be reserved for the existing Lord Stirling project. There will be at least three permit spaces within this lot. This leaves 43 spaces for the 53 units.

To determine off-site parking, we conducted parking counts at about 500 to 650 feet outside this project, which is slightly less than the three to five-minute walk. We did these count on Tuesday, May 9, 2018, Thursday, July 9, 2019, between 10:00 pm and 11:00 pm. We chose the evening times, as opposed to traffic counts during the rush hour time. We do parking counts during the night because that is when most people are home, and this is the time that you see your highest parking demand in residential areas. We found about 45 to 46 parking spaces available overnight. However, in looking at how this sight is developed, we do believe we have sufficient parking, but if there ever is an overflow of parking, then we also have sufficient parking along the street. We are seeking a variance, because this particular development demands 105 parking spaces and your ordinance is based on RSIS standards, which is a statewide standard, however this is not a one-size-fits-all standard. With respect to this project, there are a few things to consider, where one is the location of transit and other uses that serve the site. So, I prepared this exhibit, where A-6, dated 8/26/2019, shows map of destinations of interest, where a star shows the

proposed site. We are also showing the bus lines, which stop a block or two from the site, and County M5 bus stops in this area, as well as the train station about 0.6 miles away. There is a grocery store, library. The other key piece here, is that we have a lot of commercial uses in this area that constitute a large number of jobs in this area. It is important to note how this site fits into the overall network. Therefore, within the 3- to 5-minute walk there are a plethora of locations for enjoyment and employment. In addition, it is important to note that part of this development will be to act as transitional housing for the homeless, so we are talking about people who may not have the means to own a car. From FHA studies, we have also determined that there is definitely a drop in car ownership when you go to this lower level of income. One of the key aspects of that is that this area has a number of services with easy access by walking and transit. Looking at the Census tracts, we found that about 31% of people have zero cars and about 80% of them have zero or one car. Therefore, the parking ratio provided is definitely appropriate in this case. There are a number of studies that have determined the connectivity of the site, with a "Walk Score" for the area being 92/100, a high level of walkability and an "All-Transit" score of 8.1/10 scale. Our architect also confirmed that we are providing 15 covered bike parking spaces. Therefore, this is definitely an area that residents can be served here without a car.

John McDonough, PP, Licensed Professional Planner: This is an infill development where the applicant is proposing a mid-rise multi-family apartment complex. The applicant is proposing a use variance, but it is really related to the form of use. We will look at compatibility to the neighborhood character. So, I brought 15 copies here of 11 by 17 (Exhibit A-7).

We are dealing here with two side-by-side lots at roughly a half acre, Block 121, Lot 1.01 and 1.02. That are bounded by streets on all sides. Which is directly adjacent to Lord Stirling. The second page is showing the physical characteristic of the property. And you can see that Lot 1.01 was developed as a parking lot in conjunction with Lord Stirling, which actually has a demand for only three parking spaces, all the others are parked there illegally. This is to remind the Board that this is a private parking lot, not a public parking lot. The applicant plans to enclose this space. The rest of the property is vacant and is an eyesore. The next page shows a land use pattern in the area, where we color coded the surrounding area based on GIS, with gold standing for residential and the red for non-residential. Where this area is predominantly residential-multi-family, so we have a nice mix of compatibility on that end. Fourth page shows the reason why we are here, the area is zoned as R-6 and there is also an overlay, which we are not applying here because the applicant does not meet the parameters. The R-6 is the zoning that applies here. There are several variances here that the applicant is seeking. The fifth page shows the physical conditions of the property showing the blighted conditions. This is a view from the site looking towards the downtown. We are long at a property that is clear, flat and can easily accommodate new development. Page 3 and 4 shows the parking lot conditions. What you see

there is what you would see today as well. Most of the parking lot is empty, and only see are actually there by virtue of parking permits. The rest have just overflowed in just because the space is there. Finally, on Page 6 you get a sense as to the surrounding land use context. And on Frame 5, we have a vacant lot to the north. Frame 6, we have a vacant building to the west. Frame 7, we have multi-family to the east. Frame 8, we have land use to the south which is the Lord Stirling site, which is sort of a companion development. This is to serve as a backdrop for the rest of the presentation. Again, looking at the R-6 zoning, multi-family is allowed here. Just multi-family in the form of low rise and not mid-rise is what the applicant is proposing here. Therefore, the relief can be provided by the "d(4)" for the Floor Area, and the "d(6)" for the height. And then there are several bulk variances which this is all correlates to the mass of the development. And I will fall back to what was presented in the previous testimony, in that the proposed developed blends very well with the surrounding land use content. And if you look at A-4, you can see that this building is not going to stand out, but is actually going to blend in very well. We on the applicant side were somewhat challenged in trying to figure out which building the applicant is actually proposing here because it fits so nicely here.

With that said, the "d(1)" variance, we are dealing with a special condition here, as we are dealing with a project that is 100% affordable, which takes out of the Medici standard that we would ordinarily deal with in a use variance. So, we are now in the more simplified Sica test, which is centered around it being an inherently beneficial use. The reason the courts decided that is because the positive criteria are automatically satisfied. So, it's not incumbent on the Applicant to prove that there is an unmet need here and particular suitability that the board would typically deal with. So, what the courts have put together is what we call an analytical shortcut that includes a four-prong test, a simplified test under the law. And the first prong in the test is to identify the public interest at stake, and here it is pretty clear cut that affordable housing is the interest at stake, which is line with the Mount Laurel and most recently the Homes for Hope VI case that shows that affordable housing is inherently beneficial, even after the municipality has met its need and satisfied its affordable housing obligation as well.

The second prong of the test takes us from the positive and puts in the negative, which is to identify any detrimental effects that would be associated with this development. I think that the applicant has done a good job of putting the other witnesses before me that testify to any problems associated with the additional floor area and height. This is an intensity of use question and I am satisfied from a planning standpoint that that the application can be adequately parked, served by utilities and the like. And from a visual standpoint, it is not overdevelopment and fits very nicely into the neighborhood context. This actually is not too far from the redevelopment plan, which if it were to be a part of it, there would be four habitable stories that would be allowed. And this is a development that actually has four

habitable stories. With four living levels over one parking level. After a strict review of the ordinance over what habitable is, this marries up with the policy intent.

The third part of the test is to determine whether the Board can mitigate any of the negative effects that come from the development, which the applicant has actually done already by scaling back the development by one less story and by putting forth a parking management plan with three spaces also being dedicated for the Lord Stirling site and then the remainder being used to accommodate this development. So, all the maintenance and other plans have been provided to justify mitigation of the potential impacts that could come about from this development.

The fourth part of the test is a weight test, where we measure the inherently beneficial use, where we weigh that against the impact, and decide whether the impacts are substantial. For all the testimony that the applicant has put on the record, I believe that this test has been met. Interrelated are a "d(4)" and "d(6)" variances. In terms of the positive criteria, all of the positives carry forward, regarding the added height, added floor area, they are necessary to provide the affordable housing and meet the corresponding public policy.

All of the above are consistent with the purposes of zoning, including purpose "a" promotion of the general welfare, purpose "m" the efficient use of land, purpose "i" promotion of a desirable visual environment, and purpose "g" provides for a variety of uses with appropriate locations. On the negative side, again I come back to A-4, visually it will not seem out of scale, functionally massing can be adequately accommodated by utilities and screened, and we believe that the development will not cause any problems associated with additional height such as shadow effects and blocking of views.

The bulk variances can be accommodated by the "c(2)" balancing test because the of the benefits of the project as a whole substantially outweigh the detriments. The applicant is proposing to mitigate the additional runoff from the proposed coverage with drainage improvements. Lastly, as testified by the engineer, the parking supply will meet the parking demand.

With that said, this is going to be a significant investment in what is a problem site for the community. The proposal will revitalize the site. Therefore, all relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the area.

Todd Bletcher, Board Planner: There are "d" variances, "d(1)" for use, "d(4)" for FAR, "d(6)" for height, "c" for number of stories, multiple front yard setbacks, building coverage, impervious coverage, parking, and existing conditions for lot area and width, and a façade sign variance, where two are proposed on Neilson with a total area of 38 sf.

Mr. McDonough: One is more informational, really both are informational, not advertising, the Stirlingside sign is going to be an identification sign to demarcate the entry to the building

Mr. Bouzas Those are metal letterings about 25 square feet, and the parking sign has been removed. The only sign is the Stirlingside sign and we will comply with the 18 square feet requirement. So, no sign variance is being sought.

Applicant's engineer is called to address engineering comments.

Sufiane El Moussi, Bachelor's Degree in Civil Engineering, P.E. in the state of New Jersey: To address Carley's comments regarding the lighting, we have provided updated lighting drawing, including a reduction in lighting counts. Therefore, the updated lighting plan now satisfies the ordinance. The date of the plans is July 1, 2019. Furthermore, to respond to the stormwater reports for discharge, we have changed the pitch to the garage entrance. We have also incorporated a 2% slope and ADA access. As for sanitary waste, will seek a TWA permit. Fire suppression is provided.

Public Comment

Nilsa Rodriguez-Feeney, 27 Laurel Street, Hopelawn, NJ

Had a general comment, was told to wait to end of meeting.

Blake Width, Attorney, Objectors, Middlesex Apartments LLC: The Lower George Street Redevelopment Plan, goal to improve the quality of residential development through the deconstruction of density. This plan does the opposite of that. The application is seeking a total of eight variances. The green roof is a false attempt to address impervious coverage concerns. The main concern is parking - 43 spaces for the residences. The plan does not mention what is going to happen with the 20 spots allotted for Lord Stirling that currently exist. Presumably if there is a shared parking agreement it should meet the requirements of the ordinance. There's no testimony as to whether Lord Stirling residents agree to this. Parking enforcement is not sufficient, illegal cars are always parked in the lot. Is it related to the Lord Stirling residents, such as caregivers? The traffic expert says that 34% of New Brunswick residents do not own cars. This doesn't address households with more than one vehicle. Some offices set forth in the plan documents, no provisions made for those who will be working at the building. It seems as though the project is being pushed through prematurely and not giving due coverage to impervious coverage and other factors.

Lee D. Klein, Traffic Engineer, Objectors: The 43 spaces for 111 bedrooms provides a ratio of 0.39 parking spaces per bedroom. I looked at Census data provided by the traffic engineer. After you break out the math, you get a total

of 59 automobiles to be parked there. There are 23 spaces on the site currently. Three will be replaced, the other 20, we don't know where they are. I went over there at 6:00 and there were 12 cars parked there. I'm pretty sure all the parking spaces will not be able to fit in the 46 spaces proposed, therefore we need to find a place for these cars. I looked at ITE parking requirements for mid-rise apartments....

Quotes parking ratios for various types of built environments.

Based on Census information, we are looking 59 spaces, whereas only 43 are proposed.

Quotes Internet research on car ownership in low-income households.

Heather Fenyk, Member of Middlesex Apartments, LLC, 54 Hassart Street

Provided eight photos, marked Exhibit O-1

The photos show double and triple parking. Ms. Fenyk took the photos of the area on the weekend. She goes through each photo one-by-one, explaining the sites and showing the parking where there are consistent parking violations.

On May 9, Rutgers classes had ended. The traffic study did not take into account the significant student traffic.

The building has 20 units, built in 1928 and there is only on-street parking.

The objector attorney called Mr. Seckler for questioning.

Mr. Width: Was the Rutgers academic schedule taken into account?

Mr. Seckler: No, it was based on the applicant's wish to submit something and we went out the next available night. We typically don't do counts in the summer, but if we waited until school was in session we would still be waiting.

Charles Kratovil: I do want to vouch that it's not easy to find parking in the area, even in the summer. Was this application submitted to the Environmental Commission?

Dan Dominguez, Acting Director, Department of Planning, Community and Economic Development: I believe I gave these to Manny Castaneda to relay to the Environmental Commission.

Mr. Kratovil: And how about the historical association?

Mr. Dominguez: I did not relay anything to the historic association.

Mr. Kratovil: Mr. McDonough mentioned this would be done through the R-6 zone and that it doesn't stack up to do it through the redevelopment plan. Why doesn't it stack up?

Mr. McDonough: The way the redevelopment plan is structured, it's an overlay. If the applicant does not comply with the overlay, it goes back to the R-6.

Mr. Kratovil: Why isn't it compatible with the redevelopment plan?

Mr. McDonough: The redevelopment plan allows for four stories; this is a five-story building. And floor area.

Charlie Kratovil: I have some concerns about the long-term tax exemption. I encourage them to do something for our school system, they are getting relief where every other taxpayer has to support the school system. I share concerns about parking, but I support the affordable housing.

Public portion is closed. Board discussion.

Peg Chester: I feel torn on the application. I support affordable housing. Illegal parking in the lot should be enforced by the city. But with a gated parking garage, that wouldn't be an issue anymore.

Ms. Nee called Mr. Klein for questioning.

Mr. Klein and Ms. Nee discussed methodology used for determining the number of cars that would be generated by the project. Ms. Nee noted that these numbers did not take into account the parking required for affordable housing units.

Ms. Nee called Ms. Fenyk for questioning.

Ms. Fenyk: The photos were taken at 11:30 am and 12:30 pm.

Ms. Nee called Mr. Seckler for questioning.

Mr. Seckler: While there may be a trend towards less low-income households with zero vehicles, he still stated a fifth of low-income households to still not own vehicles. People in poverty tend to have less vehicle ownership.

Mr. Seckler discussed car ownership rates for low-income households.

Public comment: None

Board comment: None

Mr. Bletcher reads the conditions of approval if the Board acts favorably into the record.

Motion to Approve: Zimmerman
 Second: Azcona

	YES	NO
John Cox (Chairperson)	X	
Ivan Adorno (VC)		
Michael Belvin	X	
Peg Chester	X	
Sue McElligot		
John Zimmerman	X	
Doug Sheehan	X	
Charlotte McNair		
Evelyn Azcona	X	
Nancy Coppola		

Approved.

B. RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL FOR STIRLINGSIDE URBAN RENEWAL LLC, ZB-2017-22

Motion to Approve: Chester
 Second: Sheehan

	YES	NO
John Cox (Chairperson)	X	
Ivan Adorno (VC)		
Michael Belvin	X	
Peg Chester	X	
Sue McElligot		
John Zimmerman	X	
Doug Sheehan		
Charlotte McNair		
Evelyn Azcona	X	
Nancy Coppola		

Approved.

VII. OTHER MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE PUBLIC

Vanessa Rodriguez, 294-296 Lee Avenue: Here about Gloria Legacy. I am a resident of New Brunswick. This business is trying to expand this business on our block. There are several stores in the area. We've had a lot of issues with loitering and trash. Trash cans are overflowing. We got a ticket because the trash ends up on our property. The business opens at 6:00 in the morning and closes at 11:00 at night. This is a residential area. I wanted to speak on behalf of my community.

Ms. Rodriguez-Feeney: I wanted to add to my sister's testimony. There's no regard for the homes in the area. We wanted a trash can, and we have a sewer issue and the trash clogs the sewer.

Mr. Kratovil: Why was the resolution done tonight?

Mr. Dominguez: The applicant is seeking get low-income tax credit from the state and the deadline is September 12.

VIII. ADJORNMENT