

**Minutes of the Bogota Planning/Zoning Board Meeting
June 22, 2021**

The Bogota Borough Planning/Zoning Board had a regular meeting on June 22, 2021. The meeting commenced at 7:32 p.m. with chairman reading the open public meetings act notice.

Roll call was taken, with the following members were present: T. Napolitano, C. Mancini, E. Rieper, J. Frias, M. Murphy, D. Schnipp, & F. Miranda.

The Board opened to the public for public comments, and hearing none closed to the public. The Chairman asked for a motion to amend the agenda to add the adoption of minutes and approval of bills from Paul Grygiel, the Planner for the Borough. The motion was made by T. Napolitano and seconded by M. Murphy and passed unanimously. The minutes were adopted, as moved by T. Napolitano and seconded by M. Murphy. The bills of Paul Grygiel were adopted, moved by T. Napolitano, seconded by M. Murphy. All those votes were unanimous.

New Business: Hampshire Venture Partners, LLC, Site Plan Application. Forward application for site plan approval. Glen Pantel, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Pantel indicated he has worked with the borough planner and is proposing an 89,000-distribution facility and light manufacturing and assembly. The application, as being presented by the applicant, meets all parking and loading requirements. This is an industrial warehouse use on an under-utilized site. The proposed use is allowed under current zoning, as well as the proposed redevelopment plan of the Borough.

Michael Kates, Esquire, appeared in opposition to this plan, representing Star Candle, located at 300 Industrial Way.

Mr. Pantel called witness, Christopher Badger, as architect from Hampshire, located at 100 Standwith Lane, Princeton, New Jersey. Mr. Badger is involved as project manager and manager of industrial development properties. This is a third-generation commercial real estate operation that engages in industrial development and is currently redeveloping 1,000,000 square feet all over the United States, and they are currently the contract purchaser. The applicant has the ability to develop the subject property and is interested in installing the plan depicted in the application. The board and the public were permitted to ask questions of the applicant representative.

Mr. Kates, asked if the applicant engaged in residential development.

Mr. Napolitano asked what tenants would be at the site.

Mr. Miranda asked how was the transfer effectuated.

Mr. Schnipp asked what light manufacturing is defined as, which was responded to be light assembly of components, repackaging and pre-manufactured components. The applicant's representative indicated light assembly and logistical warehouse distribution facilities are all part of the plan, and they have sufficient parking for both uses.

Mr. Napolitano asked how the applicant determined to come to the site, and Mr. Badger indicated that they had undertaken an analysis and found it to be a logical site.

Ms. Murphy indicated she was concerned with truck traffic, and her questions were deferred to the traffic expert. The board closed the application for questioning.

Mr. Pantel next called architect Brian Ringham, 2152 Willows Lane Creek, Kildon, Illinois, who is the principal of the architectural firm hired for this project. The witness described the nature of the project, and it has experience designing these projects. He was accepted as an expert by the board. The witness identified A-1 as the architectural plans, which shows the appearance of the facility. It will contain future office space for the facility, as well as warehouse and light industrial space. He described the building as a precast metal panel on the side of the building, which will have a large entry area and canopy system. The site will have windows, access to the outside, and provide light in the warehouse space. The applicant is proposing a white building, accented by medium gray, with also some slate gray. These colors were in reply to suggestions by the Borough Planner.

The witness identified Exhibit A-2, which is the elevation for Facility No. 2, dated June 17, 2021. The applicant proposed a number of options, including Option A. The applicant has added architectural elements, including accent bands, in the reveals of the building precast panels. The elevation face is depicted as the view from River Road and is the easterly elevation. The expert indicated he had broken up the appearance of the building with the architectural accent bands to reduce the expanse of the building. The board requested a 3D-color rendering be provided to help the board understand.

The witness also identified Exhibit A-3, which was Option B, which shows more horizontal elements to further break up the expanse of the building. The applicant found this also as an attractive combination of the colors and posed it as an alternative for the board. The board indicated in comments that this was not as attractive as Option A.

The witness indicated the height of the building is 41 feet and is below the allowable limit.

The board's experts were permitted to question the expert presented by the applicant, and Mr. Costa asked about rooftop units that will service the site. He was told that they are 10 to 20-ton units. The applicant also indicated it would screen the rooftop units, so they're not visible from the road.

Borough Planner, Paul Grygiel, testified that the color and materials are appropriate for the site, and recommended Option A as the more attractive of the two, and asked for the applicant to consider other architectural detail, including corners, to further enhance the break-up of the expanse. The applicant indicated they were willing to consider this. The borough planner felt this was the better option and asked for more detail about it.

Mr. Napolitano asked that the applicant consider more aesthetic enhancements. The applicant's witness was open to the public for cross-examination.

Mr. Kates indicated an objection that this matter be considered only as a preliminary site plan, and not as a preliminary and final site plan. Mr. Kelly addressed Mr. Kates and indicated the board routinely will consider preliminary and final at the same time.

The applicant next called Kevin Webb, Langan Engineering, Elmwood Park, New Jersey. Mr. Webb was qualified as an expert in engineering and identified A-4 as the existing conditions. He described the site as spanning Ridgefield Park and Bogota. Bogota has a 6-acre piece, which is fully developed with parking lots that currently serve the existing building. It's surrounded by the Hackensack River on the west and apartment buildings to the north and is subject to the south-end redevelopment overlay for the site. He indicated no wetland delineation has been undertaken to date, and a waiver was requested, which Mr. Costa has indicated is appropriate.

The witness identified Exhibit A-5, which is a site plan rendering, dated May 25, 2021, showing the proposed improvements for the site. The witness indicated he sees the project as taking place as a single-phase project. Ultimately, Ridgefield Park approval will be required for that portion of the project that is located there, but the applicant intends to complete the project in one phase, once both municipalities give their approval. The project will share utilities across the site.

The witness described the project as 89,130 square feet site, which will be warehouse /light industrial with 5,500 square feet of office space. There will be ten loading docks and the

elevation of the site will be 3 feet higher than the current golf center. The witness indicated the applicant cannot build the project without raising the site due to current Department of Environmental Protection standards. The site is fully compliant with all aspects of the redevelopment plan. Access to the site will remain the same as currently configured. The witness identified A-6, which is a circulation plan with a revision date of June 17, 2021, which shows the car circulation and truck circulation around the site, which can be undertaken without issue.

Industrial Avenue, which currently exists on the site, will be widened and will be subject to public dedication. Mr. Webb asked that guardrails remain and then road to simply be repaved.

The witness identified 154 car parking spaces are being provided, which exceed that which is required. Six accessible spaces are contained with 127 other spaces, including four electrical vehicle charging stations. Three to five spaces will be for waterfront improvement access, and the site will have a 30-foot-wide public easement with 12-foot-wide paved walkways on the waterfront with pedestrian lighting and landscaping. The applicant will install benches and garbage receptacles and appropriate lighting for the area, as well as landscaping.

The witness described site lighting as consistent of LED lighting with building-mounted lighting. All fixtures are LED. They will be 27 feet apart with 3-foot concrete bases and 16-foot-high decorative lights. The applicant will have the ability to adjust lights and can review the lighting after a 6-month period and can adjust the lighting based upon any existing problems or complaints. A freestanding monument sign is also being proposed, which will be externally illuminated.

The witness described the stormwater management plan where the stormwater will outflow to the river. The site is being improved as backflow preventers will be installed that don't currently exist, which will improve drainage in the area. The site will also have new sewer and new sewer tie-ins. The applicant stipulated it will do required inspections of all existing sewers to verify condition and will make improvements in conjunction with the borough if required. The witness described outside approvals as being shade tree, Bergen County Planning, police and fire, and will obtain all prior approvals.

Mr. Costa indicated a plan showing signage onto the River Road site should be provided. He also questioned as to pedestrian access down an easement that is used to access the Industrial Road site.

The applicant testified that he would examine if there were safer methods in terms of access. The board engineer indicated he wanted to see the title work to confirm the access rights involved with regard to the project.

Meeting was continued to the July 13, 2021 meeting of the Board with consent of the applicant.

Meeting adjourned.

**Minutes of the Bogota Planning/Zoning Board Meeting
July 13, 2021**

The Bogota Borough Planning/Zoning Board had a regular meeting on July 13, 2021. The meeting commenced at 7:45 p.m. with chairman reading the open public meetings act notice.

Roll call was taken, with the following members were present: T. Napolitano, C. Mancini, E. Rieper, J. Frias, M. Murphy.

The Board opened to the public for public comments, and hearing none closed to the public.

New Business: Hampshire Venture Partners, LLC, Site Plan Application.

Glenn Pantel, Esq. Appeared for the Applicant. It was discussed that board members had difficulty accessing the site of the Zoom meeting. The chairman called in terms of continuing business the application by Hampshire for the redevelopment area. Mr. Pantel appeared. He once again reiterated that they had a fully conforming plan with the overlay.

Mr. Costa came into the meeting and confirmed had difficulty accessing the site. It was discovered that the Zoom Meeting link listed on the Borough website was completely different than that which had been advertised by the applicant.

In light of this, the board counsel recommended that the matter be carried to another date and that the matter be re-noticed and re-advertised. After verifying the discrepancy, Mr. Pantel agreed and the matter was carried to a July 27, 2021 meeting of the board.

**Minutes of the Bogota Planning/Zoning Board Meeting
July 27, 2021**

The Bogota Borough Planning/Zoning Board had a regular meeting on July 27, 2021. The meeting commenced at 7:30 p.m. with chairman reading the open public meetings act notice.

Roll call was taken, with the following members were present: T. Napolitano, C. Mancini, J. Frias, M. Murphy, F. Miranda, D. Schnipp, J. Chavez

The Board opened to the public for public comments, and hearing none closed to the public.

New Business: Hampshire Venture Partners, LLC, Site Plan Application.

Glenn Pantel, Esq. Appeared for the Applicant. The applicant identified as Exhibit A-7, the re-notice of the meeting for the evening's hearing. In addition to A-8, the applicant marked the June 22 meeting notice. Mr. Pantel indicated that he was in the process of speaking with his experts and the borough engineer to address the issue of site access and required additional time to address the concerns of Mr. Costa. As such, he asked that the board confirm that the notice is approved, which board counsel did, and he requested that the matter be carried to the August 10, 2021 meeting of the board without further publication or notice being required. The board consented and this matter is carried to August 10, 2021 whereas the meeting was adjourned.

AUGUST 10, 2021 MEETING OF THE BOARD

The Bogota Borough Planning/Zoning Board had a regular meeting on July 27, 2021. The meeting commenced at 7:30 p.m. with chairman reading the open public meetings act notice. Members in attendance: T. Napolitano , C. Mancini, E. Reiper, J. Frias, M. Murphy, D. Schnipp, J. Mitchell, F. Miranda, J. Chavez.

The Board opened to the public for public comments, and hearing none closed to the public.

Counsel for the board confirmed that he had been in touch with Mr. Pantel, and Mr. Pantel forwarded correspondence requesting that the matter be carried to the September 14 meeting of the board because the applicant required additional time to confirm issues related to access. The applicant will re-notice the meeting and will re-advertise, as well. The board consented to carrying the meeting until September 14, 2021 at which time a motion to adjourn was made and the meeting was adjourned.