

REORGANIZATION
&
REGULAR MEETING

Re-Organization Meeting called to order by Mayor Dan Mahler with a salute to the flag at 7:43pm.

READING: Opening Public Meeting Announcement

This is a Reorganization And Regular Meeting of the Wanaque Planning Board and adequate notice has been given and it has been duly advertised by the placement of a notice in the Herald News on February 13, 2016 and the Suburban Trends on February 17, 2016 and a notice thereof has been posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building in the Borough of Wanaque and a copy thereof has been on file with the Borough Clerk

Mayor Mahler swore in New Member, Dale Spear, and Reappointed Members Kevin Platt and David Slater.

ROLL CALL: Gilbert Foulon, Mayor Dan Mahler, Councilman Dominick Cortellessa, Kevin Platt, Dale Spear, Michael Ryan and David Slater.

ABSENT: Joseph Graceffo, Marc Demetriou and Eugene Verba.

NOMINATION FOR CHAIRMAN: Member Platt nominated Gilbert Foulon, seconded by Councilman Cortellessa. No other nominations heard. Nominations closed.

ROLL CALL ON NOMINATION FOR CHAIRMAN: Voting yes were Member Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

NOMINATION FOR VICE CHAIRMAN: Member Platt nominated Joseph Graceffo, seconded by Member Foulon. No other nominations heard. Nominations closed.

ROLL CALL ON NOMINATION FOR VICE CHAIRMAN: Voting yes were Member Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

NOMINATION FOR BOARD ATTORNEY: Councilman Cortellessa nominated Steven Veltri, seconded by Member Platt. No other nominations heard. Nominations closed.

ROLL CALL ON NOMINATION FOR BOARD ATTORNEY: Voting yes were Member Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

NOMINATION FOR BOARD ENGINEER: Member Foulon nominated Alaimo Engineering, seconded by Member Platt. No other nominations heard. Nominations closed.

ROLL CALL ON NOMINATION FOR BOARD ENGINEER: Voting yes were Member Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

NOMINATION FOR BOARD PLANNERS: Member Foulon nominated both Alaimo Engineering and Fred Suljic, seconded by Councilman Cortellessa. No other nominations heard. Nominations closed.

ROLL CALL ON NOMINATION FOR BOARD PLANNERS: Voting yes were Member Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

MOTION TO RECESS RE-ORGANIZATION MEETING AT 7:50PM: made by Councilman Cortellessa, seconded by Member Foulon. Voting yes were Member Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

REGULAR MEETING

Regular Meeting called to order by Chairman Foulon at 7:51pm.

MINUTES: from the December 18, 2015 Meeting.

MOTION TO APPROVE: made by Member Ryan, seconded by Member Slater. Voting yes were Chairman Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Ryan and Slater.

Members Platt and Spear abstained.

COMMUNICATIONS REPORT: None

APPLICATION STATUS REPORT: Eng. Cristaldi reported no new applications.

NEW BUSINESS APPLICATION: Doorway Church, Inc.

Property Owner: Doorway Church, Inc.

Property Address: 815 Ringwood Avenue, Haskell, NJ (Block 306/Lot 12)

Alfred Acquaviva, Esq. represents the applicant, Doorway Church, Inc.

Doorway Church is the recent purchaser and owner of 815 Ringwood Avenue. It is a Christian Church and I have Pastor Joseph Catanese to answer any questions the Board may have. The property was purchased on February 16, 2016. The Church has been in existence almost 30 years in various locations throughout Bergen and Passaic County. Since this property has been lying dormant for some time, Pastor has taken pictures of the work they have done at the property and would like to show the Board what the property looked like on February 16th and what it looks like now with the clean-up. (Pictures were given to the Board Members)

Pastor Joseph Catanese stated the ministry was incorporated in 1985 and we have had various different names because of different organizations. We started our ministry work in October of 1986 in South Hackensack, then Fair Lawn, Elmwood Park and Paterson. I have been a resident of Ringwood since 1992 and married for 47+ years. Both of my sons graduated from Lakeland Regional High School.

Our last location for the church was in the Riverside section of Paterson. We were not the classic Paterson church, not by any means. In fact, only a very few people from Paterson are a part of our church. We have people in our church from Haskell, Kinnelon, Pompton Lakes, Ringwood and Mahwah.

We are a Christian Church and faith based Bible Church. My wife and I are both graduates of Rhema Bible Training College, which is located just outside of Tulsa, Oklahoma. We graduated college in 1985 and relocated back to New Jersey in 1986. I am a member and hold credentials with the Rhema Ministerial Association International, which is a large organization with over 200 Bible Colleges throughout the world and over 70,000 ministers throughout the world as well. We have churches and ministries in every continent of the world. As a Church we are committed to building families. When you build a family, you build a community.

Services are held every Sunday and Wednesday night. We have men and women conferences twice a year. We also have a youth and children's ministry. On occasion we might have services that might be in the evening or the weekends because of a guest minister. We have classic Christmas Eve Candle Lighting Services, Good Friday, Easter and Christmas Services.

We have started to clean up the property every weekend and, after many years of deterioration, filled a 30 yard dumpster in two hours of just junk. We have the lights working on the outside of the building and the inside so there is life on this property again. We have a landscaper cutting down all the overgrowth.

I have plans on meeting all the clergy in the area. I know that every year there is some kind of a parade that goes down Ringwood Avenue and if there is any way our Church can be a part and cooperate with it, help support it, we are very much open to the idea of being a part of the community.

We are hoping and planning to be operating May 1st. We have a contractor that is in the process of obtaining all the appropriate permits that are needed. The interior of the building has been demoed and we are bringing the electrical and plumbing all up to code. You will have a good neighbor with us.

Attorney Veltri questioned you have three employees? Pastor responded myself, my wife and my office secretary. Our daughter does work with us almost full time.

Attorney Veltri questioned are you going to have office facilities in the building?

Pastor responded “yes”.

Attorney Veltri questioned no one is going to be living there?

Pastor responded “no, no”.

Chairman Foulon questioned how many members do you have?

Pastor responded if they all showed up at the same time together, we would probably have about 150.

Mayor Mahler questioned what are your plans for the inside?

Pastor responded that they have torn out everything that needs to be torn out. We are not really changing any of the structure; we are just upgrading it. The walls had to come down since, when they took the old sheetrock down, there was no insulation.

Mayor Mahler questioned you are putting the sanctuary where the old ballroom was?

Pastor responded “yes”.

Attorney Veltri questioned any child care facilities?

Pastor responded during church services, we have children’s church. We do not have a day care and it is not a Christian School either; only during the time of regular services do we have children’s ministry at the same time.

Attorney Veltri – What about signage?

Pastor responded we are looking into getting a sign put out in accordance with the ordinance.

Mayor Mahler questioned do you have any plans for the second floor?

Pastor responded “not now”. Right now it is just an attic.

Mayor Mahler advised the Pastor that you may want an engineer to look at the roof.

Myself and Councilman Cortellessa were in there and you have two roofs.

Pastor stated we are not doing anything upstairs and, if and when we do, we will all talk again.

Member Spear questioned, since it used to be a restaurant, did you pull all the kitchen stuff out? Are you going to be serving any meals at any time?

Pastor stated the previous owner took all the ovens and all that. The only thing that was left behind was a big old style dishwasher that no one wants. We will not be doing any cooking in there. We will have just a staff kitchen with just a sink, a microwave, and some counter space. We are not cooking, nor serving any meals. We like to cater when we have affairs; it is just so much easier. One of the things I am looking to do with some of the local vendors (Il Palazzo, Carmines) is speak with them and try to help promote their businesses with our Church. A lot of people often times like to go out to eat after church. I am asking the businesses if they would like me to take a thirty second video of them to explain their business and we would show it to the members.

MOTION TO APPROVE NEW BUSINESS WITH THE CONDITION THAT NO CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY IS ISSUED UNTIL ALL INSPECTIONS ARE APPROVED AND FINALIZED: made by Councilman Cortellessa, seconded by Member Platt. Voting yes were Chairman Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

DISCUSSION: Proposed 2016 Fair Share Plan And Housing Element

Patrick McNamara, Special Counsel to the Borough of Wanaque
Law Firm of Scarinci Hollenbeck

Fred Suljic, Licensed Planner of Benecke Economics

Thomas Carroll, Borough Administrator, Borough of Wanaque

Fred Suljic was sworn in by Attorney Veltri

Attorney McNamara stated the report that has been prepared and is posted on the Borough's website is the result of several months of work following a Declaratory Judgment Action that was filed on behalf of the Borough in July 2015. That action was filed as a result of the ruling by the New Jersey State Supreme Court just over a year ago where they invalidated the growth share methodology that had been tried and failed and had been the result of extensive litigation over the prior fifteen years. As a result, all towns were given until early July 2015 to file these actions to provide themselves with interim immunity from any type of builders' remedy lawsuit. As a result, our action was filed and the interim immunity was approved by the court and since then we have been working on developing what is now, in draft form and dated March 11, 2016, the 2016 Fair Share Plan Housing Element. We are here tonight to provide you with a brief update by Planner Suljic. We will continue to work with the Court Appointed Special Master, Joseph Burgess, who is a Licensed Professional Planner, and serves as a Planner to a number of municipalities in Bergen County, and here in Passaic County he is serving as a Court Appointed Special Master. His responsibility is to review the draft that is before you and then we are to take his comments and continue to work on the document to the point where

he can advise the court that the document is in accordance with the dictates of the State Supreme Court and what were called, back in the day, the 1st and 2nd Round Rules. These were the rules that COAH used from its inception in the mid 1980's through 1999 and that direction was given by the State Supreme Court because they advised all parties that those rules had been previously challenged and found to be constitutional. As a result, numerous reports have been generated, Dr. Kinsey has generated a methodology report on behalf of Fair Share Housing Center and the Builders Association, a firm E-Consult has generated one on behalf of the Municipal Consortium of over 200 plus municipalities, of which you are a member.

Mr. Benecke and Planner Suljic have worked on the document in your possession, which briefly gives you a synopsis of the issues of concern, especially the fact that when the old rules existed they pre-dated the enactment of the Highlands Law and the fact that the vast majority of your community is designated preservation.

Planner Suljic, referring to Page 38, Diagram 6, a copy of which is attached to these Minutes, is the COAH Component Fair Share from Second Round COAH Fact Sheet, the Number of Affordable Units was 312, Rehabilitation Component being 37 and we are looking at the Net To Be Built Fair Share (Initial RDP), which is the Realistic Development Potential, is in the area of 275 units. Previously, you had the Regional Contribution Agreement with Hoboken which amounted to 24. We had a net of 251 units. Then we made an adjustment with the Pulte-Powder Hill, and the gap period being 1999 to the year 2014, that was 86 units. The adjusted Round Two Fair Share is 15. We then looked at the construction Pulte Building and Contribution-Powder Hill that is 60. We have the Town Center Redevelopment that amounts to 26 units. There is a Special Needs Housing which is 6 units, but just as a footnote, that may go up to 10 to 12 depending upon the availability of adjacent land that can be purchased and added to that design. That gives us an Unmet Need – Net Remaining Units From Round Two of approximately 73 units. Vacant Land Adjustment is 73. The Remaining Unmet Obligation is, per our perspective, because of the 87% of lands that you have in the Highlands Preservation Area and Planning Area and that has a tremendous constraint on what you have on your availability to additional units. We add back the Highlands Disputed Properties, which is RSK Development at 2 units. There is Mountain Lakes Estates and Lakeside Manor which is 35 units and then we have the Rock Outcrop which is to be determined at a future date.

Planner Suljic, referring to Page 40, Wanaque 2016 Fair Share Plan, a copy of which is attached to these Minutes, contains a Policy Statement that the Borough recognizes its ongoing obligation to provide access to affordable housing opportunities. We are looking at Rehab in the range of 88 to 125 units. During the course of our meeting with Mr. Carroll and Mr. Burgess, I think he admitted to us, as we have indicated to you before, that he realizes there is a tremendous need for rehabilitation of the housing units that exist in the Borough because of all the cape cods, etc. that were built prior to WWII. We are concerned about that and I think that will be a tremendous opportunity for the Borough to do the rehab units. Honestly, this number could be closer to 200 or 250 since we are not sure until we do a more detailed survey of those properties. The Prior Round Unmet Needs is 73 units satisfied by the vacant land adjustment, and the Prospective Need 0 due to the

lack of land. This will put us in the area of about a total of 161-198 units. Again, we have taken all the positive steps and we have also indicated that we will keep the inclusionary zoning as a 20% set aside for any future land development that may occur. There are only a handful of two or three properties that are left. Regarding the one property with 50 acres, we will be lucky if 50% is available because of shallow depth of bedrock, topography issues, and wetlands. We have calculated less than 5% of the land in the Borough will be available for future development.

Councilman Cortellessa questioned the net requirement is 150 after all the manipulation of all the data and information of getting us down to zero?

Attorney McNamara stated that part of the problem is that the way this works is you have these 10 year periods. The gap period, which has recently been ruled on by two trial judges in Middlesex and Ocean County, leaves the municipalities with taking the position that in absence of regulations there should be no gap obligation. So far two trial judges have disagreed, so we have to now work through your rehab and through your vacant land analysis and unmet need to try to look at that time period because we can't say it is at zero because we didn't have operative rules. That is one hurdle. The second is we are now in a period where we are looking at 2015/2016 to 2025/2026 and what is that obligation going forward. Even with the past discounts for work that has been done, and credit for vacant land adjustments, one of the things we still need to resolve is what is the obligation going to be going forward? Given the environmental constraints and the Highlands constraints, there still may be some type of obligation above and beyond using rehabilitation of units to get you some credits. We may have to look at doing overlay zones that are site specific to certain parcels that are rundown or abandoned or have been underutilized where someone wanted to come along and do a small scale development, they would have to include a few COAH units. That would be part of the ways we try to meet your obligation in a manner that can be approved by the courts and with absolute minimal impact on municipal services and on the community. That is the goal.

Planner Suljic stated we could get bonuses in the future with your credit for construction and new rental units.

Councilman Cortellessa stated I am a little confused. There is not a lot of land left in Wanaque, and not a lot of development going on so even looking at 15 years, how do the courts or anyone else justify additional commitment when you don't have the facilities to do that?

Attorney McNamara commented that is part of the vacant land adjustment. What the courts have done is, over the years, they have issued Scarce Resource Orders, and you are relatively close to being at capacity for your water and sewer utilities. In other words, if there are two developers and one has affordable housing components and the other doesn't, the one who doesn't has to wait their turn in line and the one who does will get priority for water and sewer service. We can foresee communities, not just in this region but central and south jersey, especially in the Pinelands, where there are very tight restrictions on using ground water supplies, where there is going to be competition for those resources and there is going to be judges that'll have to decide that this guy's project has 20 affordable units and yours has none, so you are going to wait in line behind him. Courts, if necessary, will issue those Orders on Motion by various developers or even by municipalities to have

the court choose the developers when there are multiple.

Councilman Cortellessa stated I can understand that, but I'm not understanding what the vacant land issues are. Our vacant land is not of the nature that we can build significantly on. Secondly, the rehabilitation issue is something that as we take some of these older homes that have been here for a long time, rehabilitating those doesn't necessarily drive into the COAH needs.

Attorney McNamara stated you do get credit for rehabilitation units and you can use some of the monies that the community has collected in its trust fund. You set up a Development Fee Trust Fund years ago and you have an approved spending plan and you can devote a lot of those resources toward rehabilitation and you do get credits for rehabilitating those units. If you have a house that is 70/80 years old, and the bathroom and the kitchen need replacement, you can do that but then I think you have to have a 10 or 15 year deed restriction so no one uses the money basically to fix and flip and profits at your expense. That is not permitted. That is an avenue we are going to strongly pursue because it fits with the age of your housing inventory and the fact that you don't have a lot of vacant land left. You have to use other tools within the kit to show a court that you are trying to meet your obligation. You do not have to guarantee that all that gets built are done. The standard is: are you providing the opportunity? By providing the opportunity, that is, you create a rehabilitation program, do you create one or two zones for property that has been sitting vacant, undeveloped or abandoned for a number of years where someone might be able to do something that is a small size development of 15 or 20 units with a mix of studios and one and two bedroom apartments and some of those count toward your obligation. These are the different things we are going to continue to work on and come back to you with as we continue to fine-tune this document. The goal is to get it approved by the Special Master and then approved by the Judge on notice to all the parties we have to send notice to; the Fair Share Housing Center, the builders and everyone else the Supreme Court says we have to give notice to, and once approved, you get a 10-year Judgment of Repose. This means for the following ten years, you are bulletproof. No builder can come and threaten to sue you unless he can prove to the court that you've somehow done something blatantly unconstitutional after this has been approved by a judge, which is almost impossible. So in the year 2025, everyone will be revisiting this again and deciding to plan out for the next ten years.

Councilman Cortellessa questioned what is our obligation for the next ten years?

Attorney McNamara answered we would like to keep it as minimal as possible. We are aiming to get to that zero, if possible, but it is going to take some adjusting as we are going along looking at how much we can accomplish using rehabilitation of units as a tool, how much of the vacant land analysis will the Special Master and Court agree with as well as any objector. Do we have to look to get a little creative in zoning a couple of small parcels here and there that are undeveloped or vacant or dilapidated and rejuvenate those properties or rehabilitate those properties to get additional credits? There are other tools in the arsenal where people can do mother/daughters or do other things to gain credits. If you do a group home for people who have down syndrome or developmentally disabled people and they were in a four bedroom home, each bedroom counts as a separate unit under COAH regulations.

Mayor Mahler stated Monday night Bob Benecke made a comment about a 5% Rule that if our vacant land is under 5% we get a special exemption and ours is like 9/10's of 1%. Attorney McNamara stated that is what we are aiming for. But again we are looking at using old rules that existed before the Highlands Law and when the Highlands Law was passed, years later they passed another law where they abolished the use of Regional Contribution Agreements and that tool is gone. The bill was called A500 and signed by Governor Corzine. It was signed in the office of the Fair Share Housing Center and that is the kind of political clout they had during the Corzine administration. There is a provision in that law that says, to the extent economically feasible, properties that are either governed by the Highlands Law, the Hackensack Meadowlands Law, and the Pinelands, still have that 20% fair share obligation. The law does have that very important caveat to say you can try and plan this out. You might be an area where you are overwhelming preservation compared to planning under the Highlands Law so someone comes in and says I want to do something at a 20% set aside, well there may not be enough land, or there may not be enough utilities to make it economically feasible to get the density and type of development needed for the development to be profitable for someone.

Chairman Foulon is questioning the rehabilitation. If I have an old house and it needs a bathroom and kitchen, but I also have a mortgage on this house, what bank is going to allow you to come in and do this rehabilitation and sign a 15 year commitment that you won't sell it?

Administrator Carroll commented that we have had this program since the late 1990's. The mortgage is put on by the Borough. We are using money that is in our housing trust fund or money that we get through small cities community grants. This would be a second lien to the first mortgage. If the cost is \$20,000 for the rehab and the property is sold before the ten years, since it is 10 year forgivable loan, we get \$10,000 back; it is prorated. Chairman Foulon questioned, as a homeowner, would I partake of this when I know I am committed to 10 or 15 years to staying in that house?

Administrator Carroll answered that out of the twenty homes that we did, I think only three sold in the ten years. With this program, you have to meet the income limits and what we found was that a lot of the people who participate are residents who have been in town for a long time, are older and don't have the resources to improve their properties. It is a good program for keeping the money in town and improving the housing stock in town.

Chairman Foulon commented that you don't have to rehabilitate all of these houses; you just have to offer it.

Attorney McNamara stated you set up a program and pre-screen people to see whether or not their income qualifies per state regulations. You can't force someone to do it. All qualifications are specified by state rules and regulations. Someone has to go through a screening process and you are going to vet certain people out just through the normal course of that procedure.

Attorney Veltri questioned at what point do you designate the units?

Attorney McNamara believes once they are approved, then you are going to commit funds and then they are designated.

Administrator Carroll stated we have an outside agency handle the screening process – Community Grants and Planning.

Attorney Veltri stated you have numbers on the grid of 88 to 125 units.

Planner Suljic suspects it's probably double that, at least.

Attorney Veltri questioned when will we designate those units or do we designate them?

Attorney McNamara stated you don't designate them in advance; they get designated once they qualify for the program. We have the ability using the tax records to put a realistic estimate on it. You do have a significant percentage of housing here that is WWII vintage or older so you are dealing with housing that is 65 to 80/90 years old. For example, in contrast, I represent Union City, the most densely populated city in the entire state.

Everyone agrees their present need number is zero. Depending on whose report you look at, the rehab share number is anywhere from 450 to 1700. Again, because you have a densely populated municipality and roughly 55% of the housing stock is pre 1950, you are dealing with a lot older houses and a decent percentage of pre WWII.

Councilman Cortellessa questioned how do you know they haven't already been rehabilitated?

Attorney McNamara stated more often than not it is going to show up on a property record card because if they did it right, they pulled permits.

Attorney Veltri stated that is up to the Special Master to agree with us.

Attorney McNamara stated that is right because he is going to be looking at the same census data that we are looking at and Joe is looking at the same census data as a planner sitting up there on the dais on behalf of the towns he is the planner for in Bergen County. He is very conversant with it. He has a good firm and he has been at it for 30 years and knows his way around the program as well as anybody around here. If you had asked for someone to be a good Special Master to have, who is going to be fair, but who clearly understands the burdens municipalities have, it is him.

Planner Suljic commented that the number of units you have on Figure 6 built in 1939 or earlier is 584 units, which is almost 14% of the total. There is another 293 that is 1940 to 1949 and you will probably have at least 50 to 70 out of those.

Chairman Foulon stated the other night you said 40 years and older. You are going into the 70's now, not the 50's and 60's.

Planner Suljic states easily I think you will probably get 100 or 150 maybe even more people signing up, but they may not be income eligible. The rule of thumb is you usually get two to three times the number of people who are eligible. You let people know through your website, community outreach and mailers.

Member Slater stated that on Monday night there was some discussion regarding some of the industrial property owners taking their properties and trying to get a builder's remedy type development in there and this area is basically between 2nd and 4th Avenues, east of Ringwood Avenue. What are the possibilities there?

Attorney McNamara stated if someone is going to come in, once this plan is approved, they would have to come and ask for a complete zoning change and then that would be up to the governing body and in your role as the Planning Board to evaluate whether or not you even want to pursue that option. Certainly, anyone looking at those properties is also going to be looking at dealing with the environmental legacy issues that those properties have and that certainly is going to cut into the ledger sheet in terms of trying to figure out whether or not changing it to a residential site is economically feasible from the developer standpoint.

He can't come in and just say I want a builder's remedy and have a site that, for all practical purposes, can't be converted for residential use because of the pre-existing environmental legacy issues.

Member Slater questioned are the regulations regarding contaminations lesser for multi-unit as opposed to single family?

Attorney McNamara stated there are two different sets of cleanup criteria the DEP has under the TECH Regs adopted under the Spill Act for residential direct contact cleanup standards and non-residential. Residential cleanup standards, depending on the nature and type of contamination, can be expediently greater in terms of the level of reduction required to meet DEP standards. Properties that are redevelopment often have to have DEP Notices on them saying that if the area is all parking and asphalt on the bottom and the buildings are a level up, that there is a deed restriction saying you can't open up the ground without DEP approval; you can't do other things without DEP approval. Doing ground field sites for this type of development is a real challenge.

MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING ON TONIGHT'S PORTION OF THIS PRESENTATION: made by Councilman Cortellessa, seconded by Member Platt. Voting yes were Chairman Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

Chairman Foulon – Let it be noted that we will not take action on this tonight. There still might be some tweaking going on in the next few weeks. We will probably take action on it at the next meeting. So this public hearing will also be opened at the next meeting.

Attorney McNamara stated when we have permission from the court and matters are sent back to us to present this to you and to the governing body, it will be done on public notice.

Chairman Foulon – Anyone in the audience wishing to address the Board or the Professionals on this Plan only, please step forward and state your name and address. We will have our normal Public Discussion after we close this portion.

John DiMeglio – 414 Ringwood Avenue, Wanaque

At what price range would you consider affordable housing? Say a home down in Haskell sells for \$200,000, would that be considered affordable housing?

Attorney McNamara stated based on 30% of the income of that household. It is based on income. There are regulations and state issues that define income brackets based on size of family for low, very low and moderate income households.

Mr. DiMeglio stated my feeling is we have a lot of affordable housing in this town.

Attorney McNamara stated that one of the principal complaints about this entire process is that you're really not allowed to take much credit for pre-existing housing inventory that may otherwise be deemed affordable. There is a lot of debate based around what is called "filtering process" or "trickled down housing" where there may be units that are otherwise affordable, but because they are pre-existing and were developed long before these rules first kicked in in the 1980's, you don't get credit for it.

MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON TONIGHT'S PORTION OF THIS PRESENTATION: made by Mayor Mahler, seconded by Councilman Cortellessa. Voting yes were Chairman Foulon, Mayor Mahler, Councilman Cortellessa, Members Platt, Spear, Ryan and Slater.

RESOLUTIONS: None

VOUCHERS: None

PUBLIC DISCUSSION: Anyone in the audience wishing to address the Planning Board on any Planning Board matter, please step forward, state your name and address.

Let the record show no one came forward.

MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:36PM: made by Member Slater, seconded by Member Ryan. Carried by a voice vote.

Jennifer A. Fiorito
Planning Board Secretary