

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PLAINFIELD PLANNING BOARD  
GRANTING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL,  
AND DEVIATIONS FROM THE TODN-NORTH AVENUE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN  
TO 1112 NORTH URBAN RENEWAL, LLC  
BLOCK 402, LOT 5  
PB 2022-16**

WHEREAS, **1112 NORTH URBAN RENEWAL, LLC** (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant") has applied to the Planning Board of the City of Plainfield for preliminary and final site plan approval, as well as deviations from the TODN-South Avenue Redevelopment Plan for property located at 1112-1118 North Avenue, Plainfield, New Jersey, also known as Block 402, Lot 5 on the Tax Map of the City of Plainfield (hereinafter the "Subject Property"), which application has been listed as PB 2022-16; and

WHEREAS, the site plan is shown on a plan entitled "Preliminary and Final Site Plan for 1112 North Avenue, LLC, Proposed Multi-Family Building," prepared by Brett W. Skapinetz, P.E. and Robert J. Colucco, P.E., of Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated May 12, 2022, last revised June 15, 2022, consisting of thirteen (13) sheets; and a plan entitled "New Apartment Building, 1112-1118 North Ave, Plainfield - New Jersey," prepared by Brian M. Taylor, AIA of Taylor Architecture & Design, dated May 11, 2022, last revised June 10, 2022, consisting of seventeen (17) sheets; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant provided notice in accordance with the provisions of Section 40-18 of the Land Use Ordinance and

the Municipal Land Use Law ("MLUL") and the Board conducted a public hearing on July 7, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Board received and reviewed reports from the Board Planner and the Board Engineer and provided an opportunity for comments from interested parties; and,

WHEREAS, all members of the Planning Board voting on this resolution have attended the public hearing(s) or have certified that they have read the transcript(s) or listened to the tape(s) of the hearing pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10.2; and

WHEREAS, the Board reviewed the application and the submission of the Applicant and is granting approval in reliance upon the representations made in the application and public presentation by the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Board after carefully considering the evidence submitted by the Applicant, the Planning Board's experts and the general public, makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1. Applicant is the owner and designated redeveloper of the Subject Property which is located in the TODN-TODN Avenue Redevelopment Area. Development of the Subject Property is governed by the Trainside Commercial District ("TSC") standards contained in the TODN-North Avenue Redevelopment Plan (hereinafter the "Plan"). The Plan provides that any other

regulations not addressed in the Plan shall be governed by the City Land Use Ordinance (hereinafter the "LUO").

2. The Subject Property consists of 0.72 acres/31,248 square feet ("SF") and is located within Flood Zone AO, a Special Flood Hazard Area. It has 156.24 feet of frontage on North Avenue. The Subject Property is currently improved with a one-story commercial/industrial building and asphalt parking area.

3. Applicant proposes to construct a five (5) story apartment building consisting of a parking area containing 54 parking spaces (including 9 electric vehicle parking spaces) on the ground level; and 55 residential apartment units on the second through fifth floors on the Subject Property (hereinafter the "Applicant's Proposal"). The Board acknowledges that while the Applicant is proposing 54 off-street parking spaces, it is entitled to a credit for 60 off-street parking spaces under State regulations and the LUO.

4. In connection with the Applicant's Proposal, the Applicant required deviations from the bulk regulations of the Plan related to: maximum number of stories within the first 20 feet from the property line - where required is 4 stories and proposed is 5 stories; number of signs - where 0 are permitted and proposed are 2; maximum sign height (both signs) - where

required is 2 feet and proposed is 30 feet; maximum sign mounting height (both signs) - where required is 14 feet and proposed is 21 feet; maximum curb cut width - where required is 26 feet and proposed is 34.5 feet; minimum rear pedestrian/bicycle walkway (where an 8 foot walkway is required and no walkway is proposed); and tenant storage space - where required is 350 cubic feet per unit and proposed is 247-263 cubic feet of storage space per unit.

5. At the hearing, the Applicant's legal counsel, Lawrence A. Calli, Esq., provided a summary of the Applicant's proposal.

6. At the hearing, Robert J. Colucco, P.E., the applicant's Site Engineer provided a summary of the existing conditions on the Subject Property, as well as the Applicant's proposed improvements.

7. Mr. Colucco proffered Exhibit A-1 consisting of aerial map exhibit; which was entered into the record by the Board. Referring to Exhibit A-1, Mr. Colucco noted that the Subject Property is located in the TODN-TSC District of the Plan. He noted that the Subject Property contains 31,248 SF and is fully developed with structures and an asphalt parking area.

8. Mr. Colucco noted that: the properties to the north of the Subject Property consist of residential uses; the

property to the east of the Subject Property contains the Netherwood Post Office; the property to the south of the Subject Property contains the New Jersey Transit tracks; and the property to the west of the Subject Property consists of the Netherwood Station parking lot.

9. Mr. Colucco advised that the existing improvements on the Subject Property contain numerous non-conforming conditions which would be eliminated through the development of the Subject Property with the Applicant's Proposal.

10. Mr. Colucco thereafter proffered Exhibit A-2, a colorized version of the site plan; which was entered into the record by the Board. Referring to Exhibit A-2, Mr. Colucco advised that the Applicant proposed to raze the existing buildings on the Subject Property and construct a multi-family building with a 25,777 square footprint; including ground level parking. He noted that the proposed apartments would include 5 studio units; 41 one-bedroom units; and 9 two-bedroom units.

11. Mr. Colucco stated that the Applicant's Proposal required a deviation from the Plan relating to the maximum number of stories within 20 feet of the front property line.

12. Mr. Colucco indicated that the Applicant proposed one full movement driveway at the northeasterly portion of the structure. He advised that the proposed driveway would be 24.5

feet wide, and the curb cut would be 34.5 feet wide. Mr. Colucco stated that the width of the curb cut required a deviation from the Plan requirement relating to the maximum curb cut width. He testified that circulation in the parking area would be one-way in a clockwise motion. Mr. Colucco indicated that the parking spaces within the parking area would be 9 feet by 18 feet.

13. Mr. Colucco advised that the Subject Property is located in an AO Flood Zone. He noted that the location within the flood zone required the elevation of the finished floors and parking areas. Mr. Colucco indicated that the Applicant had submitted the plans to the NJDEP for review and had worked with the City's Flood Plain Manager on the design of the Applicant's Proposal.

14. Mr. Colucco indicated that evacuation from the Subject Property during a flood event would be through the rear of the Subject Property and would traverse the New Jersey Transit tracks.

15. Mr. Colucco indicated that the proposed 55 apartment units required 55 parking spaces. He noted that the Applicant proposed to supply 54 parking spaces including 9 electric vehicle spaces. Mr. Colucco advised that under State regulations and the LUO, the Applicant was granted an additional

credit of 6 spaces for the electric vehicle spaces; resulting in 60 total proposed spaces.

16. Mr. Colucco indicated that the Applicant was supplying bicycle parking as required under the Plan at a rate of 1 bicycle parking space per every 10 automobile parking spaces. He confirmed that 6 bicycle parking spaces were proposed by the Applicant.

17. Mr. stated indicated that the Applicant also required deviations from the Plan for the proposed signage for the structure. He advised that the deviations included the number of signs and the vertical dimension of the signs. Mr. Colucco further noted that the signs were proposed to be illuminated with halo lighting.

18. Mr. Colucco confirmed that the Applicant's proposal was not a major development from a stormwater perspective; as less than one acre was being disturbed and the impervious coverage was being reduced. Mr. Colucco confirmed that the Applicant had reviewed the stormwater requirements with the City Engineer - who had no comments.

19. Mr. Colucco confirmed that the Applicant's proposal supplied all of the streetscape requirements contained in the City Streetscape Design Manual.

20. Mr. Colucco indicated that the Applicant was proposing three (3) street trees, as well as eleven (11) additional trees along the westerly property line. He noted that the Applicant required a deviation for planting within a parking area; as most of the Applicant's parking was located below the structure. Mr. Colucco acknowledged that the City Shade Tree Commission memorandum questioned the viability of the trees propose on the westerly side of the Subject Property; but he opined that the viability would not be an issue.

21. Mr. Colucco advised that in additional to the eleven (11) trees on the westerly property line; five (5) trees were proposed in the terrace areas and trees were also proposed on the deck areas for the units. He indicated that the Applicant did not propose to supply a contribution to the City Tree Fund; as it believed that the landscaping was sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Plan and LUO.

22. Mr. Colucco thereafter proffered Exhibit A-3, a photographic/architectural exhibit containing eleven (11) pages; which was entered into the record by the Board.

23. Mr. Colucco acknowledged that the Plan required a walkway along the rear property line adjacent to the New Jersey Transit train tracks. He opined that the walkway was not practicable due to the steep grading in the vicinity of the rear



property line, as well as existing and proposed retaining walls. Mr. Colucco advised that the structure could not be relocated towards North Avenue to accommodate the walkway due to overhead wires and flood zone issues.

24. Mr. Colucco advised that the street lighting would meet the requirements of the City Streetscape Design Manual; and that the Applicant also proposed building mounted lights.

25. In response to an inquiry from the Board regarding the number of electric vehicle spaces, Mr. Colucco confirmed that 3 electrical vehicle spaces would be provided at the time of initial occupancy; and that 6 additional make ready spaces would also be supplied and completed as required by State regulations and the LUO.

26. In response to an inquiry from the Board concerning the nature of the electric vehicle charging spaces, Mr. Calli confirmed that 220 volt charging stations would be supplied by the Applicant.

27. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner, Mr. Colucco confirmed that the Applicant would coordinate any Board approval with the City Flood Plain Manager.

28. At the hearing, Brian M. Taylor, A.I.A., the Applicant's Architect provided testimony concerning the proposed structure.

29. Referring to Exhibit A-3, Mr. Taylor noted a rendering of the structure from North Avenue looking easterly across the front of the structure. He noted that Exhibit A-3 depicted the proposed trees on the westerly property line, as well a four-foot-high aluminum fence which would provide screening for the parking area to the west of the Subject Property. Mr. Taylor confirmed that no parking spaces in the parking area faced the front of the building (on North Avenue). He noted that the parking along the easterly property line faced the post office building which consisted of a blank wall with no windows.

30. Mr. Taylor confirmed that the Applicant proposed a fence along the entire perimeter of the parking area adjacent to the parking spaces. He noted that the fence would consist of a four-foot-high decorative aluminum fence (wrought iron style).

31. Mr. Taylor thereafter reviewed the ground floor of the proposed structure. He noted that the structure would contain a prominent entrance at the northwesterly corner of the structure which would be recessed under an overhang. Mr. Taylor noted that the ground floor would include an amenity area, a mail room, a package room, a dog wash area, a transformer room, a fire/sprinkler room, a trash room, tenant storage and two elevators.

32. Mr. Taylor confirmed that bicycle storage was proposed on the ground level in compliance with the requirements of the Plan. He noted that a dog run was proposed between the side of the structure and the Netherwood Station parking lot to the west. Mr. Taylor advised that the dog run would be enclosed with a four-foot-high black aluminum decorative fence.

33. Mr. Taylor testified that the main entrance to the parking area would be located on North Avenue.

34. Mr. Taylor thereafter reviewed the plan for the second floor of the structure. He noted that the second floor would include amenity areas, as well as residential units. Mr. Taylor advised that the amenities on the second floor would include a fitness area; bathrooms; and an amenity deck with a pool and soft seating area.

35. Mr. Taylor confirmed that the Applicant proposed 55 residential units, consisting of 5 studio units, 41 one-bedroom units and 9 two-bedroom units. He indicated that all two-bedroom units would include two bathrooms. Mr. Taylor noted that all residential units would include a washer and dryer. He stated that each residential level would include a trash room containing a trash chute as well as recyclable containers. Mr. Taylor noted that building maintenance staff would bring the

recyclables from each level to the trash room on the ground level.

36. Referring to the third-floor plan, Mr. Taylor confirmed that the third floor would contain residential units; a trash room; a utility closet and additional tenant storage space. He noted that the plans for the third and fourth floors would be identical.

37. Mr. Taylor thereafter reviewed the plans for the fifth floor. He noted that the Applicant required a variance for the setback of the façade, which was 13 feet, 8.5 inches rather than the 20-foot setback required under the Plan.

38. Mr. Taylor then reviewed the plan for the roof. He noted that the roof would be flat and would contain a parapet. Mr. Taylor indicated that the roof would also include the mechanical equipment for the common areas - screened with a four-foot-high solid equipment screen.

39. Mr. Taylor next reviewed a move-in/move-out exhibit; identifying the path utilized for tenants to move in and move out of the units. He noted that ample space was provided to pass vehicle parked in the loading area. Mr. Taylor noted that the move-in elevator was double sided to provide access from a room adjacent to the loading space.

40. Mr. Taylor thereafter reviewed a trash removal exhibit; identifying how trash and recycling would be handled at the building.

41. Mr. Taylor then reviewed a tenant storage space exhibit which depicted the modification of the utility room and storage space on the residential unit floors. He noted that while the Applicant could not meet the total requirement of 350 cubic feet of storage space per unit, approximately 247-263 cubic feet of storage space was provided for each unit.

42. Mr. Taylor thereafter reviewed the design of the exterior of the structure; noting that it would include a base, middle and top course. He noted that balconies, a parapet, and center balconies were included to provide architectural variety on the façade. Mr. Taylor indicated that the base course would consist of a dark colored brick and that fiber cement panels in two colors would be utilized for the upper levels. Mr. Taylor advised that the corner entrance treatment would include a window area with a wood texture fiber cement.

43. Mr. Taylor confirmed that the sizes of the residential units would meet or exceed the requirements of the Plan. He noted that the units would be prewired for both internet and cable; and each unit would include uniform window treatments.

44. Mr. Taylor confirmed that the Applicant would voluntarily agree to comply with any comments from the Police Department and Fire Department.

45. Mr. Taylor advised that the electrical vehicle spaces were located along the open side of the building in order to address concerns of the Fire Department.

46. In response to an inquiry from the Board concerning the design of the dog washroom, Mr. Taylor advised that the dog washroom would likely include two dog wash bins.

47. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Taylor advised that the Applicant was unable to supply a balcony for each residential unit. He noted that all of the residential units would be provided with balconies with the exception of the three units at the front of the structure along North Avenue on the third and fourth floors.

48. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Taylor confirmed that the pool would only be open seasonally.

49. In response to an inquiry from the Board, Mr. Taylor confirmed that the Applicant would provide both light and auditory safety signals at the vehicular entrance to the parking facility on North Avenue.

50. Mr. Taylor advised that the Applicant's proposed signage would consist of aluminum channel letters with back

lighting. He opined that the lighting would be subtle and provide no glare.

51. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner, Mr. Taylor advised that the Applicant proposed to utilize PTAC HVAC systems for the units. He noted that the structure was designed to integrate the PTAC units into the frames of the windows.

52. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner, Mr. Taylor confirmed that the Applicant would supply lighting calculations for the parking area to the satisfaction of the Board's Professionals.

53. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner concerning the incorporation of sustainable design elements into the structure, Mr. Taylor advised that the Applicant designed the building with the capacity to provide future solar panels on the roof. He thereafter identified items from the LEED Checklist which were satisfied by the Applicant's Proposal.

54. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner, Mr. Taylor confirmed that the Applicant could comply with all of the comments in the reports of the Board Planner and Board Engineer.

55. In response to an inquiry from the Board Planner concerning the building setback variance, Mr. Taylor advised that from street level the structure would look like a four-

story structure. He opined that the design of the structure would accomplish the goal of the Plan.

56. At the hearing Paul Ricci, P.P., A.I.C.P., the Applicant's Professional Planner, provided testimony concerning the deviations from the Plan required by the Applicant as well as the planning justification for same.

57. Mr. Ricci initially noted that the Applicant's proposal largely conformed with the requirements of the Plan. He noted that the Applicant required deviations from the Plan related primarily to the setback of the fifth floor, the curb cut width and the wall signage.

58. Mr. Ricci opined that the Applicant's project worked well and adhered to the core requirements of the Plan. He noted that the Applicant's proposal meets the objectives of both the Master Plan and the Plan.

59. Mr. Ricci confirmed that the deviations from the Plan required by the Applicant were not associated with an increased density. He noted that the Applicant's proposal was less than the maximum density permitted by the Plan.

60. Mr. Ricci confirmed that the existing non-conforming conditions present on the Subject Property (identified by Mr. Colucco) would be eliminated by the Applicant's Proposal.



61. Mr. Ricci testified that the intent of the setback requirement in the Plan for the fifth floor was to reduce the visibility of the fifth floor from street level. He noted that the Applicant was proposing a five-story structure where six stories are permitted under the Plan. Mr. Ricci reiterated Mr. Taylor's testimony that the fifth story would not be visible from street level. He advised that the increased height would not increase the density of the project.

62. Mr. Ricci thereafter reviewed the deviations from the Plan relating to the proposed building signage. He advised that the Applicant proposed two signs due to the frontage on North Avenue and the adjoining Netherwood Station parking area. Mr. Ricci stated that without a retail component on the ground floor, horizontal signage was no longer appropriate. Mr. Ricci noted that the Applicant's deviations for the height of the signage were caused by the vertical nature of the signage. He advised that the LUO contemplates up to 10% of the façade area for signage; and approximately 829 SF of signage is contemplated under the Plan while 60 SF is proposed by the Applicant. Mr. Ricci opined that the signage was appropriate for the building based upon the massing and scale.

63. Mr. Ricci further noted that the goal of the Plan was to minimize the width of driveways and curb cuts in order to

discourage wider crossing paths for pedestrians. He stated that the deviation from the Plan for the width of the curb cut is a calculation of the radius at the cartway. Mr. Ricci confirmed that the width of the driveway to be crossed by pedestrians is only 24 feet. He noted that the radius at the cartway was required for safe access for vehicular traffic to the facility.

64. Mr. Ricci confirmed that the Applicant's proposal promoted the four main goals of the Plan.

65. Mr. Ricci opined that the deviations could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good; the Zone Plan; the Zoning Ordinance and the Plan.

66. Mr. Ricci testified that the Applicant's proposal represented a dramatic aesthetic improvement over the existing conditions on the Subject Property.

WHEREAS, the Board after carefully considering the evidence submitted by the Applicant, the Planning Board's experts and the general public, makes the following conclusions of law:

1. Initially, the Board recognizes that the Board's consultants submitted reports to the Board recommending various revisions to the plans to bring the application into conformity, to the greatest extent possible, with the provisions of the Plan and the LUO. As noted above, the Applicant cooperated in an

effort to modify the application to comply to the extent feasible with the requirements of the Plan and LUO.

2. The Board also concludes that the deviations can be granted under a flexible (c)(2) analysis of the MLUL. The benefit to the City is the development of the Subject Property with a use permitted by the Plan; appropriate infill development; the creation of a new tax ratable; and the generation of housing and employment opportunities. While the Board recognizes that any development creates some impact on adjoining properties, it does not perceive that this development will create any impacts of a substantially adverse nature. The proposed signs are in scale with the facade. Based upon the foregoing, the Board concludes that the benefits from the granting of the deviations substantially outweigh any detriment.

3. Additionally, the Board concludes that deviations from the Plan requirements can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good. The traditional MLUL goals of light, air and open space will not be compromised by the granting of deviations from the Plan requirements.

4. Finally, the Board concludes that the deviations from the Plan requirements can be granted without substantial detriment to the Plan; the zone plan and zoning ordinance of the City of Plainfield. The proposed apartment building is

permitted by the Plan and will not be out of character in the neighborhood. The proposed residential apartments provide sufficient storage space; and a significant outdoor amenity is proposed for building residents.

5. With the conditions attached to this resolution, the application meets or exceeds the requirements for preliminary and final site plan approval contained in the LUO.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Board of the City of Plainfield that the application **1112 NORTH URBAN RENEWAL, LLC** for preliminary and final site plan approval, and deviations from requirements of the Plan related to: (a) maximum number of stories within the first 20 feet from the property line (to permit 5 stories); (b) maximum number of signs (to permit 2); (c) maximum sign height (to permit 30 feet); (d) maximum sign mounting height (to permit 21 feet); (e) maximum curb cut width (to permit 34.5 feet); (f) minimum rear pedestrian/bicycle walkway (to permit no walkway) and (g) tenant storage space (to supply 247-263 cubic feet of storage space per unit); to permit the construction of a five-story apartment building containing 54 off-street parking spaces on the ground floor and 55 apartment units on the second through fifth floors; is granted subject to the following conditions:

I. PLAN REVISIONS AND SUBMISSIONS

Prior to signing the final site plan and issuance of any construction permits, Applicant shall submit revisions to the plans and additional information as follows:

A. In accordance with the recommendations contained in the report from the Board Planner dated June 27, 2022, as follows:

1. Revision of the plans and provision of information to the satisfaction of the Board Professional Planner.

B. In accordance with the recommendations contained in the report from the Board Engineer dated July 7, 2022, as follows:

1. Revision of the plans and provision of information to the satisfaction of the Board Engineer.

C. Compliance with any comments from the Plainfield Police Department.

D. Compliance with any comments from the Plainfield Fire Department.

E. Compliance with any comments from the City Shade Tree Commission.

F. Approval by the City Flood Plain Manager; including compliance with any comments from the City Flood Plan Manager.

G. In accordance with the recommendations of the Planning Board as follows:

1. Provision of 220 volt charging stations for all electric vehicle parking spaces; and revision of the plans to reflect same.

2. Provision of both light and auditory safety signals at the vehicular entrance to the parking facility on North Avenue; and revision of the plans to reflect same.

3. Provision of lighting calculations for the parking area to the satisfaction of the Board's Professionals and revision of the plans to reflect same.

II. OTHER APPROVALS

Applicant will obtain and comply with the requirements of all outside agencies from which approval is required, including but not limited to:

A. Final approval of the Union County Planning Board, if necessary.

B. Applicant will obtain final approval from and comply with the requirements of the Plainfield Municipal Utilities Authority.

C. Applicant will enter into final service agreements with all utility companies that will service the site.

D. Applicant will obtain all other necessary approvals from all applicable county, state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over the application.

III. TAXES; LIENS; UTILITY AND MUNICIPAL CHARGES

Applicant shall pay all municipal taxes, liens, utility and other municipal charges prior to the issuance of any building permits. Proof shall be submitted through an "official search for municipal liens."

IV. FEEES

Applicant will pay all outstanding escrow and application fees within fourteen (14) days of this Resolution and receipt by Applicant of the bills for such charges. No construction permits will be issued until this section is satisfied.

V. PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE

Prior to signing the final plat, Applicant shall post a performance bond to guarantee satisfactory installation of required improvements in an amount to be determined by the Planning Board Engineer.

VI. INSPECTION FEES

Applicant shall post inspection fees in an amount to be determined by the Planning Board Engineer before any improvements are installed.

VII. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

A. Applicant will submit additional prints of the plat map and attachments for distribution as required by the Planning Board Engineer.

B. Applicant will post a legally adequate notice of decision in the Official Paper and provide an affidavit of publication to the Division of Planning.

VIII. SATISFACTION OF CONDITIONS

This approval shall not be deemed satisfied and construction permits shall not be issued until such time as the Director of Planning determines that all conditions of approval have been satisfied.

**ROLL CALL ON MOTION JULY 7, 2022:**

Mapp:	<u>    Aye    </u>	Person:	<u>    Aye    </u>
(by designee Pile)		Hunt:	<u>    Aye    </u>
Workman:	<u>    Aye    </u>	Scott Bey:	<u>    Aye    </u>
McRae:	<u>    Aye    </u>	Toth:	<u>    Aye    </u>
Baldwin:	<u>          </u>	Exum:	<u>    Aye    </u>
El-Amin:	<u>    Aye    </u>		

This Resolution adopted this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2022 memorializes the action taken at a meeting of the City of Plainfield Planning Board on July 7, 2022, with the roll call vote on the memorialization as follows:



**ROLL CALL ON MEMORIALIZATION**

Mapp:	_____	Person:	_____
(by designee Pile)	_____	Hunt:	_____
Workman:	_____	Scott Bey:	_____
McRae:	_____	Toth:	_____
Baldwin:	_____	Exum:	_____
El-Amin:	_____		

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a Resolution of the City of Plainfield Planning Board memorialized on \_\_\_\_\_, 2022.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Maximo Vazquez  
Planning Board Secretary